

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [editorial.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:editorial.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## A cross-sectional study of the quality of life in Chinese inpatients with lung cancer

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-019873
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Sep-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Gu, Wen; Shenzhen Kangning Hospital Xu, Yan-Min; Wuhan Mental Health Centre Zhong, Baoliang
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Oncology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Keywords:	lung cancer, quality of life, psychosocial factors

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Peer Review Only

1  
2  
3  
4 **A cross-sectional study of the quality of life in Chinese inpatients with**  
5  
6 **lung cancer**  
7

8 Wen Gu<sup>1</sup>, Yan-Min Xu<sup>2</sup>, Bao-Liang Zhong<sup>2\*</sup>  
9

10 <sup>1</sup>Shenzhen Key Laboratory for Psychological Healthcare, Shenzhen Institute of Mental  
11 Health, Shenzhen Kangning Hospital, Shenzhen Mental Health Center, Shenzhen,  
12 Guangdong Province, China  
13  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 <sup>2</sup>Affiliated Wuhan Mental Health Center (The Ninth Clinical School), Tongji Medical  
19 College of Huazhong University of Science & Technology, Wuhan, Hubei Province,  
20 China  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27  
28 \*Correspondence author: Bao-Liang Zhong, Department of Psychiatry, Wuhan  
29 Mental  
30 Health Center, No. 89, Gongnongbing Rd., Wuhan, Hubei 430012, China (email:  
31 [haizhilan@gmail.com](mailto:haizhilan@gmail.com))  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Word count: 2263  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

**Objective** In China, psychosocial problems of cancer patients are underrecognized and undertreated in medical oncology practice. This study examined the quality of life (QOL) in inpatients with lung cancer treated in large general hospitals and explored the demographic, clinical, and psychosocial factors associated with QOL.

**Design** Cross-sectional study.

**Participants and setting** Altogether, 148 inpatients with lung cancer were consecutively recruited from two large general hospitals in Tianjin, China.

**Main outcome measured** QOL, pain intensity, depressive and anxiety symptoms, and social support were assessed with World Health Organization QOL Scale Brief Version, four-point Verbal Rating Scale, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, and Social Support Rating Scale, respectively.

**Results** Compared with the normative data for the Chinese general population, patients had significantly lower scores in physical and psychological QOL. Being unmarried, poor economic status, metastasis, poor performance status, depression, anxiety, and low utilization of social support were independently associated with poor physical QOL, while female gender, less education years, currently receiving chemotherapy, small-cell cancer, more intense pain, poor performance status, anxiety, and inadequate subjective social support were independently associated with poor psychological QOL.

**Conclusions** Inpatients with lung cancer treated in Chinese large general hospitals had poorer QOL in comparison with general population. Appropriate management of

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

psychosocial problems is potentially effective to improve their QOL.

For peer review only

### Strengths and limitations of this study

This is one of the very few studies that investigated associations of quality of life with psychosocial factors in patients with lung cancer in China.

The present study provide empirical evidence for the importance of psychooncology services from the perspective of quality of life, which are seriously neglected in Chinese general hospitals.

The sample size is relatively small and subjects are restricted to lung cancer patients of Chinese general hospitals.

A few factors related to the quality of life of patients with cancer are not investigated in this study.

## INTRODUCTION

During the recent decades, health-related quality of life (QOL) has become an important outcome measure in medical oncology research and clinical practice, because it can comprehensively assess the effectiveness of an anticancer regime and the impact of cancer on a patient's physical, functional, social and emotional well-being <sup>1</sup>. In addition, QOL outcome is also an important prognostic indicator, which can be used to predict the survival time of a patient with cancer <sup>2</sup>. Examining the level and predictors of QOL in patients with cancer is therefore essential in developing more effective clinical interventions.

In China, lung cancer is the most prevalent type of cancer and the leading cause of mortality of cancer-related death <sup>3</sup>. Because the survival time of patients with lung cancer is very likely to be short and treatments of lung cancer are expected to be toxic and limited in efficacy, QOL is particularly important for patients with lung cancer <sup>4</sup>. Until now, QOL of patients with lung cancer have been extensively studied in international literature, and most studies were conducted in Western countries <sup>4-10</sup>. These studies have shown that QOL among the lung cancer patients was associated with gender, age, performance status, fatigue, metastasis, cough, pain, social support, depression, and anxiety <sup>4-10</sup>.

There is convincing evidence that socio-cultural factors significantly impact QOL <sup>11</sup>. Therefore, findings reported in Western countries might not apply to patients with lung cancer living under Chinese socio-cultural settings. To date, there have been a few studies examining the QOL of Chinese patients with lung cancer <sup>13-18</sup>. These

1  
2  
3 studies reported a variety of factors associated with QOL of Chinese patients with  
4 lung cancer, including age, marital status, income, cancer stage, treatment regime,  
5 and cell type<sup>13-18</sup>. However, compared to international studies, very few of them  
6 focused on the roles of psychosocial factors on QOL.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12  
13 Because of Chinese oncologists' limited knowledge and the lack of training in  
14 clinical psychiatry, psychosocial problems of their patients are not routinely screened,  
15 which results in a serious undertreatment for psychosocial problems in clinical  
16 oncology practice<sup>19</sup>. More fundamentally, the specific psychosocial services for  
17 cancer patients, psychooncology services, are still not available in nearly all of the  
18 Chinese general hospitals<sup>20</sup>. Given the important roles of psychosocial factors in  
19 cancer incidence and prognosis<sup>21</sup>, the associations between psychosocial factors and  
20 QOL need to be further examined in Chinese patients with lung cancer, which can  
21 increase Chinese oncologists' understanding on the importance of psychosocial  
22 interventions.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 In China, more than two-thirds cancer patients prefer to seek treatment from  
39 oncology departments of large general hospitals (i.e., secondary and tertiary  
40 hospitals)<sup>22,23</sup>. Large general hospitals may represent a good setting to examine the  
41 QOL of lung cancer patients due to its good sample representativeness. The objective  
42 of this study was to investigate the QOL of Chinese inpatients with lung cancer in  
43 large general hospitals and explore the demographic, clinical, and psychosocial  
44 characteristics associated with QOL.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## METHODS

### Subjects

This study was part of a large-scale collaborative project investigating the mental health, suicidal behaviors, and QOL of oncology inpatients in two large general hospitals in Tianjin, China <sup>24</sup>. The cross-sectional survey was conducted between February and December 2015, and its details have been published elsewhere <sup>24</sup>. Briefly, we consecutively recruited adult inpatients who were hospitalized in the two hospitals at the time of the survey, diagnosed with cancer (ascertained by histological examination), and had the capacity to provide informed consent, to join in the study. Patients who were too ill, had cognitive disorders (i.e., dementia), or had difficulties in communicating with others, were excluded. Altogether, 735 eligible cancer inpatients were invited and 517 completed the survey. Among the completers, 148 were patients with lung cancer.

### Assessments

Demographic and clinical data were collected with a form designed for the present study following a careful review of medical records and an interview with patients and their treating oncologists (when necessary). Demographic variables included gender, age, education, marital status, and self-rated economic status (poor, fair, good). Clinical factors included cancer stage (metastatic vs. not metastatic) <sup>25</sup>, cell type (small vs. non-small cell), pain intensity, time since the diagnosis of cancer, functional status, and current treatment regime (chemotherapy, radiotherapy, surgery). A validated four-point Verbal Rating Scale was used to assess the pain

1  
2  
3 intensity: patients were asked to rate their pain intensity in the last month choosing  
4 from the four category responses (1=none, 2=mild, 3=moderate, and 4=severe)<sup>26</sup>.  
5  
6 The Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) Performance Status Scale was  
7  
8 adopted to assess the impact of cancer on patients' daily living abilities, which is  
9  
10 rated on a scale from 0 (fully active) to 5 (dead), with higher score denoting poorer  
11  
12 function<sup>27</sup>.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 Psychosocial factors, including depression, anxiety, and social support, were  
19  
20 collected by a self-administered questionnaire. The validated Chinese version of the  
21  
22 Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) was used to assess the presence and  
23  
24 severity of depressive and anxiety symptoms of patients<sup>28 29</sup>. This 14-item scale  
25  
26 consists of two subscales: seven items for depression and the remaining seven for  
27  
28 anxiety. Each item is rated on a 0-3 scale, yielding a total score ranging between from  
29  
30 0 to 21 for each subscale. Higher scores denote more severe symptoms of depression  
31  
32 or anxiety<sup>28 29</sup>. Social support was assessed with the validated Chinese Social  
33  
34 Support Rating Scale (SSRS), which was developed by Xiao et al.<sup>30</sup>. This 10-item scale  
35  
36 evaluates three dimensions of social support: objective support (actual received  
37  
38 practical support and available social networks), subjective support (emotional and  
39  
40 perceived support), and utilization of support (one's use of social network). A higher  
41  
42 total score in each subscale indicate a higher level of social support.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 QOL was assessed with the validated Chinese World Health Organization QOL  
51  
52 Scale Brief Version (WHOQOL-BREF)<sup>31-33</sup>. To reduce the survey burden on patients,  
53  
54 only items of the physical and psychological domains of WHOQOL-BREF were used in  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 the present study. The two subscales used seven and six items to assess the physical  
4 and psychological QOL in the past month, respectively. Each item is rated on a  
5  
6 5-point Likert scale ranging between 1 (“very dissatisfied/very poor”) and 5 (“very  
7  
8 satisfied/very good”). The two QOL domains are scaled in a positive direction with  
9  
10 higher scores indicating a better QOL.  
11  
12  
13  
14

### 15 **Statistical analysis**

16  
17  
18 Data analyses were conducted with SPSS 16.0. By using the recommended formulas  
19  
20 <sup>33</sup>, the raw scores of physical and psychological QOL domains were transformed to a  
21  
22 0-100 scale before the analysis. The comparisons of QOL between patients and the  
23  
24 normative data of Chinese general population <sup>34</sup> were performed using the  
25  
26 independent-samples t-test. Multivariable linear regression analysis that entered all  
27  
28 demographic, clinical, and psychosocial factors as independent variables and physical  
29  
30 or psychological QOL as the dependent variable, was conducted to examine the  
31  
32 independent relationships of QOL with all variables. The statistical significance level  
33  
34 was set at  $P < 0.05$  (two-sided).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **RESULTS**

44  
45 The average age of the 148 inpatients with lung cancer was 64.8 years (standard  
46  
47 deviation [SD]: 11.5, range: 20-99), and 94 (63.5%) were men. [Table 1](#) displays the  
48  
49 demographic, clinical, and psychosocial characteristics of the participants.  
50

51  
52 Scores of physical and psychological domains of QOL were significantly lower in  
53  
54 patients with lung cancer than the normative data of the Chinese general population  
55  
56  
57

(Table 2).

Multiple linear regression analyses (Table 3) revealed that marital status of “unmarried”, poor economic status, metastatic cancer, a high Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status score, more depressive symptoms, more anxiety symptoms, and a low score of utilization of social support were independently associated with poor physical QOL, while female gender, less education years, currently receiving chemotherapy, small-cell type of lung cancer, more intense pain, a high ECOG performance status score, more anxiety symptoms, and a low score of subjective social support were independently associated with poor psychological QOL.

## DISCUSSION

Although significant advances in cancer treatment have been achieved in recent decades, the survival of patients with lung cancer remains limited. Therefore quality of life should be prioritized over quantity of life in cancer treatment practice. In the present study, patients with lung cancer had significantly poorer QOL in both physical and psychological domains than the Chinese general population, which is in line with findings of prior studies conducted in Western and Chinese contexts<sup>35-38</sup>. Many symptoms of lung cancer such as cough, chest pain, loss of appetite, and shortness of breath could negatively impact the physical health of patients<sup>4</sup>. Psychological distress after cancer diagnosis, fear of death, depression, hopelessness, and even suicidality further worsen the mental health of patients who are experiencing the

1  
2  
3 physical pain of cancer <sup>24</sup>. In addition, side effects caused by cancer treatment can  
4  
5 exacerbate the health of patients <sup>39</sup>. Therefore, we found a markedly impaired  
6  
7 physical and psychological QOL in patients with cancer compared to the general  
8  
9 population.  
10  
11

12  
13 This study found a number of demographic and clinical correlates of QOL in lung  
14  
15 cancer patients. Female patients with lung cancer had worse psychological QOL,  
16  
17 which may be related to gender difference in the prevalence of risk factors  
18  
19 associated with poor QOL, for example, females patients with cancer may have more  
20  
21 psychological and social issues than males <sup>40 41</sup>. The study by Montazeri, et al.  
22  
23 reported significantly association between a low socioeconomic status and poor QOL  
24  
25 in lung cancer patients in Iran <sup>42</sup>. Similarly, we found the significant association of  
26  
27 poor QOL with less education years and poor economic status in Chinese patients  
28  
29 with lung cancer. Consistent with previous findings <sup>13 41</sup>, we found that unmarried  
30  
31 patients had poorer physical QOL than married patients.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 As expected, metastasis was negatively associated with physical QOL. Due to a  
39  
40 worse global health status, impaired physical functioning, and more physical  
41  
42 symptoms associated with metastatic cancer, patients with metastatic lung cancer  
43  
44 reported poorer QOL. Because of the rapid progression of small-cell cancer, most  
45  
46 patients with small-cell lung cancer have been at terminal stage when their cancer is  
47  
48 diagnosed <sup>13 43</sup>, which could explain the significant relationship between small-cell  
49  
50 type and poor psychological QOL in our study. Cheng and colleagues found that QOL  
51  
52 of lung cancer patients varied across different treatment regimes, with  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 chemotherapy having the worst QOL and surgery having the best QOL<sup>13</sup>. Our finding  
4  
5  
6 on the poor psychological QOL among patients receiving chemotherapy relative to  
7  
8 other treatments is in accordance with it, which may be explained by the many  
9  
10 unbearable side effects of chemotherapy and deteriorating physical health of  
11  
12 patients receiving chemotherapy. In this study, patients who experience more  
13  
14 intense pain had poorer psychological QOL; this might be due to the deleterious  
15  
16 effects of pain on patients' mental health, employment status, sleep, and personal  
17  
18 relationships<sup>44</sup>. Studies have shown that the ability to perform daily activities and  
19  
20 self-care are two important determinants of QOL in patients with cancer<sup>45 46</sup>. Owing  
21  
22 to functional limitations in hospitalized patients with lung cancer, the significant  
23  
24 association between poor performance status and low physical and psychological  
25  
26 QOL is expected.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 In addition to significant contributions of demographic and clinical factors to QOL  
34  
35 of patients with lung cancer, the significant association of QOL with psychosocial  
36  
37 factors is also demonstrated in this study, suggesting that psychosocial factors exert  
38  
39 an important influence on the QOL of Chinese patients with lung cancer. This finding  
40  
41 is in keeping with our expectations. According to the theory of QOL satisfaction  
42  
43 model<sup>47</sup>, unmet social needs reduce QOL of patients even if they are receiving  
44  
45 treatment in hospitals. Empirical evidence shows that social support can act as a  
46  
47 buffer against the negative consequences of stress, protects against physical and  
48  
49 mental morbidities, and promotes mental adjustment to chronic medical  
50  
51 conditions, including cancer<sup>48 49</sup>. For patients with lung cancer, being diagnosed with  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 cancer and treated for cancer such as surgery are all very stressful, therefore social  
4  
5 support is particularly important for the clinical management of hospitalized cancer  
6  
7 patients. As a result of this, it is plausible to observe the poor physical QOL in patents  
8  
9 with low use of social support and the poor psychological QOL in patients who  
10  
11 perceived a low level of social support. At the same time, depression and anxiety  
12  
13 were associated with poor QOL in Chinese lung cancer patients. These associations  
14  
15 can be ascribed to the negative effects of depression and anxiety on the physical and  
16  
17 mental health <sup>7</sup>. Importantly, because depressive disorders in Chinese cancer  
18  
19 inpatients are often underrecognized and undertreated <sup>19</sup>, untreated depression (and  
20  
21 other mental health problems) may have a more profound effect on the health of  
22  
23 patients.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 There are some limitations in our study. First, this is a cross-sectional survey, so the  
32  
33 causality of relationships between QOL and its correlates could not be ascertained.  
34  
35 Second, some social factors related to QOL, such as stigma, were not assessed. Third,  
36  
37 the WHOQOL-BREF is a generic QOL scale and not a lung cancer-specific instrument  
38  
39 on QOL. Although the WHOQOL-BREF could be used for assessing QOL of any  
40  
41 populations including cancer patients, it is not sensitive enough to capture  
42  
43 cancer-specific domains of QOL. Fourth, due to logistical reasons, no healthy controls  
44  
45 were recruited for the study. Comparisons were conducted with the reported  
46  
47 normative Chinese data derived by the WHOQOL-BREF.  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 In summary, inpatients with lung cancer managed in large general hospitals have a  
54  
55 poorer QOL than the general population in China. A variety of factors, in particularly  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 psychosocial factors, are significantly associated with QOL of Chinese patients with  
4 lung cancer. Given that psychosocial factors are preventable or modifiable, the  
5  
6 significant associations of poor QOL with clinical and psychosocial factors suggest  
7  
8 that in addition to conventional anticancer management, oncologists (and other  
9  
10 medical professionals) of Chinese large general hospitals should also pay special  
11  
12 attention to psychosocial problems of patients with lung cancer, and when necessary,  
13  
14 refer patients for psychooncology services and psychiatric consultation.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**REFERENCES**

1. Hamel JF, Saulnier P, Pe M, et al. A systematic review of the quality of statistical methods employed for analysing quality of life data in cancer randomised controlled trials. *Eur J Cancer* 2017;**83**:166-76.
2. Montazeri A. Quality of life data as prognostic indicators of survival in cancer patients: an overview of the literature from 1982 to 2008. *Health and quality of life outcomes* 2009;**7**:102.
3. Chen W, Zheng R, Baade PD, et al. Cancer statistics in China, 2015. *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians* 2016;**66**:115-32.
4. Polanski J, Jankowska-Polanska B, Rosinczuk J, et al. Quality of life of patients with lung cancer. *OncoTargets and therapy* 2016;**9**:1023-8.
5. Bade BC, Brooks MC, Nietert SB, et al. Assessing the Correlation Between Physical Activity and Quality of Life in Advanced Lung Cancer. *Integrative cancer therapies* 2016:1534735416684016.
6. Jung JY, Lee JM, Kim MS, et al. Comparison of Fatigue, Depression, and Anxiety as Factors Affecting Posttreatment Health-Related Quality of Life in Lung Cancer Survivors. *Psychooncology* 2017.
7. Polanski J, Chabowski M, Chudiak A, et al. Intensity of Anxiety and Depression in Patients with Lung Cancer in Relation to Quality of Life. *Advances in experimental medicine and biology* 2017.
8. Chabowski M, Polanski J, Mazur G, et al. Sociodemographic and Clinical Determinants of Quality of Life of Patients with Non-small Cell Lung Cancer. *Advances in experimental medicine and biology* 2017.
9. Dai YL, Yang CT, Chen KH, et al. Changes in and Determinants of Quality of Life in Patients With Advanced Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer Undergoing Initial Chemotherapy. *The journal of nursing research : JNR* 2017;**25**:203-15.
10. Banik A, Schwarzer R, Pawlowska I, et al. Women with family cancer history are at risk for poorer physical quality of life and lower self-efficacy: a longitudinal study among men and women with non-small cell lung cancer. *Health and*

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- quality of life outcomes* 2017;**15**:62.
11. Dyllal L, Kepa M, Teh R, et al. Cultural and social factors and quality of life of Maori in advanced age. Te puawaitanga o nga tapuwae kia ora tonu - Life and living in advanced age: a cohort study in New Zealand (LiLACS NZ). *The New Zealand medical journal* 2014;**127**:62-79.
  12. Wan GJ, Counte MA, Cella DF, et al. The impact of socio-cultural and clinical factors on health-related quality of life reports among Hispanic and African-American cancer patients. *Journal of outcome measurement* 1999;**3**:200-15.
  13. Cheng X, Zhou D, Lv L. Factors affecting the quality of life in lung cancer patients measured by EORTC QLQ questionnaire. *Chin J Lung Cancer* 2004;**7**:230-35.
  14. Zhang CM, Zhu GD, Li QL, et al. Analysis of quality of life and influencing factors in lung cancer survivor. *Mod Prev Med* 2011;**38**:1204-06.
  15. Wang B. Analysis of status quo and influence factors of life quality of lung cancer young patients. *Nurs Res* 2015;**29**:1759-60.
  16. Weng W, Yan M, Shen W, et al. Analyzing the factors affected the QOL of patients with middle-late lung cancer. *Hebei Med* 2015;**21**:1798-20.
  17. Yao HY, Shi LY. A study on influencing factors of quality of life in patients with lung cancer. *Bull Chin Cancer* 2004;**13**:683-85.
  18. Cai C, Zhou Z, Yu L, et al. Predictors of the health-related quality of life of patients who are newly diagnosed with lung cancer in China. *Nursing & health sciences* 2011;**13**:262-8.
  19. Zhao L, Li X, Zhang Z, et al. Prevalence, correlates and recognition of depression in Chinese inpatients with cancer. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 2014;**36**:477-82.
  20. Tang L, Groot Jd, Bultz B. Psychosocial oncology in China—Challenges and opportunities. *Chinese-German J Clin Oncol* 2009;**8**:123-28.
  21. Yang P. Epidemiology of lung cancer prognosis: quantity and quality of life. *Methods in molecular biology* 2009;**471**:469-86.
  22. Luo B, Du L, Pan B, et al. Prevalence of tumours and related community health service status among residents aged 15 and over in Guangzhou City. *South*

- 1  
2  
3 *China J Prev Med* 2006;**32**:11-14,18.  
4  
5 23. Wang Y, Shen J, Sun F, et al. Investigation and analysis on the utilization of health  
6 services among community-based patients with advanced cancer. *J Nurs Adm*  
7 2009;**9**:11-12,15.  
8  
9  
10 24. Zhong BL, Li SH, Lv SY, et al. Suicidal ideation among Chinese cancer inpatients of  
11 general hospitals: Prevalence and correlates. *Oncotarget* 2017;**8**:25141-50.  
12  
13 25. Brown KW, Levy AR, Rosberger Z, et al. Psychological distress and cancer survival:  
14 a follow-up 10 years after diagnosis. *Psychosom Med* 2003;**65**:636-43.  
15  
16 26. Closs SJ, Barr B, Briggs M, et al. A comparison of five pain assessment scales for  
17 nursing home residents with varying degrees of cognitive impairment. *J Pain*  
18 *Symptom Manage* 2004;**27**:196-205.  
19  
20 27. Wu M. *The Xiehe Handbook for Gynecological Tumors*. Beijing: People's Medical  
21 Publishing House, 2012.  
22  
23 28. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr*  
24 *Scand* 1983;**67**:361-70.  
25  
26 29. Yang Y, Ding R, Hu D, et al. Reliability and validity of a Chinese version of the HADS  
27 for screening depression and anxiety in psycho-cardiological outpatients.  
28 *Compr Psychiatry* 2014;**55**:215-20.  
29  
30 30. Wang XD, Wang XL, Ma H. Rating scales for mental health. *Chin Ment Health J*  
31 1999;**Suppl.**:127-31.  
32  
33 31. Skevington SM, Lotfy M, O'Connell KA, et al. The World Health Organization's  
34 WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment: psychometric properties and  
35 results of the international field trial. A report from the WHOQOL group. *Qual*  
36 *Life Res* 2004;**13**:299-310.  
37  
38 32. Zhong BL, Liu TB, Chan SS, et al. Common mental health problems in  
39 rural-to-urban migrant workers in Shenzhen, China: prevalence and risk  
40 factors. *Epidemiology and psychiatric sciences* 2017:1-10.  
41  
42 33. The WHOQOL Group. Development of the World Health Organization  
43 WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment. The WHOQOL Group. *Psychol Med*  
44 1998;**28**:551-8.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 34. Xia P, Li N, Hau KT, et al. Quality of life of Chinese urban community residents: a  
4  
5 psychometric study of the mainland Chinese version of the WHOQOL-BREF.  
6  
7 *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2012;**12**:37.
- 8  
9 35. Lee LJ, Chung CW, Chang YY, et al. Comparison of the quality of life between  
10  
11 patients with non-small-cell lung cancer and healthy controls. *Qual Life Res*  
12  
13 2011;**20**:415-23.
- 14  
15 36. Myrdal G, Valtysdottir S, Lambe M, et al. Quality of life following lung cancer  
16  
17 surgery. *Thorax* 2003;**58**:194-7.
- 18  
19 37. Dai SF, Li WN. Correlation of life quality and coping styles of patients with lung  
20  
21 cancer. *J Nursing Sci* 2009;**25**:30-32.
- 22  
23 38. Larsson M, Ljung L, Johansson BB. Health-related quality of life in advanced  
24  
25 non-small cell lung cancer: correlates and comparisons to normative data.  
26  
27 *European journal of cancer care* 2012;**21**:642-9.
- 28  
29 39. Mazzotti E, Antonini Cappellini GC, Buconovo S, et al. Treatment-related side  
30  
31 effects and quality of life in cancer patients. *Support Care Cancer*  
32  
33 2012;**20**:2553-7.
- 34  
35 40. Grant M, McMullen CK, Altschuler A, et al. Gender differences in quality of life  
36  
37 among long-term colorectal cancer survivors with ostomies. *Oncol Nurs*  
38  
39 *Forum* 2011;**38**:587-96.
- 40  
41 41. Chang NW, Lin KC, Hsu WH, et al. The effect of gender on health-related quality of  
42  
43 life and related factors in post-lobectomy lung-cancer patients. *Eur J Oncol*  
44  
45 *Nurs* 2015;**19**:292-300.
- 46  
47 42. Montazeri A, Hole DJ, Milroy R, et al. Quality of life in lung cancer patients: does  
48  
49 socioeconomic status matter? *Health and quality of life outcomes* 2003;**1**:19.
- 50  
51 43. Salomaa ER, Sallinen S, Hiekkanen H, et al. Delays in the diagnosis and treatment  
52  
53 of lung cancer. *Chest* 2005;**128**:2282-8.
- 54  
55 44. McCarberg BH, Nicholson BD, Todd KH, et al. The impact of pain on quality of life  
56  
57 and the unmet needs of pain management: results from pain sufferers and  
58  
59 physicians participating in an Internet survey. *American journal of*  
60  
*therapeutics* 2008;**15**:312-20.

- 1  
2  
3 45. Pergolotti M, Deal AM, Williams GR, et al. Activities, function, and health-related  
4 quality of life (HRQOL) of older adults with cancer. *Journal of geriatric*  
5 *oncology* 2017;**8**:249-54.  
6  
7  
8  
9 46. Hsu YH, Chai HY, Lin YF, et al. Health-related quality of life and satisfaction with  
10 case management in cancer survivors. *J Clin Nurs* 2017.  
11  
12 47. Katschnig H, Freeman H, Sartorius N. *Quality of Life in Mental Disorders, Second*  
13 *Edition*. New York: Wiley, 2005.  
14  
15  
16 48. Helgeson VS. Social support and quality of life. *Qual Life Res* 2003;**12** **Suppl**  
17 **1**:25-31.  
18  
19 49. Applebaum AJ, Stein EM, Lord-Bessen J, et al. Optimism, social support, and  
20 mental health outcomes in patients with advanced cancer. *Psychooncology*  
21 2014;**23**:299-306.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The authors thank all the patients involved in this study for their cooperation and support.

For peer review only

**CONTRIBUTORS**

Wen Gu and Bao-Liang Zhong were responsible for the design of the study, interpretation of data, the manuscript draft, and statistical analysis, Yan-Min Xu for the critical revision of the manuscript. All authors reviewed the data and analysis, revised the manuscript, had full access to all of the data in the study and can take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis, and had authority over approval of final manuscript version and the decision to submit for publication.

**FUNDING STATEMENT**

This work was supported by Wuhan Health and Family Planning Commission [grant number: WG16A02 (Bao-Liang Zhong, PI) and WX17Q30 (Yan-Min Xu, PI)].

For peer review only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**COMPETING INTERESTS**

None declared.

For peer review only

1  
2  
3 **PATIENT CONSENT**  
4

5  
6 Yes.  
7

8 **ETHICS APPROVAL**  
9

10 The Ethics Committees of Wuhan Mental Health Center approved the study protocol.  
11

12  
13 The protocol including the methods was performed in accordance with the  
14

15 Declaration of Helsinki and the relevant ethical guidelines and regulations in China.  
16

17  
18 Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1 Demographic, clinical, and psychosocial characteristics of inpatients with lung cancer**

Characteristics	Total sample (n=148)	
	n	%
Gender: male	94	63.5
Marital status: married	140	94.6
Self-rated economic status: poor	54	36.5
Cancer staging: metastatic	38	25.7
Current treatment regimen: chemotherapy	135	91.2
Pathological type: small cell	32	21.6
	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age (years)	64.8	11.5
Education (years)	8.1	3
Score of pain intensity	1.9	1.1
Time since cancer diagnosis (months)	24.9	18.4
ECOG Scale score of performance status	2	1
Depressive symptoms: HADS-D score	8.2	3.2
Anxiety symptoms: HADS-A score	7.8	3.2
SSRS: objective social support	7.7	1.8
SSRS: subjective social support	24.7	4
SSRS: utilization of social support	7.7	1.9

**Table 2 Comparison of QOL between inpatients with lung cancer and the general population**

QOL	Patients (n=148)		Normative data of the Chinese general population (n=1052) <sup>34</sup>		t	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Physical	39.02	10.62	66	12.56	-25.86	<0.001
Psychological	38.85	10.28	60.55	13.96	-18.225	<0.001

**Table 3 Multivariable linear regression analyses on correlates of physical and psychological QOL**

Variables	Physical QOL		Psychological QOL	
	Coefficient	P	Coefficient	P
Gender: female	-0.700	0.235	-1.494	<b>0.001</b>
Age (years)	-0.018	0.489	-0.024	0.283
Education (years)	-0.135	0.173	-0.209	<b>0.013</b>
Marital status: unmarried*	-2.471	<b>0.032</b>	-0.456	0.652
Self-rated economic status: poor	-1.764	<b>0.004</b>	-0.355	0.474
Cancer staging: metastatic	-1.328	<b>0.032</b>	-0.835	0.106
Current treatment regimen:				
chemotherapy	-1.068	0.281	-1.536	<b>0.043</b>
Pathological type: small cell	-0.725	0.273	-1.157	<b>0.026</b>
Score of pain intensity	0.17	0.556	-0.535	<b>0.015</b>
Time since cancer diagnosis (months)	0.028	0.083	0.009	0.503
ECOG Scale score of performance status	-0.959	<b>0.003</b>	-0.930	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Depressive symptoms: HADS-D score	-0.465	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-0.016	0.881
Anxiety symptoms: HADS-A score	-0.208	<b>0.048</b>	-0.178	<b>0.019</b>
SSRS: objective social support	0.018	0.918	0.191	0.195
SSRS: subjective social support	0.12	0.153	0.137	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
SSRS: utilization of social support	0.344	<b>0.042</b>	0.145	0.267

\*"Unmarried" includes never married, separated, cohabitating, divorced, and widowed.

**STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies***

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	6
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	7-8
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	8-9
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	8-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	NA
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
<b>Results</b>			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	9-10
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9-10
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9-10
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9-10
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	9-10
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	9-10
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	9-10
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	NA
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	10
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	13
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	10-13
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	10-13
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	22

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).

# BMJ Open

## Health-related quality of life in Chinese inpatients with lung cancer treated in large general hospitals: a cross-sectional study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-019873.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Jan-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Gu, Wen; Shenzhen Kangning Hospital, Department of Psychiatry Xu, Yan-Min; Affiliated Wuhan Mental Health Center, Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science & Technology, Department of Psychiatry Zhong, Baoliang; Affiliated Wuhan Mental Health Center, Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science & Technology, Department of Psychiatry
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Oncology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Keywords:	quality of life, lung cancer, psychosocial factor

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 **Health-related quality of life in Chinese inpatients with lung cancer**  
5  
6 **treated in large general hospitals: a cross-sectional study**  
7

8 Wen Gu<sup>1</sup>, Yan-Min Xu<sup>2</sup>, Bao-Liang Zhong<sup>2\*</sup>  
9

10 <sup>1</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Shenzhen Key Laboratory for Psychological Healthcare,  
11  
12 Shenzhen Institute of Mental Health, Shenzhen Kangning Hospital, Shenzhen Mental  
13  
14 Health Center, Shenzhen, Guangdong Province, China  
15

16  
17  
18 <sup>2</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Affiliated Wuhan Mental Health Center (The Ninth  
19  
20 Clinical School), Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science &  
21  
22 Technology, Wuhan, Hubei Province, China  
23

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 \*Correspondence author: Bao-Liang Zhong, Department of Psychiatry, Wuhan  
29  
30 Mental  
31  
32 Health Center, No. 89, Gongnongbing Rd., Wuhan, Hubei 430012, China (E-mail:  
33  
34 [haizhilan@gmail.com](mailto:haizhilan@gmail.com))  
35  
36

37  
38 Word count: 2538  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

**Objective** In China, psychosocial problems of cancer patients are underrecognized and undertreated in medical oncology practice. This study examined the quality of life (QOL) in inpatients with lung cancer treated in large general hospitals and explored the demographic, clinical, and psychosocial factors associated with QOL.

**Design** Cross-sectional study.

**Participants and setting** Altogether, 148 inpatients with lung cancer were consecutively recruited from two large general hospitals in Tianjin, China.

**Main outcome measured** QOL, pain intensity, depressive and anxiety symptoms, and social support were assessed with World Health Organization QOL Scale Brief Version, four-point Verbal Rating Scale, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, and Social Support Rating Scale, respectively.

**Results** Compared with the normative data for the Chinese general population, patients had significantly lower scores in physical and psychological QOL. Being unmarried, poor economic status, metastasis, poor performance status, depression, anxiety, and low utilization of social support were independently associated with poor physical QOL, while female gender, less education years, currently receiving chemotherapy, small-cell cancer, more intense pain, poor performance status, anxiety, and inadequate subjective social support were independently associated with poor psychological QOL.

**Conclusions** Inpatients with lung cancer treated in Chinese large general hospitals had poorer QOL in comparison with general population. Appropriate management of

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

psychosocial problems is potentially effective to improve their QOL.

For peer review only

### Strengths and limitations of this study

This is one of the very few studies that investigated associations of quality of life (QOL) with psychosocial factors in patients with lung cancer in China.

The relatively small sample size of patients and recruiting patients from inpatient departments of large general hospitals only may limit the generalizability of the findings.

The instrument for assessing QOL in this study, the World Health Organization QOL Scale Brief Version, is a generic QOL scale and not a lung cancer-specific instrument on QOL.

## INTRODUCTION

During the recent decades, health-related quality of life (QOL) has become an important outcome measure in medical oncology research and clinical practice, because it can comprehensively assess the effectiveness of an anticancer regime and the impact of cancer on a patient's physical, functional, social and emotional well-being<sup>1</sup>. In addition, QOL outcome is also an important prognostic indicator, which can be used to predict the survival time of a patient with cancer<sup>2</sup>. Cancer treatment is challenging, because many physical and psychosocial problems are present at all stages of the disease but conventional treatment for cancer such as chemotherapy focuses on addressing the physical dimensions of cancer (i.e., stopping or slowing the growth of cancer cells)<sup>3,4</sup>. Given that QOL is a comprehensive assessment of clinical outcome, examining the level and predictors of QOL in patients with cancer is therefore essential in developing measures to improve quality of care and treatment outcomes.

In China, lung cancer is the most prevalent type of cancer and the leading cause of mortality of cancer-related death<sup>5</sup>. Because the survival time of patients with lung cancer is very likely to be short and treatments of lung cancer are expected to be toxic and limited in efficacy, QOL is particularly important for patients with lung cancer<sup>6</sup>. Until now, QOL of patients with lung cancer have been extensively studied in international literature, and most studies were conducted in Western countries<sup>6-12</sup>. These studies have shown that QOL among the lung cancer patients was associated with gender, age, performance status, fatigue, metastasis, cough, pain, social support,

1  
2  
3 depression, and anxiety<sup>6-12</sup>.

4  
5  
6 There is convincing evidence that socio-cultural factors significantly impact QOL<sup>13</sup>,  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
14. Therefore, findings reported in Western countries might not apply to patients with lung cancer living under Chinese socio-cultural settings. To date, there have been a few studies examining the QOL of Chinese patients with lung cancer<sup>15-20</sup>. These studies reported a variety of factors associated with QOL of Chinese patients with lung cancer, including age, marital status, income, cancer stage, treatment regime, and cell type<sup>15-20</sup>. However, compared to international studies, very few of them focused on the roles of psychosocial factors on QOL: only one reported the significant association between social support and the global QOL in patients with newly diagnosed lung cancer<sup>20</sup>.

Because of Chinese oncologists' limited knowledge and the lack of training in clinical psychiatry, psychosocial problems of their patients are not routinely screened, which results in a serious underrecognition/undertreatment for psychosocial problems in clinical oncology practice<sup>21</sup>. More fundamentally, the specific psychosocial services for cancer patients, psychooncology services, are still not available in nearly all of the Chinese general hospitals<sup>22</sup>. Given the important roles of psychosocial factors in cancer incidence and prognosis<sup>23</sup>, the associations between psychosocial factors and QOL need to be further examined in Chinese patients with lung cancer, which can increase Chinese oncologists' understanding on the importance of psychosocial interventions.

In China, more than two-thirds cancer patients prefer to seek treatment from

1  
2  
3 oncology departments of large general hospitals (i.e., secondary and tertiary  
4 hospitals) <sup>24, 25</sup>. Large general hospitals may represent a good setting to examine the  
5  
6 QOL of lung cancer patients due to its good sample representativeness. The objective  
7  
8 of this study was to investigate the QOL of Chinese inpatients with lung cancer in  
9  
10 large general hospitals and explore the demographic, clinical, and psychosocial  
11  
12 characteristics associated with QOL.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 20 **METHODS**

### 21 **Subjects**

22  
23 This study was part of a large-scale collaborative project investigating the mental  
24  
25 health, suicidal behaviors, and QOL of oncology inpatients in two large general  
26  
27 hospitals in Tianjin, China <sup>26</sup>. The cross-sectional survey was conducted between  
28  
29 February and December 2015, and its details have been published elsewhere <sup>26</sup>.  
30  
31 Briefly, we consecutively recruited adult inpatients who were hospitalized in the two  
32  
33 hospitals at the time of the survey, diagnosed with cancer (ascertained by  
34  
35 histological examination), and had the capacity to provide informed consent, to join  
36  
37 in the study. Patients who were too ill, had cognitive disorders (i.e., dementia), or  
38  
39 had difficulties in communicating with others, were excluded.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

### 47 **Assessments**

48  
49 Demographic and clinical data were collected with a form designed for the present  
50  
51 study, followed by a careful review of medical records and an interview with patients  
52  
53 and their treating oncologists (when necessary).  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 Demographic variables included gender, age, education, marital status, and  
4 self-rated economic status (poor, fair, good).  
5  
6

7  
8 Clinical factors included cancer stage (metastatic vs. not metastatic)<sup>27</sup>, cell type  
9 (small vs. non-small cell), pain intensity, time since the diagnosis of cancer, functional  
10 status, and current treatment regime (chemotherapy, radiotherapy, surgery). A  
11 validated four-point Verbal Rating Scale was used to assess the pain intensity:  
12 patients were asked to rate their pain intensity in the last month choosing from the  
13 four category responses (1=none, 2=mild, 3=moderate, and 4=severe)<sup>28</sup>. The Eastern  
14 Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) Performance Status Scale was adopted to assess  
15 the impact of cancer on patients' daily living abilities, which is rated on a scale from 0  
16 (fully active) to 5 (dead), with higher score denoting poorer function<sup>29</sup>.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Psychosocial factors, including depression, anxiety, and social support, were  
31 collected by a self-administered questionnaire. The validated Chinese version of the  
32 Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) was used to assess the presence and  
33 severity of depressive and anxiety symptoms of patients<sup>30, 31</sup>. This 14-item scale  
34 consists of two subscales: seven items for depression and the remaining seven for  
35 anxiety. Each item is rated on a 0-3 scale, yielding a total score ranging between from  
36 0 to 21 for each subscale. Higher scores denote more severe symptoms of depression  
37 or anxiety<sup>30, 31</sup>. Social support was assessed with the validated Chinese Social  
38 Support Rating Scale (SSRS), which was developed by Xiao et al.<sup>32</sup>. This 10-item scale  
39 evaluates three dimensions of social support: objective support (actual received  
40 practical support and available social networks), subjective support (emotional and  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 perceived support), and utilization of support (one's use of social network). A higher  
4  
5 total score in each subscale indicate a higher level of social support.  
6  
7

8 QOL was assessed with the validated Chinese World Health Organization QOL  
9  
10 Scale Brief Version (WHOQOL-BREF)<sup>33-35</sup>. To reduce the survey burden on patients,  
11  
12 only items of the physical and psychological domains of WHOQOL-BREF were used in  
13  
14 the present study. The two subscales used seven and six items to assess the physical  
15  
16 and psychological QOL in the past month, respectively. Each item is rated on a  
17  
18 5-point Likert scale ranging between 1 (“very dissatisfied/very poor”) and 5 (“very  
19  
20 satisfied/very good”). The two QOL domains are scaled in a positive direction with  
21  
22 higher scores indicating a better QOL.  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 **Statistical analysis**

28  
29 Data analyses were conducted with SPSS 16.0. By using the recommended formulas  
30  
31 <sup>35</sup>, the raw scores of physical and psychological QOL domains were transformed to a  
32  
33 0-100 scale before the analysis. We used the independent-samples t-test to compare  
34  
35 QOL between patients and the normative data, which is derived from a  
36  
37 representative sample (N=1052) of Chinese general adult population<sup>36</sup>. Multivariable  
38  
39 linear regression analysis that entered all demographic, clinical, and psychosocial  
40  
41 factors as independent variables and physical or psychological QOL as the dependent  
42  
43 variable, was conducted to examine the independent relationships of QOL with all  
44  
45 variables. The statistical significance level was set at P<0.05 (two-sided).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

## 55 **RESULTS**

1  
2  
3 Altogether, 735 eligible cancer inpatients were invited and 517 completed the survey.  
4  
5  
6 For lung cancer, the numbers of patients who were invited and completed the survey  
7  
8 were 179 and 148, respectively. The average age of the 148 inpatients with lung  
9  
10 cancer was 64.8 years (standard deviation [SD]: 11.5, range: 20-99), and 94 (63.5%)  
11  
12 were men. Table 1 displays the demographic, clinical, and psychosocial characteristics  
13  
14 of the participants.  
15  
16

17  
18 Scores of physical and psychological domains of QOL were significantly lower in  
19  
20 patients with lung cancer than the normative data of the Chinese general population  
21  
22 (Table 2).  
23  
24

25  
26 Multiple linear regression analyses (Table 3) revealed that marital status of  
27  
28 “unmarried”, poor economic status, metastatic cancer, a high Eastern Cooperative  
29  
30 Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status score, more depressive symptoms, more  
31  
32 anxiety symptoms, and a low score of utilization of social support were  
33  
34 independently associated with poor physical QOL, while female gender, less  
35  
36 education years, currently receiving chemotherapy, small-cell type of lung cancer,  
37  
38 more intense pain, a high ECOG performance status score, more anxiety symptoms,  
39  
40 and a low score of subjective social support were independently associated with  
41  
42 poor psychological QOL.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 **DISCUSSION**

51  
52 Although significant advances in cancer treatment have been achieved in recent  
53  
54 decades, the survival of patients with lung cancer remains limited. Therefore  
55  
56

1  
2  
3 improving the QOL of patients with limited life expectancy should be a primary  
4 concern in lung cancer treatment practice. In the present study, patients with lung  
5 cancer had significantly poorer QOL in both physical and psychological domains than  
6 the Chinese general population, which is in line with findings of prior studies  
7 conducted in Western and Chinese contexts <sup>37-40</sup>. Many symptoms of lung cancer  
8 such as cough, chest pain, loss of appetite, and shortness of breath could negatively  
9 impact the physical health of patients <sup>6</sup>. Psychological distress after cancer diagnosis,  
10 fear of death, depression, hopelessness, and even suicidality further worsen the  
11 mental health of patients who are experiencing the physical pain of cancer <sup>26</sup>. In  
12 addition, side effects caused by cancer treatment can exacerbate the health of  
13 patients <sup>41</sup>. Therefore, we found a markedly impaired physical and psychological QOL  
14 in patients with cancer compared to the general population.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 This study found a number of demographic and clinical correlates of QOL in lung  
34 cancer patients. Female patients with lung cancer had worse psychological QOL,  
35 which may be related to gender difference in the prevalence of risk factors  
36 associated with poor QOL, for example, females patients with cancer may have more  
37 psychological and social issues than males <sup>42, 43</sup>. The study by Montazeri, et al.  
38 reported significantly association between a low socioeconomic status and poor QOL  
39 in lung cancer patients in Iran <sup>44</sup>. Similarly, we found the significant association of  
40 poor QOL with less education years and poor economic status in Chinese patients  
41 with lung cancer. Consistent with previous findings <sup>15, 43</sup>, we found that unmarried  
42 patients had poorer physical QOL than married patients.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 As expected, metastasis was negatively associated with physical QOL. Due to a  
5  
6 worse global health status, impaired physical functioning, and more physical  
7  
8 symptoms associated with metastatic cancer, patients with metastatic lung cancer  
9  
10 reported poorer QOL. Because of the rapid progression of small-cell cancer, most  
11  
12 patients with small-cell lung cancer have been at terminal stage when their cancer is  
13  
14 diagnosed <sup>15, 45</sup>, which could explain the significant relationship between small-cell  
15  
16 type and poor psychological QOL in our study. Cheng and colleagues found that QOL  
17  
18 of lung cancer patients varied across different treatment regimes, with  
19  
20 chemotherapy having the worst QOL and surgery having the best QOL <sup>15</sup>. Our finding  
21  
22 on the poor psychological QOL among patients receiving chemotherapy relative to  
23  
24 other treatments is in accordance with it, which may be explained by the many  
25  
26 unbearable side effects of chemotherapy and deteriorating physical health of  
27  
28 patients receiving chemotherapy. In this study, patients who experience more  
29  
30 intense pain had poorer psychological QOL; this might be due to the deleterious  
31  
32 effects of pain on patients' mental health, employment status, sleep, and personal  
33  
34 relationships <sup>46</sup>. Studies have shown that the ability to perform daily activities and  
35  
36 self-care are two important determinants of QOL in patients with cancer <sup>47, 48</sup>. Owing  
37  
38 to functional limitations in hospitalized patients with lung cancer, the significant  
39  
40 association between poor performance status and low physical and psychological  
41  
42 QOL is expected.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 In addition to significant contributions of demographic and clinical factors to QOL  
53  
54 of patients with lung cancer, the significant association of QOL with psychosocial  
55  
56

1  
2  
3 factors is also demonstrated in this study, suggesting that psychosocial factors exert  
4  
5 an important influence on the QOL of Chinese patients with lung cancer. This finding  
6  
7 is in keeping with our expectations. According to the theory of QOL satisfaction  
8  
9 model <sup>49</sup>, unmet social needs reduce QOL of patients even if they are receiving  
10  
11 treatment in hospitals. Empirical evidence shows that social support can act as a  
12  
13 buffer against the negative consequences of stress, protects against physical and  
14  
15 mental morbidities, and promotes mental adjustment to chronic medical  
16  
17 conditions, including cancer <sup>50,51</sup>. For patients with lung cancer, being diagnosed with  
18  
19 cancer and treated for cancer such as surgery are all very stressful, therefore social  
20  
21 support is particularly important for the clinical management of hospitalized cancer  
22  
23 patients. As a result of this, it is plausible to observe the poor physical QOL in patents  
24  
25 with low use of social support and the poor psychological QOL in patients who  
26  
27 perceived a low level of social support. At the same time, depression and anxiety  
28  
29 were associated with poor QOL in Chinese lung cancer patients. These associations  
30  
31 can be ascribed to the negative effects of depression and anxiety on the physical and  
32  
33 mental health <sup>9</sup>. Importantly, because depressive disorders in Chinese cancer  
34  
35 inpatients are often underrecognized and undertreated <sup>21</sup>, untreated depression (and  
36  
37 other mental health problems) may have a more profound effect on the health of  
38  
39 patients.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 There are some limitations in our study. First, this is a cross-sectional survey, so the  
51  
52 causality of relationships between QOL and its correlates could not be ascertained.  
53  
54 Second, some social factors related to QOL, such as stigma, were not assessed. Third,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 the WHOQOL-BREF is a generic QOL scale and not a lung cancer-specific instrument  
5  
6 on QOL. Although the WHOQOL-BREF could be used for assessing QOL of any  
7  
8 populations including cancer patients, it is not sensitive enough to capture  
9  
10 cancer-specific domains of QOL. Fourth, due to logistical reasons, no healthy controls  
11  
12 were recruited for the study. Comparisons were conducted with the reported  
13  
14 normative Chinese data derived by the WHOQOL-BREF. Fifth, the sample size of our  
15  
16 study (N=148) is relatively small, because we studied a total of 16 candidate  
17  
18 predictors of QOL and the required minimum number of subjects should be 160,  
19  
20 according to the “10 subjects per predictor” rule of thumb for minimum sample size  
21  
22 for multiple linear regression<sup>52</sup>. The lack of statistical power might limit the ability of  
23  
24 multiple linear regression model to identify more significant predictors of QOL.  
25  
26 Further, due to the small number of patients who were unmarried patients (N=8) and  
27  
28 not receiving chemotherapy (N=13), our findings on the relationships between QOL  
29  
30 and marital status and treatment regimen might not be reliable. Large-scale studies  
31  
32 are warranted to confirm these relationships. Finally, we recruited patients with lung  
33  
34 cancer from inpatient departments of large general hospitals only, outpatients of  
35  
36 general hospitals and primary care patients were not included, potentially  
37  
38 influencing the representativeness of the sample of patients with lung cancer. We  
39  
40 need to be cautious in generalizing findings of the present study to all patients with  
41  
42 lung cancer.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 In summary, inpatients with lung cancer managed in large general hospitals have a  
53  
54 poorer QOL than the general population in China. A variety of factors, in particularly  
55  
56

1  
2  
3 psychosocial factors, are significantly associated with QOL of Chinese patients with  
4 lung cancer. Given that psychosocial factors are preventable or modifiable, the  
5  
6 significant associations of poor QOL with clinical and psychosocial factors suggest  
7  
8 that in addition to conventional anticancer management, oncologists (and other  
9  
10 medical professionals) of Chinese large general hospitals should also pay special  
11  
12 attention to psychosocial problems of patients with lung cancer, and when necessary,  
13  
14 refer patients for psychooncology services and psychiatric consultation.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**REFERENCES**

1. Hamel JF, Saulnier P, Pe M, et al. A systematic review of the quality of statistical methods employed for analysing quality of life data in cancer randomised controlled trials. *Eur J Cancer* 2017;**83**:166-76.
2. Montazeri A. Quality of life data as prognostic indicators of survival in cancer patients: an overview of the literature from 1982 to 2008. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2009;**7**:102.
3. Neamtiu L, Deandrea S, Pylkkanen L, et al. Psycho-oncological support for breast cancer patients: A brief overview of breast cancer services certification schemes and national health policies in Europe. *Breast* 2016;**29**:178-80.
4. Zugazagoitia J, Guedes C, Ponce S, et al. Current Challenges in Cancer Treatment. *Clin Ther* 2016;**38**:1551-66.
5. Chen W, Zheng R, Baade PD, et al. Cancer statistics in China, 2015. *CA: Cancer J Clin* 2016;**66**:115-32.
6. Polanski J, Jankowska-Polanska B, Rosinczuk J, et al. Quality of life of patients with lung cancer. *OncoTargets Ther* 2016;**9**:1023-8.
7. Bade BC, Brooks MC, Nietert SB, et al. Assessing the Correlation Between Physical Activity and Quality of Life in Advanced Lung Cancer. *Integr Cancer Ther* 2016:1534735416684016.
8. Jung JY, Lee JM, Kim MS, et al. Comparison of Fatigue, Depression, and Anxiety as Factors Affecting Posttreatment Health-Related Quality of Life in Lung Cancer Survivors. *Psychooncology* 2017; doi: 10.1002/pon.4513..

- 1  
2  
3  
4 9. Polanski J, Chabowski M, Chudiak A, et al. Intensity of Anxiety and Depression in  
5  
6 Patients with Lung Cancer in Relation to Quality of Life. *Adv Exp Med Biol*  
7  
8 2017; doi: 10.1007/5584\_2017\_50.  
9  
10  
11 10. Chabowski M, Polanski J, Mazur G, et al. Sociodemographic and Clinical  
12  
13 Determinants of Quality of Life of Patients with Non-small Cell Lung Cancer.  
14  
15 *Adv Exp Med Biol* 2017;**1022**:1-10..  
16  
17  
18 11. Dai YL, Yang CT, Chen KH, et al. Changes in and Determinants of Quality of Life in  
19  
20 Patients With Advanced Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer Undergoing Initial  
21  
22 Chemotherapy. *J Nurs Res* 2017;**25**:203-15.  
23  
24  
25 12. Banik A, Schwarzer R, Pawlowska I, et al. Women with family cancer history are at  
26  
27 risk for poorer physical quality of life and lower self-efficacy: a longitudinal  
28  
29 study among men and women with non-small cell lung cancer. *Health Qual*  
30  
31 *Life Outcomes* 2017;**15**:62.  
32  
33  
34  
35 13. Dyall L, Kepa M, Teh R, et al. Cultural and social factors and quality of life of Maori  
36  
37 in advanced age. Te puawaitanga o nga tapuwae kia ora tonu - Life and living  
38  
39 in advanced age: a cohort study in New Zealand (LiLACS NZ). *N Z Med J*  
40  
41 2014;**127**:62-79.  
42  
43  
44  
45 14. Wan GJ, Counte MA, Cella DF, et al. The impact of socio-cultural and clinical  
46  
47 factors on health-related quality of life reports among Hispanic and  
48  
49 African-American cancer patients. *JOM* 1999;**3**:200-15.  
50  
51  
52 15. Cheng X, Zhou D, Lv L. Factors affecting the quality of life in lung cancer patients  
53  
54 measured by EORTC QLQ questionnaire. *Chin J Lung Cancer* 2004;**7**:230-35.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
16. Zhang CM, Zhu GD, Li QL, et al. Analysis of quality of life and influencing factors in lung cancer survivor. *Mod Prev Med* 2011;**38**:1204-06.
17. Wang B. Analysis of status quo and influence factors of life quality of lung cancer young patients. *Nurs Res* 2015;**29**:1759-60.
18. Weng W, Yan M, Shen W, et al. Analyzing the factors affected the QOL of patients with middle-late lung cancer. *Hebei Med* 2015;**21**:1798-20.
19. Yao HY, Shi LY. A study on influencing factors of quality of life in patients with lung cancer. *Bull Chin Cancer* 2004;**13**:683-85.
20. Cai C, Zhou Z, Yu L, et al. Predictors of the health-related quality of life of patients who are newly diagnosed with lung cancer in China. *Nurs Health Sci* 2011;**13**:262-8.
21. Zhao L, Li X, Zhang Z, et al. Prevalence, correlates and recognition of depression in Chinese inpatients with cancer. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 2014;**36**:477-82.
22. Tang L, Groot Jd, Bultz B. Psychosocial oncology in China—Challenges and opportunities. *Chinese-German J Clin Oncol* 2009;**8**:123-28.
23. Yang P. Epidemiology of lung cancer prognosis: quantity and quality of life. *Methods Mol Biol* 2009;**471**:469-86.
24. Luo B, Du L, Pan B, et al. Prevalence of tumours and related community health service status among residents aged 15 and over in Guangzhou City. *South China J Prev Med* 2006;**32**:11-14,18.
25. Wang Y, Shen J, Sun F, et al. Investigation and analysis on the utilization of health services among community-based patients with advanced cancer. *J Nurs Adm*

- 2009;**9**:11-12,15.
26. Zhong BL, Li SH, Lv SY, et al. Suicidal ideation among Chinese cancer inpatients of general hospitals: Prevalence and correlates. *Oncotarget* 2017;**8**:25141-50.
27. Brown KW, Levy AR, Rosberger Z, et al. Psychological distress and cancer survival: a follow-up 10 years after diagnosis. *Psychosom Med* 2003;**65**:636-43.
28. Closs SJ, Barr B, Briggs M, et al. A comparison of five pain assessment scales for nursing home residents with varying degrees of cognitive impairment. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2004;**27**:196-205.
29. Wu M. *The Xiehe Handbook for Gynecological Tumors*. Beijing: People's Medical Publishing House, 2012.
30. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1983;**67**:361-70.
31. Yang Y, Ding R, Hu D, et al. Reliability and validity of a Chinese version of the HADS for screening depression and anxiety in psycho-cardiological outpatients. *Compr Psychiatry* 2014;**55**:215-20.
32. Wang XD, Wang XL, Ma H. Rating scales for mental health. *Chin Ment Health J* 1999;**Suppl.**:127-31.
33. Skevington SM, Lotfy M, O'Connell KA, et al. The World Health Organization's WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment: psychometric properties and results of the international field trial. A report from the WHOQOL group. *Qual Life Res* 2004;**13**:299-310.
34. Zhong BL, Liu TB, Chan SS, et al. Common mental health problems in

- 1  
2  
3 rural-to-urban migrant workers in Shenzhen, China: prevalence and risk  
4  
5 factors. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci* 2017;1-10.  
6  
7
- 8 35. The-WHOQOL-Group. Development of the World Health Organization  
9  
10 WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment. The WHOQOL Group. *Psychol Med*  
11  
12 1998;**28**:551-8.  
13  
14
- 15 36. Xia P, Li N, Hau KT, et al. Quality of life of Chinese urban community residents: a  
16  
17 psychometric study of the mainland Chinese version of the WHOQOL-BREF.  
18  
19 *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2012;**12**:37.  
20  
21
- 22 37. Lee LJ, Chung CW, Chang YY, et al. Comparison of the quality of life between  
23  
24 patients with non-small-cell lung cancer and healthy controls. *Qual Life Res*  
25  
26 2011;**20**:415-23.  
27  
28
- 29 38. Myrdal G, Valtysdottir S, Lambe M, et al. Quality of life following lung cancer  
30  
31 surgery. *Thorax* 2003;**58**:194-7.  
32  
33
- 34 39. Dai SF, Li WN. Correlation of life quality and coping styles of patients with lung  
35  
36 cancer. *J Nursing Sci* 2009;**25**:30-32.  
37  
38
- 39 40. Larsson M, Ljung L, Johansson BB. Health-related quality of life in advanced  
40  
41 non-small cell lung cancer: correlates and comparisons to normative data. *Eur*  
42  
43 *J Cancer Care* 2012;**21**:642-9.  
44  
45
- 46 41. Mazzotti E, Antonini Cappellini GC, Buconovo S, et al. Treatment-related side  
47  
48 effects and quality of life in cancer patients. *Support Care Cancer*  
49  
50 2012;**20**:2553-7.  
51  
52
- 53 42. Grant M, McMullen CK, Altschuler A, et al. Gender differences in quality of life  
54  
55  
56

- 1  
2  
3 among long-term colorectal cancer survivors with ostomies. *Oncol Nurs*  
4  
5  
6 *Forum* 2011;**38**:587-96.  
7
- 8 43. Chang NW, Lin KC, Hsu WH, et al. The effect of gender on health-related quality of  
9  
10 life and related factors in post-lobectomy lung-cancer patients. *Eur J Oncol*  
11  
12 *Nurs* 2015;**19**:292-300.  
13  
14
- 15 44. Montazeri A, Hole DJ, Milroy R, et al. Quality of life in lung cancer patients: does  
16  
17 socioeconomic status matter? *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2003;**1**:19.  
18  
19
- 20 45. Salomaa ER, Sallinen S, Hiekkanen H, et al. Delays in the diagnosis and treatment  
21  
22 of lung cancer. *Chest* 2005;**128**:2282-8.  
23  
24
- 25 46. McCarberg BH, Nicholson BD, Todd KH, et al. The impact of pain on quality of life  
26  
27 and the unmet needs of pain management: results from pain sufferers and  
28  
29 physicians participating in an Internet survey. *Am J Ther* 2008;**15**:312-20.  
30  
31
- 32 47. Pergolotti M, Deal AM, Williams GR, et al. Activities, function, and health-related  
33  
34 quality of life (HRQOL) of older adults with cancer. *J Geriatr Oncol*  
35  
36 *2017*;**8**:249-54.  
37  
38
- 39 48. Hsu YH, Chai HY, Lin YF, et al. Health-related quality of life and satisfaction with  
40  
41 case management in cancer survivors. *J Clin Nurs* 2017.  
42  
43
- 44 49. Katschnig H, Freeman H, Sartorius N. *Quality of Life in Mental Disorders, Second*  
45  
46 *Edition*. New York: Wiley, 2005.  
47  
48
- 49 50. Helgeson VS. Social support and quality of life. *Qual Life Res* 2003;**12 Suppl**  
50  
51 **1**:25-31.  
52  
53
- 54 51. Applebaum AJ, Stein EM, Lord-Bessen J, et al. Optimism, social support, and  
55  
56

1  
2  
3 mental health outcomes in patients with advanced cancer. *Psychooncology*  
4  
5  
6 2014;**23**:299-306.  
7

- 8  
9 52. Babyak M. What you see may not be what you get: a brief, nontechnical  
10  
11 introduction to overfitting in regression-type models. *Psychosom Med*  
12  
13 2004;**66**:411-21.  
14

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The authors thank all the patients involved in this study for their cooperation and support.

For peer review only

## CONTRIBUTORS

Wen Gu and Bao-Liang Zhong were responsible for the design of the study, interpretation of data, the manuscript draft, and statistical analysis, Yan-Min Xu for the critical revision of the manuscript. All authors reviewed the data and analysis, revised the manuscript, had full access to all of the data in the study and can take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis, and had authority over approval of final manuscript version and the decision to submit for publication.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**FUNDING STATEMENT**

This work was supported by Wuhan Health and Family Planning Commission [grant number: WG16A02 (Bao-Liang Zhong, PI) and WX17Q30 (Yan-Min Xu, PI)].

For peer review only

1  
2  
3  
4 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

5  
6 None declared.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

1  
2  
3 **PATIENT CONSENT**  
4

5  
6 Yes.  
7

8 **ETHICS APPROVAL**  
9

10 The Ethics Committee of Wuhan Mental Health Center approved the study protocol.  
11

12  
13 The protocol including the methods was performed in accordance with the  
14

15 Declaration of Helsinki and the relevant ethical guidelines and regulations in China.  
16

17  
18 Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**DATA SHARING STATEMENT**

The data sets generated and analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

For peer review only

**Table 1 Demographic, clinical, and psychosocial characteristics of inpatients with lung cancer\***

Characteristics	Total sample (n=148)	
	n	%
Gender: male	94	63.5
female	54	36.5
Marital status: married	140	94.6
never married	1	0.7
separated/divorced	5	3.4
widowed	2	1.4
Self-rated economic status: poor	54	36.5
fair	81	54.7
good	13	8.8
Cancer staging: metastatic	38	25.7
not metastatic	110	74.3
Current treatment regimen: chemotherapy	135	91.2
radiotherapy	8	5.4
surgery	5	3.4
Pathological type: small cell	32	21.6
non-small cell	116	78.4
	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age (years)	64.8	11.5

Education (years)	8.1	3.0
Score of pain intensity	1.9	1.1
Time since cancer diagnosis (months)	24.9	18.4
ECOG Scale score of performance status	2.0	1.0
Depressive symptoms: HADS-D score	8.2	3.2
Anxiety symptoms: HADS-A score	7.8	3.2
SSRS: objective social support score	7.7	1.8
SSRS: subjective social support score	24.7	4.0
SSRS: utilization of social support score	7.7	1.9

\* ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. HADS, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. SSRS, Social Support Rating Scale. Demographic factors included gender, age, education, marital status, and self-rated economic status. Clinical factors included cancer stage, pathological type, pain intensity, time since the diagnosis of cancer, ECOG scale, and current treatment regime. Psychosocial factors included HADS-D, HADS-A, and SSRS. In this study, the ECOG scale score ranged between 0 and 4: 1=Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature, e.g., light house work, office work; 2=Ambulatory and capable of all self-care but unable to carry out any work activities; up and about more than 50% of waking hours; 3=Capable of only limited self-care; confined to bed or chair more than 50% of waking hours; 4=Completely disabled; cannot carry on any self-care; totally confined to bed or chair.

**Table 2 Comparison of QOL between inpatients with lung cancer and the general population**

QOL	Patients (n=148)		Normative data of the Chinese general population (n=1052) <sup>36</sup>		t	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
	Physical	39.02	10.62	66		
Psychological	38.85	10.28	60.55	13.96	-18.225	<0.001

**Table 3 Multivariable linear regression analyses on correlates of physical and psychological QOL**

Variables	Physical QOL		Psychological QOL	
	Coefficient	P	Coefficient	P
Gender: female	-0.700	0.235	-1.494	0.001
Age (years)	-0.018	0.489	-0.024	0.283
Education (years)	-0.135	0.173	-0.209	0.013
Marital status: unmarried*	-2.471	0.032	-0.456	0.652
Self-rated economic status: poor	-1.764	0.004	-0.355	0.474
Cancer staging: metastatic	-1.328	0.032	-0.835	0.106
Current treatment regimen:				
chemotherapy	-1.068	0.281	-1.536	0.043
Pathological type: small cell	-0.725	0.273	-1.157	0.026
Score of pain intensity	0.170	0.556	-0.535	0.015
Time since cancer diagnosis (months)	0.028	0.083	0.009	0.503
ECOG Scale score of performance status	-0.959	0.003	-0.930	<0.001
Depressive symptoms: HADS-D score	-0.465	<0.001	-0.016	0.881
Anxiety symptoms: HADS-A score	-0.208	0.048	-0.178	0.019
SSRS: objective social support	0.018	0.918	0.191	0.195
SSRS: subjective social support	0.120	0.153	0.137	<0.001
SSRS: utilization of social support	0.344	0.042	0.145	0.267

\*"Unmarried" included never married, separated/divorced, and widowed.

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	6
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	7-8
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	8-9
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	8-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	NA
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
<b>Results</b>			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	9-10
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9-10
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9-10
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9-10
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	9-10
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	9-10
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	9-10
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	NA
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	10-11
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	13-14
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	10-13
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13-14
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	25

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).

# BMJ Open

## Health-related quality of life in Chinese inpatients with lung cancer treated in large general hospitals: a cross-sectional study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-019873.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Feb-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Gu, Wen; Shenzhen Kangning Hospital, Department of Psychiatry Xu, Yan-Min; Affiliated Wuhan Mental Health Center, Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science & Technology, Department of Psychiatry Zhong, Baoliang; Affiliated Wuhan Mental Health Center, Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science & Technology, Department of Psychiatry
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Oncology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Keywords:	quality of life, lung cancer, psychosocial factor

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 **Health-related quality of life in Chinese inpatients with lung cancer**  
5  
6 **treated in large general hospitals: a cross-sectional study**  
7

8 Wen Gu<sup>1</sup>, Yan-Min Xu<sup>2</sup>, Bao-Liang Zhong<sup>2\*</sup>  
9

10 <sup>1</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Shenzhen Key Laboratory for Psychological Healthcare,  
11  
12 Shenzhen Institute of Mental Health, Shenzhen Kangning Hospital, Shenzhen Mental  
13  
14 Health Center, Shenzhen, Guangdong Province, China  
15

16  
17  
18 <sup>2</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Affiliated Wuhan Mental Health Center (The Ninth  
19  
20 Clinical School), Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science &  
21  
22 Technology, Wuhan, Hubei Province, China  
23

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 \*Correspondence author: Bao-Liang Zhong, Department of Psychiatry, Wuhan  
29  
30 Mental  
31  
32 Health Center, No. 89, Gongnongbing Rd., Wuhan, Hubei 430012, China (E-mail:  
33  
34 [haizhilan@gmail.com](mailto:haizhilan@gmail.com))  
35  
36

37  
38 Word count: 2812  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

**Objective** In China, psychosocial problems of cancer patients are underrecognized and undertreated in medical oncology practice. This study examined the quality of life (QOL) in inpatients with lung cancer treated in large general hospitals and explored the demographic, clinical, and psychosocial factors associated with QOL.

**Design** Cross-sectional study.

**Participants and setting** Altogether, 148 inpatients with lung cancer were consecutively recruited from two large general hospitals in Tianjin, China.

**Main outcome measured** QOL, pain intensity, depressive and anxiety symptoms, and social support were assessed with World Health Organization QOL Scale Brief Version, four-point Verbal Rating Scale, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, and Social Support Rating Scale, respectively.

**Results** Compared with the normative data for the Chinese general population, patients had significantly lower scores in physical and psychological QOL. Being unmarried, poor economic status, metastasis, poor performance status, depression, anxiety, and low utilization of social support were independently associated with poor physical QOL, while female gender, less education years, currently receiving chemotherapy, small-cell cancer, more intense pain, poor performance status, anxiety, and inadequate subjective social support were independently associated with poor psychological QOL.

**Conclusions** Inpatients with lung cancer treated in Chinese large general hospitals had poorer QOL in comparison with general population. Appropriate management of

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

psychosocial problems is potentially effective to improve their QOL.

For peer review only

### Strengths and limitations of this study

This is one of the very few studies that investigated associations of quality of life (QOL) with psychosocial factors in patients with lung cancer in China.

The relatively small sample size of patients and recruiting patients from inpatient departments of large general hospitals only may limit the generalizability of the findings.

The instrument for assessing QOL in this study, the World Health Organization QOL Scale Brief Version, is a generic QOL scale and not a lung cancer-specific instrument on QOL.

## INTRODUCTION

During the recent decades, health-related quality of life (QOL) has become an important outcome measure in medical oncology research and clinical practice, because it can comprehensively assess the effectiveness of an anticancer regime and the impact of cancer on a patient's physical, functional, social and emotional well-being<sup>1</sup>. In addition, QOL outcome is also an important prognostic indicator, which can be used to predict the survival time of a patient with cancer<sup>2</sup>. Cancer treatment is challenging, because many physical and psychosocial problems are present at all stages of the disease but conventional treatment for cancer such as chemotherapy focuses on addressing the physical dimensions of cancer (i.e., stopping or slowing the growth of cancer cells)<sup>3, 4</sup>. Given that QOL is a comprehensive assessment of clinical outcome, examining the level and predictors of QOL in patients with cancer is therefore essential in developing measures to improve quality of care and treatment outcomes.

In China, lung cancer is the most prevalent type of cancer and the leading cause of mortality of cancer-related death<sup>5</sup>. In 2013, population-based cancer registration data estimated that the crude incidence and mortality rates of lung cancer in China were as high as 70.1 and 36.8 per 100000 respectively, and the two rates have been stable in recent years<sup>6, 7</sup>. Meanwhile, due to the poor quality of care and limited medical treatment for lung cancer, the overall five-year survival rate of lung cancer remains low in China (16.1%), particularly in rural regions (11.2%)<sup>7, 8</sup>. Because the survival time of patients with lung cancer is very likely to be short and treatments of

1  
2  
3 lung cancer are expected to be toxic and limited in efficacy, QOL is particularly  
4 important for patients with lung cancer<sup>9</sup>. Until now, QOL of patients with lung cancer  
5  
6 have been extensively studied in international literature, and most studies were  
7  
8 conducted in Western countries<sup>9-15</sup>. These studies have shown that QOL among the  
9  
10 lung cancer patients was associated with gender, age, performance status, fatigue,  
11  
12 metastasis, cough, pain, social support, depression, and anxiety<sup>9-15</sup>.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 There is convincing evidence that socio-cultural factors significantly impact QOL<sup>16</sup>,  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

17. Therefore, findings reported in Western countries might not apply to patients with lung cancer living under Chinese socio-cultural settings. To date, there have been a few studies examining the QOL of Chinese patients with lung cancer<sup>18-23</sup>. These studies reported a variety of factors associated with QOL of Chinese patients with lung cancer, including age, marital status, income, cancer stage, treatment regime, and cell type<sup>18-23</sup>. However, compared to international studies, very few of them focused on the roles of psychosocial factors on QOL: only one reported the significant association between social support and the global QOL in patients with newly diagnosed lung cancer<sup>23</sup>.

Because of Chinese oncologists' limited knowledge and the lack of training in clinical psychiatry, psychosocial problems of their patients are not routinely screened, which results in a serious underrecognition/undertreatment for psychosocial problems in clinical oncology practice<sup>24</sup>. More fundamentally, the specific psychosocial services for cancer patients, psychooncology services, are still not available in nearly all of the Chinese general hospitals<sup>25</sup>. Given the important roles of

1  
2  
3 psychosocial factors in cancer incidence and prognosis<sup>26</sup>, the associations between  
4  
5  
6 psychosocial factors and QOL need to be further examined in Chinese patients with  
7  
8 lung cancer, which can increase Chinese oncologists' understanding on the  
9  
10 importance of psychosocial interventions.  
11  
12

13 In China, more than two-thirds cancer patients prefer to seek treatment from  
14  
15 oncology departments of large general hospitals (i.e., secondary and tertiary  
16  
17 hospitals)<sup>27,28</sup>. Large general hospitals may represent a good setting to examine the  
18  
19 QOL of lung cancer patients due to its good sample representativeness. The objective  
20  
21 of this study was to investigate the QOL of Chinese inpatients with lung cancer in  
22  
23 large general hospitals and explore the demographic, clinical, and psychosocial  
24  
25 characteristics associated with QOL.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

## 33 **METHODS**

### 34 **Subjects**

35  
36  
37 This study was part of a large-scale collaborative project investigating the mental  
38  
39 health, suicidal behaviors, and QOL of oncology inpatients in two large general  
40  
41 hospitals in Tianjin, China<sup>29</sup>. The cross-sectional survey was conducted between  
42  
43 February and December 2015, and its details have been published elsewhere<sup>29</sup>.  
44  
45  
46 Briefly, adult patients who were diagnosed with lung cancer and hospitalized in the  
47  
48 two hospitals at the time of the survey were consecutively invited to participate in  
49  
50 the study. Eligible subjects were those who were aware of the diagnosis of lung  
51  
52 cancer (ascertained by histological examination), aged 18 years and above, and had  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the capacity to provide informed consent. We excluded patients who were too ill,  
4  
5 had cognitive disorders (i.e., dementia), or had difficulties in communicating with  
6  
7 others.  
8  
9

## 10 **Assessments**

11  
12 Demographic and clinical data were collected with a form designed for the present  
13  
14 study, followed by a careful review of medical records and an interview with patients  
15  
16 and their treating oncologists (when necessary).  
17  
18

19  
20 Demographic variables included gender, age, education, marital status, and  
21  
22 self-rated economic status (poor, fair, good).  
23  
24

25  
26 Clinical factors included cancer stage (metastatic vs. not metastatic)<sup>30</sup>, cell type  
27  
28 (small vs. non-small cell), pain intensity, time since the diagnosis of cancer, functional  
29  
30 status, and current treatment regime (chemotherapy, radiotherapy, surgery). A  
31  
32 validated four-point Verbal Rating Scale was used to assess the pain intensity:  
33  
34 patients were asked to rate their pain intensity in the last month choosing from the  
35  
36 four category responses (1=none, 2=mild, 3=moderate, and 4=severe)<sup>31</sup>. The Eastern  
37  
38 Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) Performance Status Scale was adopted to assess  
39  
40 the impact of cancer on patients' daily living abilities, which is rated on a scale from 0  
41  
42 (fully active) to 5 (dead), with higher score denoting poorer function<sup>32</sup>.  
43  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 Psychosocial factors, including depression, anxiety, and social support, were  
49  
50 collected by a self-administered questionnaire. The validated Chinese version of the  
51  
52 Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) was used to assess the presence and  
53  
54 severity of depressive and anxiety symptoms of patients<sup>33, 34</sup>. This 14-item scale  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 consists of two subscales: seven items for depression and the remaining seven for  
4  
5 anxiety. Each item is rated on a 0-3 scale, yielding a total score ranging between from  
6  
7 0 to 21 for each subscale. Higher scores denote more severe symptoms of depression  
8  
9 or anxiety<sup>33, 34</sup>. Social support was assessed with the validated Chinese Social  
10  
11 Support Rating Scale (SSRS), which was developed by Xiao et al.<sup>35</sup>. This 10-item scale  
12  
13 evaluates three dimensions of social support: objective support (actual received  
14  
15 practical support and available social networks), subjective support (emotional and  
16  
17 perceived support), and utilization of support (one's use of social network). A higher  
18  
19 total score in each subscale indicate a higher level of social support.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 QOL was assessed with the validated Chinese World Health Organization QOL  
26  
27 Scale Brief Version (WHOQOL-BREF)<sup>36-38</sup>. To reduce the survey burden on patients,  
28  
29 only items of the physical and psychological domains of WHOQOL-BREF were used in  
30  
31 the present study. The two subscales used seven and six items to assess the physical  
32  
33 and psychological QOL in the past month, respectively. Each item is rated on a  
34  
35 5-point Likert scale ranging between 1 (“very dissatisfied/very poor”) and 5 (“very  
36  
37 satisfied/very good”). The two QOL domains are scaled in a positive direction with  
38  
39 higher scores indicating a better QOL.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Data were collected in places of the hospitals that were deemed convenient and  
46  
47 could provide reasonable privacy for respondents (oncologists’ office, sickroom, etc.).  
48  
49 All patients independently and anonymously completed the questionnaires on  
50  
51 demographic characteristics, HADS, SSRS, and WHOQOL-BREF. Trained investigators  
52  
53 interviewed patients and their treating oncologists and reviewed medical records to  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 collect data on clinical factors.  
4

### 5 6 **Patient and public involvement** 7

8 The role of patients in this study was participants. They were not involved in the  
9 development of the research question and outcome measures, the recruitment of  
10 subjects, and the undertaking of the study. After the completion of the study, we had  
11 sent each participant a letter describing resulting of the present study in detail.  
12  
13  
14  
15

### 16 17 **Statistical analysis** 18

19 Data analyses were conducted with SPSS 16.0. By using the recommended formulas  
20  
21  
22  
23 <sup>38</sup>, the raw scores of physical and psychological QOL domains were transformed to a  
24 0-100 scale before the analysis. We used the independent-samples t-test to compare  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
QOL between patients and the normative data, which is derived from a  
representative sample (N=1052) of Chinese general adult population <sup>39</sup>.

Multivariable linear regression analysis that entered all demographic, clinical, and  
psychosocial factors as independent variables and physical or psychological QOL as  
the outcome variable, was conducted to examine the independent relationships of  
QOL with all variables. The assumptions of linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and  
absence of multicollinearity for multiple linear regression analysis were tested prior  
to the formal analysis. Because there were no curvilinear relationships in scatterplots  
of outcome variables versus continuous independent variables, and no clear  
distribution patterns in scatterplots of residuals (errors between observed and  
predicted outcome values) versus predicted outcome values, our data met the  
assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity. We also found a normal distribution

1  
2  
3 of residuals for physical QOL (K-S statistic=0.064, P=0.20) and psychological QOL (K-S  
4  
5  
6 statistic=0.068, P=0.10) in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Variance Inflation Factor  
7  
8 (VIF) values of all independent variables ranged from 1.13 to 5.77, markedly below  
9  
10 the critical threshold of 10, indicating a very low degree of multicollinearity among  
11  
12 the variables. The statistical significance level was set at P<0.05 (two-sided).  
13  
14  
15

## 16 17 18 **RESULTS**

19  
20 Altogether, 735 eligible cancer inpatients were invited and 517 completed the survey.  
21  
22 For lung cancer, the numbers of patients who were invited and completed the survey  
23  
24 were 179 and 148, respectively. The average age of the 148 inpatients with lung  
25  
26 cancer was 64.8 years (standard deviation [SD]: 11.5, range: 20-99), and 94 (63.5%)  
27  
28 were men. Table 1 displays the demographic, clinical, and psychosocial characteristics  
29  
30 of the participants.  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 Scores of physical and psychological domains of QOL were significantly lower in  
36  
37 patients with lung cancer than the normative data of the Chinese general population  
38  
39 (Table 2).  
40  
41

42  
43 Multiple linear regression analyses (Table 3) revealed that marital status of  
44  
45 “unmarried”, poor economic status, metastatic cancer, a high Eastern Cooperative  
46  
47 Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status score, more depressive symptoms, more  
48  
49 anxiety symptoms, and a low score of utilization of social support were  
50  
51 independently associated with poor physical QOL, while female gender, less  
52  
53 education years, currently receiving chemotherapy, small-cell type of lung cancer,  
54  
55  
56

1  
2  
3 more intense pain, a high ECOG performance status score, more anxiety symptoms,  
4  
5  
6 and a low score of subjective social support were independently associated with  
7  
8 poor psychological QOL.  
9

## 10 11 12 13 **DISCUSSION**

14  
15 Although significant advances in cancer treatment have been achieved in recent  
16  
17 decades, the survival of patients with lung cancer remains limited. Therefore  
18  
19 improving the QOL of patients with limited life expectancy should be a primary  
20  
21 concern in lung cancer treatment practice. In the present study, patients with lung  
22  
23 cancer had significantly poorer QOL in both physical and psychological domains than  
24  
25 the Chinese general population, which is in line with findings of prior studies  
26  
27 conducted in Western and Chinese contexts<sup>40-43</sup>. Many symptoms of lung cancer  
28  
29 such as cough, chest pain, loss of appetite, and shortness of breath could negatively  
30  
31 impact the physical health of patients<sup>9</sup>. Psychological distress after cancer diagnosis,  
32  
33 fear of death, depression, hopelessness, and even suicidality further worsen the  
34  
35 mental health of patients who are experiencing the physical pain of cancer<sup>29</sup>. In  
36  
37 addition, side effects caused by cancer treatment can exacerbate the health of  
38  
39 patients<sup>44</sup>. Therefore, we found a markedly impaired physical and psychological QOL  
40  
41 in patients with cancer compared to the general population.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 This study found a number of demographic and clinical correlates of QOL in lung  
51  
52 cancer patients. Female patients with lung cancer had worse psychological QOL,  
53  
54 which may be related to gender difference in the prevalence of risk factors  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 associated with poor QOL, for example, females patients with cancer may have more  
4  
5 psychological and social issues than males <sup>45, 46</sup>. The study by Montazeri, et al.  
6  
7 reported significantly association between a low socioeconomic status and poor QOL  
8  
9 in lung cancer patients in Iran <sup>47</sup>. Similarly, we found the significant association of  
10  
11 poor QOL with less education years and poor economic status in Chinese patients  
12  
13 with lung cancer. Consistent with previous findings <sup>18, 46</sup>, we found that unmarried  
14  
15 patients had poorer physical QOL than married patients.  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 As expected, metastasis was negatively associated with physical QOL. Due to a  
22  
23 worse global health status, impaired physical functioning, and more physical  
24  
25 symptoms associated with metastatic cancer, patients with metastatic lung cancer  
26  
27 reported poorer QOL. Because of the rapid progression of small-cell cancer, most  
28  
29 patients with small-cell lung cancer have been at terminal stage when their cancer is  
30  
31 diagnosed <sup>18, 48</sup>, which could explain the significant relationship between small-cell  
32  
33 type and poor psychological QOL in our study. Cheng and colleagues found that QOL  
34  
35 of lung cancer patients varied across different treatment regimes, with  
36  
37 chemotherapy having the worst QOL and surgery having the best QOL <sup>18</sup>. Our finding  
38  
39 on the poor psychological QOL among patients receiving chemotherapy relative to  
40  
41 other treatments is in accordance with it, which may be explained by the many  
42  
43 unbearable side effects of chemotherapy and deteriorating physical health of  
44  
45 patients receiving chemotherapy. In this study, patients who experience more  
46  
47 intense pain had poorer psychological QOL; this might be due to the deleterious  
48  
49 effects of pain on patients' mental health, employment status, sleep, and personal  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 relationships<sup>49</sup>. Studies have shown that the ability to perform daily activities and  
4 self-care are two important determinants of QOL in patients with cancer<sup>50,51</sup>. Owing  
5 to functional limitations in hospitalized patients with lung cancer, the significant  
6 association between poor performance status and low physical and psychological  
7 QOL is expected.  
8  
9

10  
11 In addition to significant contributions of demographic and clinical factors to QOL  
12 of patients with lung cancer, the significant association of QOL with psychosocial  
13 factors is also demonstrated in this study, suggesting that psychosocial factors exert  
14 an important influence on the QOL of Chinese patients with lung cancer. This finding  
15 is in keeping with our expectations. According to the theory of QOL satisfaction  
16 model<sup>52</sup>, unmet social needs reduce QOL of patients even if they are receiving  
17 treatment in hospitals. Empirical evidence shows that social support can act as a  
18 buffer against the negative consequences of stress, protects against physical and  
19 mental morbidities, and promotes mental adjustment to chronic medical  
20 conditions, including cancer<sup>53,54</sup>. For patients with lung cancer, being diagnosed with  
21 cancer and treated for cancer such as surgery are all very stressful, therefore social  
22 support is particularly important for the clinical management of hospitalized cancer  
23 patients. As a result of this, it is plausible to observe the poor physical QOL in patents  
24 with low use of social support and the poor psychological QOL in patients who  
25 perceived a low level of social support. At the same time, depression and anxiety  
26 were associated with poor QOL in Chinese lung cancer patients. These associations  
27 can be ascribed to the negative effects of depression and anxiety on the physical and  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 mental health <sup>12</sup>. Importantly, because depressive disorders in Chinese cancer  
4 inpatients are often underrecognized and undertreated <sup>24</sup>, untreated depression (and  
5 other mental health problems) may have a more profound effect on the health of  
6 patients.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 There are some limitations in our study. First, this is a cross-sectional survey, so the  
14 causality of relationships between QOL and its correlates could not be ascertained.  
15  
16 Second, some social factors related to QOL, such as stigma, were not assessed. Third,  
17 the WHOQOL-BREF is a generic QOL scale and not a lung cancer-specific instrument  
18 on QOL. Although the WHOQOL-BREF could be used for assessing QOL of any  
19 populations including cancer patients, it is not sensitive enough to capture  
20 cancer-specific domains of QOL. Fourth, due to logistical reasons, no healthy controls  
21 were recruited for the study. Comparisons were conducted with the reported  
22 normative Chinese data derived by the WHOQOL-BREF. Fifth, the sample size of our  
23 study (N=148) is relatively small, because we studied a total of 16 candidate  
24 predictors of QOL and the required minimum number of subjects should be 160,  
25 according to the “10 subjects per predictor” rule of thumb for minimum sample size  
26 for multiple linear regression <sup>55</sup>. The lack of statistical power might limit the ability of  
27 multiple linear regression model to identify more significant predictors of QOL.  
28  
29 Further, due to the small number of patients who were unmarried patients (N=8) and  
30 not receiving chemotherapy (N=13), our findings on the relationships between QOL  
31 and marital status and treatment regimen might not be reliable. Large-scale studies  
32 are warranted to confirm these relationships. Finally, we recruited patients with lung  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 cancer from inpatient departments of large general hospitals only, outpatients of  
4  
5 general hospitals and primary care patients were not included, potentially  
6  
7 influencing the representativeness of the sample of patients with lung cancer. We  
8  
9 need to be cautious in generalizing findings of the present study to all patients with  
10  
11 lung cancer.  
12  
13  
14

15  
16 In summary, inpatients with lung cancer managed in large general hospitals have a  
17  
18 poorer QOL than the general population in China. A variety of factors, in particularly  
19  
20 psychosocial factors, are significantly associated with QOL of Chinese patients with  
21  
22 lung cancer. Given that psychosocial factors are preventable or modifiable, the  
23  
24 significant associations of poor QOL with clinical and psychosocial factors suggest  
25  
26 that in addition to conventional anticancer management, oncologists (and other  
27  
28 medical professionals) of Chinese large general hospitals should also pay special  
29  
30 attention to psychosocial problems of patients with lung cancer, and when necessary,  
31  
32 refer patients for psychooncology services and psychiatric consultation.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**REFERENCES**

1. Hamel JF, Saulnier P, Pe M, et al. A systematic review of the quality of statistical methods employed for analysing quality of life data in cancer randomised controlled trials. *Eur J Cancer* 2017;**83**:166-76.
2. Montazeri A. Quality of life data as prognostic indicators of survival in cancer patients: an overview of the literature from 1982 to 2008. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2009;**7**:102.
3. Neamtiu L, Deandrea S, Pylkkanen L, et al. Psycho-oncological support for breast cancer patients: A brief overview of breast cancer services certification schemes and national health policies in Europe. *Breast* 2016;**29**:178-80.
4. Zugazagoitia J, Guedes C, Ponce S, et al. Current Challenges in Cancer Treatment. *Clin Ther* 2016;**38**:1551-66.
5. Chen W, Zheng R, Baade PD, et al. Cancer statistics in China, 2015. *CA: Cancer J Clin* 2016;**66**:115-32.
6. Zheng R, Zeng H, Zhang S, et al. Estimates of cancer incidence and mortality in China, 2013. *Chin J Cancer* 2017;**36**:66.
7. Zheng R, Zeng H, Zuo T, et al. Lung cancer incidence and mortality in China, 2011. *Thorac Cancer* 2016;**7**:94-9.
8. Chen W, Zheng R, Zhang S, et al. Cancer incidence and mortality in China in 2013: an analysis based on urbanization level. *Chin J Cancer* 2017;**29**:1-10.
9. Polanski J, Jankowska-Polanska B, Rosinczuk J, et al. Quality of life of patients with lung cancer. *OncoTargets Ther* 2016;**9**:1023-8.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 10. Bade BC, Brooks MC, Nietert SB, et al. Assessing the Correlation Between Physical  
5  
6 Activity and Quality of Life in Advanced Lung Cancer. *Integr Cancer Ther*  
7  
8 2016;1534735416684016.  
9
- 10  
11 11. Jung JY, Lee JM, Kim MS, et al. Comparison of Fatigue, Depression, and Anxiety as  
12  
13 Factors Affecting Posttreatment Health-Related Quality of Life in Lung Cancer  
14  
15 Survivors. *Psychooncology* 2017; doi: 10.1002/pon.4513.  
16  
17
- 18 12. Polanski J, Chabowski M, Chudiak A, et al. Intensity of Anxiety and Depression in  
19  
20 Patients with Lung Cancer in Relation to Quality of Life. *Adv Exp Med Biol*  
21  
22 2017; doi: 10.1007/5584\_2017\_50.  
23  
24
- 25 13. Chabowski M, Polanski J, Mazur G, et al. Sociodemographic and Clinical  
26  
27 Determinants of Quality of Life of Patients with Non-small Cell Lung Cancer.  
28  
29 *Adv Exp Med Biol* 2017;**1022**:1-10.  
30  
31
- 32 14. Dai YL, Yang CT, Chen KH, et al. Changes in and Determinants of Quality of Life in  
33  
34 Patients With Advanced Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer Undergoing Initial  
35  
36 Chemotherapy. *J Nurs Res* 2017;**25**:203-15.  
37  
38
- 39 15. Banik A, Schwarzer R, Pawlowska I, et al. Women with family cancer history are at  
40  
41 risk for poorer physical quality of life and lower self-efficacy: a longitudinal  
42  
43 study among men and women with non-small cell lung cancer. *Health Qual*  
44  
45 *Life Outcomes* 2017;**15**:62.  
46  
47  
48
- 49 16. Dyall L, Kepa M, Teh R, et al. Cultural and social factors and quality of life of Maori  
50  
51 in advanced age. Te puawaitanga o nga tapuwae kia ora tonu - Life and living  
52  
53 in advanced age: a cohort study in New Zealand (LiLACS NZ). *N Z Med J*  
54  
55  
56

- 2014;**127**:62-79.
17. Wan GJ, Counte MA, Cella DF, et al. The impact of socio-cultural and clinical factors on health-related quality of life reports among Hispanic and African-American cancer patients. *JOM* 1999;**3**:200-15.
18. Cheng X, Zhou D, Lv L. Factors affecting the quality of life in lung cancer patients measured by EORTC QLQ questionnaire. *Chin J Lung Cancer* 2004;**7**:230-35.
19. Zhang CM, Zhu GD, Li QL, et al. Analysis of quality of life and influencing factors in lung cancer survivor. *Mod Prev Med* 2011;**38**:1204-06.
20. Wang B. Analysis of status quo and influence factors of life quality of lung cancer young patients. *Nurs Res* 2015;**29**:1759-60.
21. Weng W, Yan M, Shen W, et al. Analyzing the factors affected the QOL of patients with middle-late lung cancer. *Hebei Med* 2015;**21**:1798-20.
22. Yao HY, Shi LY. A study on influencing factors of quality of life in patients with lung cancer. *Bull Chin Cancer* 2004;**13**:683-85.
23. Cai C, Zhou Z, Yu L, et al. Predictors of the health-related quality of life of patients who are newly diagnosed with lung cancer in China. *Nurs Health Sci* 2011;**13**:262-8.
24. Zhao L, Li X, Zhang Z, et al. Prevalence, correlates and recognition of depression in Chinese inpatients with cancer. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 2014;**36**:477-82.
25. Tang L, Groot Jd, Bultz B. Psychosocial oncology in China—Challenges and opportunities. *Chinese-German J Clin Oncol* 2009;**8**:123-28.
26. Yang P. Epidemiology of lung cancer prognosis: quantity and quality of life.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Methods Mol Biol* 2009;**471**:469-86.
27. Luo B, Du L, Pan B, et al. Prevalence of tumours and related community health service status among residents aged 15 and over in Guangzhou City. *South China J Prev Med* 2006;**32**:11-14,18.
28. Wang Y, Shen J, Sun F, et al. Investigation and analysis on the utilization of health services among community-based patients with advanced cancer. *J Nurs Adm* 2009;**9**:11-12,15.
29. Zhong BL, Li SH, Lv SY, et al. Suicidal ideation among Chinese cancer inpatients of general hospitals: Prevalence and correlates. *Oncotarget* 2017;**8**:25141-50.
30. Brown KW, Levy AR, Rosberger Z, et al. Psychological distress and cancer survival: a follow-up 10 years after diagnosis. *Psychosom Med* 2003;**65**:636-43.
31. Closs SJ, Barr B, Briggs M, et al. A comparison of five pain assessment scales for nursing home residents with varying degrees of cognitive impairment. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2004;**27**:196-205.
32. Wu M. *The Xiehe Handbook for Gynecological Tumors*. Beijing: People's Medical Publishing House, 2012.
33. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1983;**67**:361-70.
34. Yang Y, Ding R, Hu D, et al. Reliability and validity of a Chinese version of the HADS for screening depression and anxiety in psycho-cardiological outpatients. *Compr Psychiatry* 2014;**55**:215-20.
35. Wang XD, Wang XL, Ma H. Rating scales for mental health. *Chin Ment Health J*

- 1  
2  
3  
4 1999;Suppl.:127-31.  
5  
6 36. Skevington SM, Lotfy M, O'Connell KA, et al. The World Health Organization's  
7  
8 WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment: psychometric properties and  
9  
10 results of the international field trial. A report from the WHOQOL group. *Qual*  
11  
12 *Life Res* 2004;**13**:299-310.  
13  
14  
15 37. Zhong BL, Liu TB, Chan SS, et al. Common mental health problems in  
16  
17 rural-to-urban migrant workers in Shenzhen, China: prevalence and risk  
18  
19 factors. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci* 2017:1-10.  
20  
21  
22 38. The WHOQOL Group. Development of the World Health Organization  
23  
24 WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment. The WHOQOL Group. *Psychol Med*  
25  
26 1998;**28**:551-8.  
27  
28  
29 39. Xia P, Li N, Hau KT, et al. Quality of life of Chinese urban community residents: a  
30  
31 psychometric study of the mainland Chinese version of the WHOQOL-BREF.  
32  
33 *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2012;**12**:37.  
34  
35  
36 40. Lee LJ, Chung CW, Chang YY, et al. Comparison of the quality of life between  
37  
38 patients with non-small-cell lung cancer and healthy controls. *Qual Life Res*  
39  
40 2011;**20**:415-23.  
41  
42  
43 41. Myrdal G, Valtysdottir S, Lambe M, et al. Quality of life following lung cancer  
44  
45 surgery. *Thorax* 2003;**58**:194-7.  
46  
47  
48 42. Dai SF, Li WN. Correlation of life quality and coping styles of patients with lung  
49  
50 cancer. *J Nursing Sci* 2009;**25**:30-32.  
51  
52  
53 43. Larsson M, Ljung L, Johansson BB. Health-related quality of life in advanced  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 non-small cell lung cancer: correlates and comparisons to normative data. *Eur*  
4  
5  
6 *J Cancer Care* 2012;**21**:642-9.  
7
- 8 44. Mazzotti E, Antonini Cappellini GC, Buconovo S, et al. Treatment-related side  
9 effects and quality of life in cancer patients. *Support Care Cancer*  
10  
11 2012;**20**:2553-7.  
12  
13
- 14 45. Grant M, McMullen CK, Altschuler A, et al. Gender differences in quality of life  
15 among long-term colorectal cancer survivors with ostomies. *Oncol Nurs*  
16  
17 *Forum* 2011;**38**:587-96.  
18  
19
- 20 46. Chang NW, Lin KC, Hsu WH, et al. The effect of gender on health-related quality of  
21  
22 life and related factors in post-lobectomy lung-cancer patients. *Eur J Oncol*  
23  
24 *Nurs* 2015;**19**:292-300.  
25  
26
- 27 47. Montazeri A, Hole DJ, Milroy R, et al. Quality of life in lung cancer patients: does  
28  
29 socioeconomic status matter? *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2003;**1**:19.  
30  
31
- 32 48. Salomaa ER, Sallinen S, Hiekkanen H, et al. Delays in the diagnosis and treatment  
33  
34 of lung cancer. *Chest* 2005;**128**:2282-8.  
35  
36
- 37 49. McCarberg BH, Nicholson BD, Todd KH, et al. The impact of pain on quality of life  
38  
39 and the unmet needs of pain management: results from pain sufferers and  
40  
41 physicians participating in an Internet survey. *Am J Ther* 2008;**15**:312-20.  
42  
43
- 44 50. Pergolotti M, Deal AM, Williams GR, et al. Activities, function, and health-related  
45  
46 quality of life (HRQOL) of older adults with cancer. *J Geriatr Oncol*  
47  
48 2017;**8**:249-54.  
49  
50
- 51 51. Hsu YH, Chai HY, Lin YF, et al. Health-related quality of life and satisfaction with  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

1  
2  
3 case management in cancer survivors. *J Clin Nurs* 2017; **26**:4597-604..  
4  
5

6 52. Katschnig H, Freeman H, Sartorius N. *Quality of Life in Mental Disorders, Second*  
7  
8 *Edition*. New York: Wiley, 2005.  
9

10 53. Helgeson VS. Social support and quality of life. *Qual Life Res* 2003;**12 Suppl**  
11  
12 **1**:25-31.  
13

14  
15 54. Applebaum AJ, Stein EM, Lord-Bessen J, et al. Optimism, social support, and  
16  
17 mental health outcomes in patients with advanced cancer. *Psychooncology*  
18  
19 2014;**23**:299-306.  
20  
21

22  
23 55. Babyak M. What you see may not be what you get: a brief, nontechnical  
24  
25 introduction to overfitting in regression-type models. *Psychosom Med*  
26  
27 2004;**66**:411-21.  
28  
29

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The authors thank all the patients involved in this study for their cooperation and support.

For peer review only

**CONTRIBUTORS**

Wen Gu and Bao-Liang Zhong were responsible for the design of the study, interpretation of data, the manuscript draft, and statistical analysis, Yan-Min Xu for the critical revision of the manuscript. All authors reviewed the data and analysis, revised the manuscript, had full access to all of the data in the study and can take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis, and had authority over approval of final manuscript version and the decision to submit for publication.

**FUNDING STATEMENT**

This work was supported by Wuhan Health and Family Planning Commission [grant number: WG16A02 (Bao-Liang Zhong, PI) and WX17Q30 (Yan-Min Xu, PI)].

For peer review only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**COMPETING INTERESTS**

None declared.

For peer review only

1  
2  
3 **PATIENT CONSENT**  
4

5  
6 Yes.  
7

8 **ETHICS APPROVAL**  
9

10 The Ethics Committee of Wuhan Mental Health Center approved the study protocol.  
11

12  
13 The protocol including the methods was performed in accordance with the  
14

15 Declaration of Helsinki and the relevant ethical guidelines and regulations in China.  
16

17  
18 Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**DATA SHARING STATEMENT**

The data sets generated and analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

For peer review only

**Table 1 Demographic, clinical, and psychosocial characteristics of inpatients with lung cancer\***

Characteristics	Total sample (n=148)	
	n	%
Gender: male	94	63.5
female	54	36.5
Marital status: married	140	94.6
never married	1	0.7
separated/divorced	5	3.4
widowed	2	1.4
Self-rated economic status: poor	54	36.5
fair	81	54.7
good	13	8.8
Cancer staging: metastatic	38	25.7
not metastatic	110	74.3
Current treatment regimen: chemotherapy	135	91.2
radiotherapy	8	5.4
surgery	5	3.4
Pathological type: small cell	32	21.6
non-small cell	116	78.4
	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age (years)	64.8	11.5

Education (years)	8.1	3.0
Score of pain intensity	1.9	1.1
Time since cancer diagnosis (months)	24.9	18.4
ECOG Scale score of performance status	2.0	1.0
Depressive symptoms: HADS-D score	8.2	3.2
Anxiety symptoms: HADS-A score	7.8	3.2
SSRS: objective social support score	7.7	1.8
SSRS: subjective social support score	24.7	4.0
SSRS: utilization of social support score	7.7	1.9

\* ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. HADS, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. SSRS, Social Support Rating Scale. Demographic factors included gender, age, education, marital status, and self-rated economic status. Clinical factors included cancer stage, pathological type, pain intensity, time since the diagnosis of cancer, ECOG scale, and current treatment regime. Psychosocial factors included HADS-D, HADS-A, and SSRS. In this study, the ECOG scale score ranged between 0 and 4: 1=Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature, e.g., light house work, office work; 2=Ambulatory and capable of all self-care but unable to carry out any work activities; up and about more than 50% of waking hours; 3=Capable of only limited self-care; confined to bed or chair more than 50% of waking hours; 4=Completely disabled; cannot carry on any self-care; totally confined to bed or chair.

**Table 2 Comparison of QOL between inpatients with lung cancer and the general population**

QOL	Patients (n=148)		Normative data of the Chinese general population (n=1052) <sup>39</sup>		t	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
	Physical	39.02	10.62	66		
Psychological	38.85	10.28	60.55	13.96	-18.225	<0.001

**Table 3 Multivariable linear regression analyses on correlates of physical and psychological QOL**

Variables	Physical QOL			Psychological QOL		
	Unstandardized coefficient	P	95% Confidence interval for unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	P	95% Confidence interval for unstandardized coefficient
Gender: female	-0.700	0.235	-1.010, 2.500	-1.494	0.001	0.649, 2.339
Age (years)	-0.018	0.489	-1.238, 1.202	-0.024	0.283	-0.106, 0.058
Education (years)	-0.135	0.173	-0.357, 0.087	-0.209	0.013	-0.294, -0.123
Marital status: unmarried*	-2.471	0.032	-4.908, -0.034	-0.456	0.652	-2.644, 1.732
Self-rated economic status: poor	-1.764	0.004	-2.964, -0.564	-0.355	0.474	-10.920, 10.210
Cancer staging: metastatic	-1.328	0.032	-2.632, -0.024	-0.835	0.106	-2.047, 0.377
Current treatment regimen: chemotherapy	-1.068	0.281	-4.577, 2.441	-1.536	0.043	-3.051, -0.021

Pathological type: small cell	-0.725	0.273	-2.979, 1.529	-1.157	0.026	-2.223, -0.091
Score of pain intensity	0.170	0.556	-2.097, 2.437	-0.535	0.015	-0.919, -0.151
Time since cancer diagnosis (months)	0.028	0.083	-0.030, 0.086	0.009	0.503	-2.238, 2.256
ECOG Scale score of performance status	-0.959	0.003	-1.542, -0.376	-0.930	<0.001	-1.383, -0.477
Depressive symptoms: HADS-D score	-0.465	<0.001	-0.631, -0.299	-0.016	0.881	-0.087, 0.055
Anxiety symptoms: HADS-A score	-0.208	0.048	-0.354, -0.062	-0.178	0.019	-0.248, -0.108
SSRS: objective social support	0.018	0.918	-0.055, 0.091	0.191	0.195	-0.146, 0.528
SSRS: subjective social support	0.120	0.153	-0.012, 0.252	0.137	<0.001	0.121, 0.153
SSRS: utilization of social support	0.344	0.042	0.111, 0.577	0.145	0.267	-0.214, 0.504

---

\*"Unmarried" included never married, separated/divorced, and widowed.

**STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies***

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	6
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	7-8
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	8-9
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	8-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	NA
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
<b>Results</b>			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	9-10
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9-10
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9-10
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9-10
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	9-10
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	9-10
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	9-10
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	NA
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	10-11
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	13-14
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	10-13
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13-14
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	25

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).

# BMJ Open

## Health-related quality of life in Chinese inpatients with lung cancer treated in large general hospitals: a cross-sectional study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-019873.R3
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	22-Mar-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Gu, Wen; Shenzhen Kangning Hospital, Department of Psychiatry Xu, Yan-Min; Affiliated Wuhan Mental Health Center, Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science & Technology, Department of Psychiatry Zhong, Baoliang; Affiliated Wuhan Mental Health Center, Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science & Technology, Department of Psychiatry
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Oncology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Keywords:	quality of life, lung cancer, psychosocial factor

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 **Health-related quality of life in Chinese inpatients with lung cancer**  
5  
6 **treated in large general hospitals: a cross-sectional study**  
7

8 Wen Gu<sup>1</sup>, Yan-Min Xu<sup>2</sup>, Bao-Liang Zhong<sup>2\*</sup>  
9

10 <sup>1</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Shenzhen Key Laboratory for Psychological Healthcare,  
11  
12 Shenzhen Institute of Mental Health, Shenzhen Kangning Hospital, Shenzhen Mental  
13  
14 Health Center, Shenzhen, Guangdong Province, China  
15

16  
17  
18 <sup>2</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Affiliated Wuhan Mental Health Center (The Ninth  
19  
20 Clinical School), Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science &  
21  
22 Technology, Wuhan, Hubei Province, China  
23

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 \*Correspondence author: Bao-Liang Zhong, Department of Psychiatry, Wuhan  
29  
30 Mental  
31  
32 Health Center, No. 89, Gongnongbing Rd., Wuhan, Hubei 430012, China (E-mail:  
33  
34 [haizhilan@gmail.com](mailto:haizhilan@gmail.com))  
35

36  
37  
38 Word count: 2939  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

**Objective** In China, psychosocial problems of cancer patients are underrecognized and undertreated in medical oncology practice. This study examined the health-related quality of life (QOL) in inpatients with lung cancer treated in large general hospitals and explored the demographic, clinical, and psychosocial factors associated with QOL.

**Design** Cross-sectional study.

**Participants and setting** Altogether, 148 inpatients with lung cancer were consecutively recruited from two large general hospitals in Tianjin, China.

**Main outcome measured** QOL, pain intensity, depressive and anxiety symptoms, and social support were assessed with World Health Organization QOL Scale Brief Version, four-point Verbal Rating Scale, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, and Social Support Rating Scale, respectively.

**Results** Compared with the normative data for the Chinese general population, patients had significantly lower scores in physical ( $t=-25.860$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) and psychological ( $t=-18.225$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) QOL. Being unmarried ( $\beta=-2.471$ , 95%CI: -4.908, -0.034), poor economic status ( $\beta=-1.764$ , 95%CI: -2.964, -0.564), cancer metastasis ( $\beta=-1.328$ , 95%CI: -2.632, -0.024), poor performance status ( $\beta=-0.959$ , 95%CI: -1.542, -0.376), depression ( $\beta=-0.465$ , 95%CI: -0.631, -0.299), anxiety ( $\beta=-0.208$ , 95%CI: -0.354, -0.062), and low utilization of social support ( $\beta=-0.344$ , 95%CI: -0.577, -0.111) were independently associated with poor physical QOL, while female gender ( $\beta=-1.494$ , 95%CI: -0.649, -2.339), less education years ( $\beta=-0.209$ , 95%CI: -0.294,

1  
2  
3 -0.123), currently receiving chemotherapy ( $\beta=-1.536$ , 95%CI: -3.051, -0.021),  
4  
5  
6 small-cell cancer ( $\beta=-1.157$ , 95%CI: -2.223, -0.091), more intense pain ( $\beta=-0.535$ ,  
7  
8 95%CI: -0.919, -0.151), poor performance status ( $\beta=-0.930$ , 95%CI: -1.383, -0.477),  
9  
10  
11 anxiety ( $\beta=-0.178$ , 95%CI: -0.248, -0.108), and inadequate subjective social support  
12  
13 ( $\beta=-0.137$ , 95%CI: -0.153,-0.121) were independently associated with poor  
14  
15  
16 psychological QOL.

17  
18 **Conclusions** Inpatients with lung cancer treated in Chinese large general hospitals  
19  
20 have poorer QOL than the general population. Effective prevention and management  
21  
22 of psychosocial problems are potentially effective to improve their QOL.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study assessed psychosocial factors that were potentially associated with quality of life (QOL) of patients with lung cancer in China.
- The relatively small sample size of patients and recruiting patients from inpatient departments of large general hospitals only may limit the generalizability of the findings.
- The direction of causality between psychosocial factors and QOL could not be ascertained due to the cross-sectional design of this study.
- This study assessed QOL of lung cancer patients with a generic QOL scale, not a lung cancer-specific measure.
- Age- and sex-matched healthy controls were not included for comparison.

## INTRODUCTION

During the recent decades, health-related quality of life (QOL) has become an important outcome measure in medical oncology research and clinical practice, because it can comprehensively assess the effectiveness of an anticancer regime and the impact of cancer on a patient's physical, functional, social and emotional well-being<sup>1</sup>. In addition, the QOL outcome is also an important prognostic indicator, which can be used to predict the survival time of a patient with cancer<sup>2</sup>. Cancer treatment is challenging, because many physical and psychosocial problems are present at all stages of the disease but conventional treatment for cancer such as chemotherapy focuses on addressing the physical dimensions of cancer (i.e., stopping or slowing the growth of cancer cells)<sup>3, 4</sup>. Given that QOL is a comprehensive assessment of clinical outcome, examining the level and predictors of QOL in patients with cancer is essential in developing measures to improve quality of care and treatment outcomes.

In China, lung cancer is the most prevalent type of cancer and the leading cause of mortality of cancer-related death<sup>5</sup>. In 2013, population-based cancer registration data estimated that the crude incidence and mortality rates of lung cancer in China were as high as 70.1 and 36.8 per 100000 respectively, and the two rates have been stable in recent years<sup>6, 7</sup>. Meanwhile, due to the poor quality of care and limited medical treatment for lung cancer, the overall five-year survival rate of lung cancer remains low in China (16.1%), particularly in rural regions (11.2%)<sup>7, 8</sup>. Because the survival time of patients with lung cancer is very likely to be short and treatments of

1  
2  
3 lung cancer are expected to be toxic and limited in efficacy, QOL is particularly  
4 important for patients with lung cancer<sup>9</sup>. Until now, QOL of patients with lung cancer  
5  
6 have been extensively studied in international literature, and most studies were  
7  
8 conducted in Western countries<sup>9-15</sup>. These studies have shown that QOL among the  
9  
10 lung cancer patients was associated with gender, age, performance status, fatigue,  
11  
12 metastasis, cough, pain, social support, depression, and anxiety<sup>9-15</sup>.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 There is convincing evidence that socio-cultural factors significantly impact QOL<sup>16</sup>,  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

17. Therefore, findings reported in Western countries might not apply to patients with lung cancer living under Chinese socio-cultural settings. To date, there have been a few studies examining the QOL of Chinese patients with lung cancer<sup>18-23</sup>. These studies reported a variety of factors associated with QOL of Chinese patients with lung cancer, including age, marital status, income, cancer stage, treatment regime, and cell type<sup>18-23</sup>. However, compared to international studies, very few of them focused on the roles of psychosocial factors on QOL: only one reported the significant association between social support and the global QOL in patients with newly diagnosed lung cancer<sup>23</sup>.

Because of Chinese oncologists' limited knowledge and the lack of training in clinical psychiatry, patients' psychosocial problems are not routinely screened for by oncology providers, resulting in a serious underrecognition/undertreatment for psychosocial problems in clinical oncology practice<sup>24</sup>. More fundamentally, the specific psychosocial services for cancer patients, psychooncology services, are still not available in nearly all of the Chinese general hospitals<sup>25</sup>. Given the important

1  
2  
3 roles of psychosocial factors in cancer incidence and prognosis<sup>26</sup>, the associations  
4  
5 between psychosocial factors and QOL need to be further examined in Chinese  
6  
7 patients with lung cancer, which can increase Chinese oncologists' understanding on  
8  
9 the importance of psychosocial interventions.  
10  
11

12  
13 In China, more than two-thirds cancer patients prefer to seek treatment from  
14  
15 oncology departments of large general hospitals (i.e., secondary and tertiary  
16  
17 hospitals)<sup>27, 28</sup>. Large general hospitals may provide a good setting to examine the  
18  
19 QOL of lung cancer patients due to their representative samples. The objective of this  
20  
21 study was to investigate the QOL of Chinese inpatients with lung cancer in large  
22  
23 general hospitals and explore the demographic, clinical, and psychosocial  
24  
25 characteristics associated with QOL.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

## 32 **METHODS**

### 33 **Subjects**

34  
35 This study was part of a large-scale collaborative project investigating the mental  
36  
37 health, suicidal behaviors, and QOL of oncology inpatients in two large general  
38  
39 hospitals in Tianjin, China<sup>29</sup>. The cross-sectional survey was conducted between  
40  
41 February and December 2015, and its details have been published elsewhere<sup>29</sup>.  
42  
43 Briefly, adult patients who were diagnosed with lung cancer and hospitalized in the  
44  
45 two hospitals at the time of the survey were consecutively invited to participate in  
46  
47 the study. Eligible subjects were those who were aware of the diagnosis of lung  
48  
49 cancer (ascertained by histological examination), aged 18 years and above, and had  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the capacity to provide informed consent. We excluded patients who were too ill,  
4  
5 had cognitive disorders (i.e., dementia), or had difficulties in communicating with  
6  
7 others.  
8  
9

## 10 **Assessments**

11  
12 Demographic and clinical data were collected with a form designed for the present  
13  
14 study, followed by a careful review of medical records and an interview with patients  
15  
16 and their treating oncologists (when necessary).  
17  
18

19  
20 Demographic variables included gender, age, education, marital status, and  
21  
22 self-rated economic status (poor, fair, good).  
23  
24

25  
26 Clinical factors included cancer stage (metastatic vs. not metastatic)<sup>30</sup>, cell type  
27  
28 (small vs. non-small cell), pain intensity, time since the diagnosis of cancer, functional  
29  
30 status, and current treatment regime (chemotherapy, radiotherapy, surgery). A  
31  
32 validated four-point Verbal Rating Scale was used to assess the pain intensity:  
33  
34 patients were asked to rate their pain intensity in the last month choosing from the  
35  
36 four category responses (1=none, 2=mild, 3=moderate, and 4=severe)<sup>31</sup>. The Eastern  
37  
38 Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) Performance Status Scale was adopted to assess  
39  
40 the impact of cancer on patients' daily living abilities, which is rated on a scale from 0  
41  
42 (fully active) to 5 (dead), with higher score denoting poorer function<sup>32</sup>.  
43  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 Psychosocial factors, including depression, anxiety, and social support, were  
49  
50 collected by a self-administered questionnaire. The validated Chinese version of the  
51  
52 Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) was used to assess the presence and  
53  
54 severity of depressive and anxiety symptoms of patients<sup>33, 34</sup>. This 14-item scale  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 consists of two subscales: seven items for depression and the remaining seven for  
4  
5 anxiety. Each item is rated on a 0-3 scale, yielding a total score ranging between from  
6  
7 0 to 21 for each subscale. Higher scores denote more severe symptoms of depression  
8  
9 or anxiety<sup>33, 34</sup>. Social support was assessed with the validated Chinese Social  
10  
11 Support Rating Scale (SSRS), which was developed by Xiao, et al.<sup>35</sup>. This 10-item scale  
12  
13 evaluates three dimensions of social support: objective support (actual received  
14  
15 practical support and available social networks), subjective support (emotional and  
16  
17 perceived support), and utilization of support (one's use of social network). A higher  
18  
19 total score in each subscale indicate a higher level of social support.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 QOL was assessed with the validated Chinese World Health Organization QOL  
26  
27 Scale Brief Version (WHOQOL-BREF)<sup>36-38</sup>. To reduce the survey burden on patients,  
28  
29 only items of the physical and psychological domains of WHOQOL-BREF were used in  
30  
31 the present study. The two subscales use seven and six items to assess the physical  
32  
33 and psychological QOL in the past month, respectively. Each item is rated on a  
34  
35 5-point Likert scale ranging between 1 (“very dissatisfied/very poor”) and 5 (“very  
36  
37 satisfied/very good”). The two QOL domains are scaled in a positive direction with  
38  
39 higher scores indicating a better QOL.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Data were collected in places of the hospitals that were deemed convenient and  
46  
47 could provide reasonable privacy for respondents (oncologists’ office, sickroom, etc.).  
48  
49 All patients independently and anonymously completed the questionnaires on  
50  
51 demographic characteristics, HADS, SSRS, and WHOQOL-BREF. Trained investigators  
52  
53 interviewed patients and their treating oncologists and reviewed medical records to  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 collect data on clinical factors.  
4

### 5 6 **Patient and public involvement** 7

8 The role of patients in this study was participants. They were not involved in the  
9 development of the research question and outcome measures, the recruitment of  
10 subjects, and the undertaking of the study. After the completion of the study, we had  
11 sent each participant a letter describing resulting of the present study in detail.  
12  
13  
14  
15

### 16 17 **Statistical analysis** 18

19 Data analyses were conducted with SPSS 16.0. By using the recommended formulas  
20  
21  
22  
23 <sup>38</sup>, the raw scores of physical and psychological QOL domains were transformed to a  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
0-100 scale before the analysis. We used the independent-samples t-test to compare  
QOL between patients and the normative data, which is derived from a  
representative sample (N=1052) of Chinese general adult population <sup>39</sup>.

Multivariable linear regression analysis that entered all demographic, clinical, and  
psychosocial factors as independent variables and physical or psychological QOL as  
the outcome variable, was conducted to examine the independent relationships of  
QOL with all variables. The assumptions of linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and  
absence of multicollinearity for multiple linear regression analysis were tested prior  
to the formal analysis. Because there were no curvilinear relationships in scatterplots  
of outcome variables versus continuous independent variables, and no clear  
distribution patterns in scatterplots of residuals (errors between observed and  
predicted outcome values) versus predicted outcome values, our data met the  
assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity. We found a normal distribution of

1  
2  
3 residuals for physical (K-S statistic=0.064, P=0.20) and psychological QOL (K-S  
4  
5 statistic=0.068, P=0.10) in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. We also found a very low  
6  
7 degree of multicollinearity among independent variables, because Variance Inflation  
8  
9 Factor (VIF) values of all independent variables ranged from 1.13 to 5.77, markedly  
10  
11 below the critical threshold of 10. The statistical significance level was set at P<0.05  
12  
13 (two-sided).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 20 21 **RESULTS**

22  
23 Altogether, 735 eligible cancer inpatients were invited and 517 completed the survey.  
24  
25 For lung cancer, the numbers of patients who were invited and completed the survey  
26  
27 were 179 and 148, respectively. The average age of the 148 inpatients with lung  
28  
29 cancer was 64.8 years (standard deviation [SD]: 11.5, range: 20-99), and 94 (63.5%)  
30  
31 were men. Table 1 displays the demographic, clinical, and psychosocial characteristics  
32  
33 of the participants.  
34  
35

36  
37 Scores of physical (t=-25.860, P<0.001) and psychological (t=-18.225, P<0.001)  
38  
39 domains of QOL were significantly lower in patients with lung cancer than the  
40  
41 normative data of the Chinese general population (Table 2).  
42  
43

44  
45 Multiple linear regression analyses (Table 3) revealed that marital status of  
46  
47 “unmarried” (Unstandardized coefficient [ $\beta$ ]=-2.471, 95%CI: -4.908, -0.034), poor  
48  
49 economic status ( $\beta$ =-1.764, 95%CI: -2.964, -0.564), metastatic cancer ( $\beta$ =-1.328,  
50  
51 95%CI: -2.632, -0.024), a high Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG)  
52  
53 performance status score ( $\beta$ =-0.959, 95%CI: -1.542, -0.376), more depressive  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 symptoms ( $\beta=-0.465$ , 95%CI: -0.631, -0.299), more anxiety symptoms ( $\beta=-0.208$ ,  
4 95%CI: -0.354, -0.062), and a low score of utilization of social support ( $\beta=-0.344$ ,  
5 95%CI: -0.577, -0.111) were independently associated with poor physical QOL, while  
6 female gender ( $\beta=-1.494$ , 95%CI: -0.649, -2.339), less education years ( $\beta=-0.209$ ,  
7 95%CI: -0.294, -0.123), currently receiving chemotherapy ( $\beta=-1.536$ , 95%CI: -3.051,  
8 -0.021), small-cell type of lung cancer ( $\beta=-1.157$ , 95%CI: -2.223, -0.091), more intense  
9 pain ( $\beta=-0.535$ , 95%CI: -0.919, -0.151), a high ECOG performance status score  
10 ( $\beta=-0.930$ , 95%CI: -1.383, -0.477), more anxiety symptoms ( $\beta=-0.178$ , 95%CI: -0.248,  
11 -0.108), and a low score of subjective social support ( $\beta=-0.137$ , 95%CI: -0.153,-0.121)  
12 were independently associated with poor psychological QOL.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

## 30 **DISCUSSION**

31  
32 Although significant advances in cancer treatment have been achieved in recent  
33 decades, the survival of patients with lung cancer remains limited. Therefore  
34 improving the QOL of patients with limited life expectancy should be a primary  
35 priority in lung cancer treatment practice. In the present study, patients with lung  
36 cancer had significantly poorer QOL in both physical and psychological domains than  
37 the Chinese general population, which is in line with findings of prior studies  
38 conducted in Western and Chinese contexts<sup>40-43</sup>. Many symptoms of lung cancer  
39 such as cough, chest pain, loss of appetite, and shortness of breath could negatively  
40 impact the physical health of patients<sup>9</sup>. Psychological distress after cancer diagnosis,  
41 fear of death, depression, hopelessness, and even suicidality further worsen the  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 mental health of patients who are experiencing the physical pain of cancer <sup>29</sup>. In  
4  
5  
6 addition, side effects caused by cancer treatment can exacerbate the health of  
7  
8 patients <sup>44</sup>. Therefore, we found a markedly impaired physical and psychological QOL  
9  
10  
11 in patients with cancer compared to the general population.  
12

13 This study found a number of demographic and clinical correlates of QOL in lung  
14  
15 cancer patients. Female patients with lung cancer had worse psychological QOL,  
16  
17 which may be related to gender difference in the prevalence of risk factors  
18  
19 associated with poor QOL, for example, females patients with cancer may have more  
20  
21 psychological and social issues than males <sup>45, 46</sup>. The study by Montazeri, et al.  
22  
23 reported significantly association between a low socioeconomic status and poor QOL  
24  
25 in lung cancer patients in Iran <sup>47</sup>. Similarly, we found the significant association of  
26  
27 poor QOL with less education years and poor economic status in Chinese patients  
28  
29 with lung cancer. Consistent with previous findings <sup>18, 46</sup>, we found that unmarried  
30  
31 patients had poorer physical QOL than married patients.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 As expected, metastasis was negatively associated with physical QOL. Due to a  
39  
40 worse global health status, impaired physical functioning, and more physical  
41  
42 symptoms associated with metastatic cancer, patients with metastatic lung cancer  
43  
44 reported poorer QOL. Because of the rapid progression of small-cell cancer, most  
45  
46 patients with small-cell lung cancer have been at terminal stage when their cancer is  
47  
48 diagnosed <sup>18, 48</sup>, which could explain the significant relationship between small-cell  
49  
50 type and poor psychological QOL in our study. Cheng and colleagues found that QOL  
51  
52 of lung cancer patients varied across different treatment regimes, with  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 chemotherapy having the worst QOL and surgery having the best QOL<sup>18</sup>. Our finding  
4  
5  
6 on the poor psychological QOL among patients receiving chemotherapy relative to  
7  
8  
9 other treatments is in accordance with it, which may be explained by the many  
10  
11 unbearable side effects of chemotherapy and deteriorating physical health of  
12  
13 patients receiving chemotherapy. In this study, patients who experience more  
14  
15 intense pain had poorer psychological QOL; this might be due to the deleterious  
16  
17 effects of pain on patients' mental health, employment status, sleep, and personal  
18  
19 relationships<sup>49</sup>. Studies have shown that the ability to perform daily activities and  
20  
21 self-care are two important determinants of QOL in patients with cancer<sup>50,51</sup>. Owing  
22  
23 to functional limitations in hospitalized patients with lung cancer, the significant  
24  
25 association between poor performance status and low physical and psychological  
26  
27 QOL is expected.

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 In addition to significant contributions of demographic and clinical factors to QOL  
34  
35 of patients with lung cancer, the significant association of QOL with psychosocial  
36  
37 factors is also demonstrated in this study, suggesting that psychosocial factors exert  
38  
39 an important influence on the QOL of Chinese patients with lung cancer. This finding  
40  
41 is in keeping with our expectations. According to the theory of QOL satisfaction  
42  
43 model<sup>52</sup>, unmet social needs reduce QOL of patients even if they are receiving  
44  
45 treatment in hospitals. Empirical evidence shows that social support can act as a  
46  
47 buffer against the negative consequences of stress, protects against physical and  
48  
49 mental morbidities, and promotes mental adjustment to chronic medical  
50  
51 conditions, including cancer<sup>53,54</sup>. For patients with lung cancer, being diagnosed with  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 cancer and treated for cancer such as surgery are all very stressful, therefore social  
4  
5 support is particularly important for the clinical management of hospitalized cancer  
6  
7 patients. As a result of this, it is plausible to observe the poor physical QOL in  
8  
9 patients with low use of social support and the poor psychological QOL in patients  
10  
11 who perceived a low level of social support. At the same time, depression and  
12  
13 anxiety were associated with poor QOL in Chinese lung cancer patients. These  
14  
15 associations can be ascribed to the negative effects of depression and anxiety on the  
16  
17 physical and mental health<sup>12</sup>. Importantly, because depressive disorders in Chinese  
18  
19 cancer inpatients are often underrecognized and undertreated<sup>24</sup>, untreated  
20  
21 depression (and other mental health problems) may have a more profound effect on  
22  
23 the health of patients.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 There are some limitations in our study. First, this is a cross-sectional survey, so the  
32  
33 causality of relationships between QOL and its correlates could not be ascertained.  
34  
35 Second, some social factors related to QOL, such as stigma, were not assessed. Third,  
36  
37 the WHOQOL-BREF is a generic QOL scale and not a lung cancer-specific instrument  
38  
39 on QOL. Although the WHOQOL-BREF could be used for assessing QOL of any  
40  
41 populations including cancer patients, it is not sensitive enough to capture  
42  
43 cancer-specific domains of QOL. Fourth, due to logistical reasons, no age- and  
44  
45 gender-matched healthy controls were recruited for the study. Comparisons were  
46  
47 conducted with the reported normative Chinese data derived by the WHOQOL-BREF.  
48  
49 Fifth, the sample size of our study (N=148) is relatively small, because we studied a  
50  
51 total of 16 candidate predictors of QOL and the required minimum number of  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 subjects should be 160, according to the “10 subjects per predictor” rule of thumb  
4  
5 for minimum sample size for multiple linear regression<sup>55</sup>. The lack of statistical  
6  
7 power might limit the ability of multiple linear regression model to identify more  
8  
9 significant predictors of QOL. Further, due to the small number of patients who were  
10  
11 unmarried patients (N=8) and not receiving chemotherapy (N=13), our findings on  
12  
13 the relationships between QOL and marital status and treatment regimen might not  
14  
15 be reliable. Large-scale studies are warranted to confirm these relationships. Finally,  
16  
17 we recruited patients with lung cancer from inpatient departments of large general  
18  
19 hospitals only, outpatients of general hospitals and primary care patients were not  
20  
21 included, potentially influencing the representativeness of the sample of patients  
22  
23 with lung cancer. We need to be cautious in generalizing findings of the present study  
24  
25 to all patients with lung cancer.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 In summary, inpatients with lung cancer managed in large general hospitals have a  
34  
35 poorer QOL than the general population in China. A variety of factors, in particularly  
36  
37 psychosocial factors, are significantly associated with QOL of Chinese patients with  
38  
39 lung cancer. Given that psychosocial factors are preventable or modifiable, the  
40  
41 significant associations of poor QOL with clinical and psychosocial factors suggest  
42  
43 that in addition to conventional anticancer management, oncologists (and other  
44  
45 medical professionals) of Chinese large general hospitals should also pay special  
46  
47 attention to psychosocial problems of patients with lung cancer, and when necessary,  
48  
49 refer patients for psychooncology services and psychiatric consultation.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

**REFERENCES**

1. Hamel JF, Saulnier P, Pe M, et al. A systematic review of the quality of statistical methods employed for analysing quality of life data in cancer randomised controlled trials. *Eur J Cancer* 2017;**83**:166-76.
2. Montazeri A. Quality of life data as prognostic indicators of survival in cancer patients: an overview of the literature from 1982 to 2008. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2009;**7**:102.
3. Neamtiu L, Deandrea S, Pylkkanen L, et al. Psycho-oncological support for breast cancer patients: A brief overview of breast cancer services certification schemes and national health policies in Europe. *Breast* 2016;**29**:178-80.
4. Zugazagoitia J, Guedes C, Ponce S, et al. Current Challenges in Cancer Treatment. *Clin Ther* 2016;**38**:1551-66.
5. Chen W, Zheng R, Baade PD, et al. Cancer statistics in China, 2015. *CA: Cancer J Clin* 2016;**66**:115-32.
6. Zheng R, Zeng H, Zhang S, et al. Estimates of cancer incidence and mortality in China, 2013. *Chin J Cancer* 2017;**36**:66.
7. Zheng R, Zeng H, Zuo T, et al. Lung cancer incidence and mortality in China, 2011. *Thorac Cancer* 2016;**7**:94-9.
8. Chen W, Zheng R, Zhang S, et al. Cancer incidence and mortality in China in 2013: an analysis based on urbanization level. *Chin J Cancer* 2017;**29**:1-10.
9. Polanski J, Jankowska-Polanska B, Rosinczuk J, et al. Quality of life of patients with lung cancer. *OncoTargets Ther* 2016;**9**:1023-8.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 10. Bade BC, Brooks MC, Nietert SB, et al. Assessing the Correlation Between Physical  
5  
6 Activity and Quality of Life in Advanced Lung Cancer. *Integr Cancer Ther*  
7  
8 2016;1534735416684016.  
9  
10  
11 11. Jung JY, Lee JM, Kim MS, et al. Comparison of Fatigue, Depression, and Anxiety as  
12  
13 Factors Affecting Posttreatment Health-Related Quality of Life in Lung Cancer  
14  
15 Survivors. *Psychooncology* 2017; doi: 10.1002/pon.4513.  
16  
17  
18 12. Polanski J, Chabowski M, Chudiak A, et al. Intensity of Anxiety and Depression in  
19  
20 Patients with Lung Cancer in Relation to Quality of Life. *Adv Exp Med Biol*  
21  
22 2017; doi: 10.1007/5584\_2017\_50.  
23  
24  
25 13. Chabowski M, Polanski J, Mazur G, et al. Sociodemographic and Clinical  
26  
27 Determinants of Quality of Life of Patients with Non-small Cell Lung Cancer.  
28  
29 *Adv Exp Med Biol* 2017;**1022**:1-10.  
30  
31  
32  
33 14. Dai YL, Yang CT, Chen KH, et al. Changes in and Determinants of Quality of Life in  
34  
35 Patients With Advanced Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer Undergoing Initial  
36  
37 Chemotherapy. *J Nurs Res* 2017;**25**:203-15.  
38  
39  
40 15. Banik A, Schwarzer R, Pawlowska I, et al. Women with family cancer history are at  
41  
42 risk for poorer physical quality of life and lower self-efficacy: a longitudinal  
43  
44 study among men and women with non-small cell lung cancer. *Health Qual*  
45  
46 *Life Outcomes* 2017;**15**:62.  
47  
48  
49  
50 16. Dyall L, Kepa M, Teh R, et al. Cultural and social factors and quality of life of Maori  
51  
52 in advanced age. Te puawaitanga o nga tapuwae kia ora tonu - Life and living  
53  
54 in advanced age: a cohort study in New Zealand (LiLACS NZ). *N Z Med J*  
55  
56

- 2014;**127**:62-79.
17. Wan GJ, Counte MA, Cella DF, et al. The impact of socio-cultural and clinical factors on health-related quality of life reports among Hispanic and African-American cancer patients. *JOM* 1999;**3**:200-15.
18. Cheng X, Zhou D, Lv L. Factors affecting the quality of life in lung cancer patients measured by EORTC QLQ questionnaire. *Chin J Lung Cancer* 2004;**7**:230-35.
19. Zhang CM, Zhu GD, Li QL, et al. Analysis of quality of life and influencing factors in lung cancer survivor. *Mod Prev Med* 2011;**38**:1204-06.
20. Wang B. Analysis of status quo and influence factors of life quality of lung cancer young patients. *Nurs Res* 2015;**29**:1759-60.
21. Weng W, Yan M, Shen W, et al. Analyzing the factors affected the QOL of patients with middle-late lung cancer. *Hebei Med* 2015;**21**:1798-20.
22. Yao HY, Shi LY. A study on influencing factors of quality of life in patients with lung cancer. *Bull Chin Cancer* 2004;**13**:683-85.
23. Cai C, Zhou Z, Yu L, et al. Predictors of the health-related quality of life of patients who are newly diagnosed with lung cancer in China. *Nurs Health Sci* 2011;**13**:262-8.
24. Zhao L, Li X, Zhang Z, et al. Prevalence, correlates and recognition of depression in Chinese inpatients with cancer. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 2014;**36**:477-82.
25. Tang L, Groot Jd, Bultz B. Psychosocial oncology in China—Challenges and opportunities. *Chinese-German J Clin Oncol* 2009;**8**:123-28.
26. Yang P. Epidemiology of lung cancer prognosis: quantity and quality of life.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 *Methods Mol Biol* 2009;**471**:469-86.
- 5  
6 27. Luo B, Du L, Pan B, et al. Prevalence of tumours and related community health  
7  
8 service status among residents aged 15 and over in Guangzhou City. *South*  
9  
10  
11 *China J Prev Med* 2006;**32**:11-14,18.
- 12  
13 28. Wang Y, Shen J, Sun F, et al. Investigation and analysis on the utilization of health  
14  
15 services among community-based patients with advanced cancer. *J Nurs Adm*  
16  
17 2009;**9**:11-12,15.
- 18  
19  
20 29. Zhong BL, Li SH, Lv SY, et al. Suicidal ideation among Chinese cancer inpatients of  
21  
22 general hospitals: Prevalence and correlates. *Oncotarget* 2017;**8**:25141-50.
- 23  
24  
25 30. Brown KW, Levy AR, Rosberger Z, et al. Psychological distress and cancer survival:  
26  
27 a follow-up 10 years after diagnosis. *Psychosom Med* 2003;**65**:636-43.
- 28  
29  
30 31. Closs SJ, Barr B, Briggs M, et al. A comparison of five pain assessment scales for  
31  
32 nursing home residents with varying degrees of cognitive impairment. *J Pain*  
33  
34 *Symptom Manage* 2004;**27**:196-205.
- 35  
36  
37 32. Wu M. *The Xiehe Handbook for Gynecological Tumors*. Beijing: People's Medical  
38  
39 Publishing House, 2012.
- 40  
41  
42 33. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr*  
43  
44 *Scand* 1983;**67**:361-70.
- 45  
46  
47 34. Yang Y, Ding R, Hu D, et al. Reliability and validity of a Chinese version of the HADS  
48  
49 for screening depression and anxiety in psycho-cardiological outpatients.  
50  
51  
52 *Compr Psychiatry* 2014;**55**:215-20.
- 53  
54  
55 35. Wang XD, Wang XL, Ma H. Rating scales for mental health. *Chin Ment Health J*  
56  
57

- 1  
2  
3  
4 1999;Suppl.:127-31.  
5  
6 36. Skevington SM, Lotfy M, O'Connell KA, et al. The World Health Organization's  
7  
8 WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment: psychometric properties and  
9  
10 results of the international field trial. A report from the WHOQOL group. *Qual*  
11  
12 *Life Res* 2004;**13**:299-310.  
13  
14  
15 37. Zhong BL, Liu TB, Chan SS, et al. Common mental health problems in  
16  
17 rural-to-urban migrant workers in Shenzhen, China: prevalence and risk  
18  
19 factors. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci* 2017:1-10.  
20  
21  
22 38. The WHOQOL Group. Development of the World Health Organization  
23  
24 WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment. The WHOQOL Group. *Psychol Med*  
25  
26 1998;**28**:551-8.  
27  
28  
29 39. Xia P, Li N, Hau KT, et al. Quality of life of Chinese urban community residents: a  
30  
31 psychometric study of the mainland Chinese version of the WHOQOL-BREF.  
32  
33 *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2012;**12**:37.  
34  
35  
36 40. Lee LJ, Chung CW, Chang YY, et al. Comparison of the quality of life between  
37  
38 patients with non-small-cell lung cancer and healthy controls. *Qual Life Res*  
39  
40 2011;**20**:415-23.  
41  
42  
43 41. Myrdal G, Valtysdottir S, Lambe M, et al. Quality of life following lung cancer  
44  
45 surgery. *Thorax* 2003;**58**:194-7.  
46  
47  
48 42. Dai SF, Li WN. Correlation of life quality and coping styles of patients with lung  
49  
50 cancer. *J Nursing Sci* 2009;**25**:30-32.  
51  
52  
53 43. Larsson M, Ljung L, Johansson BB. Health-related quality of life in advanced  
54  
55  
56

- 1  
2  
3 non-small cell lung cancer: correlates and comparisons to normative data. *Eur*  
4  
5  
6 *J Cancer Care* 2012;**21**:642-9.  
7
- 8 44. Mazzotti E, Antonini Cappellini GC, Buconovo S, et al. Treatment-related side  
9  
10 effects and quality of life in cancer patients. *Support Care Cancer*  
11  
12 2012;**20**:2553-7.  
13  
14
- 15 45. Grant M, McMullen CK, Altschuler A, et al. Gender differences in quality of life  
16  
17 among long-term colorectal cancer survivors with ostomies. *Oncol Nurs*  
18  
19 *Forum* 2011;**38**:587-96.  
20  
21
- 22 46. Chang NW, Lin KC, Hsu WH, et al. The effect of gender on health-related quality of  
23  
24 life and related factors in post-lobectomy lung-cancer patients. *Eur J Oncol*  
25  
26 *Nurs* 2015;**19**:292-300.  
27  
28
- 29 47. Montazeri A, Hole DJ, Milroy R, et al. Quality of life in lung cancer patients: does  
30  
31 socioeconomic status matter? *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2003;**1**:19.  
32  
33
- 34 48. Salomaa ER, Sallinen S, Hiekkanen H, et al. Delays in the diagnosis and treatment  
35  
36 of lung cancer. *Chest* 2005;**128**:2282-8.  
37  
38
- 39 49. McCarberg BH, Nicholson BD, Todd KH, et al. The impact of pain on quality of life  
40  
41 and the unmet needs of pain management: results from pain sufferers and  
42  
43 physicians participating in an Internet survey. *Am J Ther* 2008;**15**:312-20.  
44  
45
- 46 50. Pergolotti M, Deal AM, Williams GR, et al. Activities, function, and health-related  
47  
48 quality of life (HRQOL) of older adults with cancer. *J Geriatr Oncol*  
49  
50 2017;**8**:249-54.  
51  
52
- 53 51. Hsu YH, Chai HY, Lin YF, et al. Health-related quality of life and satisfaction with  
54  
55  
56

1  
2  
3 case management in cancer survivors. *J Clin Nurs* 2017; **26**:4597-604..  
4  
5

6 52. Katschnig H, Freeman H, Sartorius N. *Quality of Life in Mental Disorders, Second*  
7  
8 *Edition*. New York: Wiley, 2005.  
9

10 53. Helgeson VS. Social support and quality of life. *Qual Life Res* 2003;**12 Suppl**  
11  
12 **1**:25-31.  
13

14 54. Applebaum AJ, Stein EM, Lord-Bessen J, et al. Optimism, social support, and  
15  
16 mental health outcomes in patients with advanced cancer. *Psychooncology*  
17  
18 2014;**23**:299-306.  
19  
20  
21

22 55. Babyak M. What you see may not be what you get: a brief, nontechnical  
23  
24 introduction to overfitting in regression-type models. *Psychosom Med*  
25  
26 2004;**66**:411-21.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The authors thank all the patients involved in this study for their cooperation and support.

For peer review only

**CONTRIBUTORS**

Wen Gu and Bao-Liang Zhong were responsible for the design of the study, interpretation of data, the manuscript draft, and statistical analysis, Yan-Min Xu for the critical revision of the manuscript. All authors reviewed the data and analysis, revised the manuscript, had full access to all of the data in the study and can take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis, and had authority over approval of final manuscript version and the decision to submit for publication.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**FUNDING STATEMENT**

This work was supported by Wuhan Health and Family Planning Commission [grant number: WG16A02 (Bao-Liang Zhong, PI) and WX17Q30 (Yan-Min Xu, PI)].

For peer review only

1  
2  
3 **COMPETING INTERESTS**  
4

5  
6 None declared.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

1  
2  
3 **PATIENT CONSENT**  
4

5  
6 Yes.  
7

8 **ETHICS APPROVAL**  
9

10 The Ethics Committee of Wuhan Mental Health Center approved the study protocol.  
11

12  
13 The protocol including the methods was performed in accordance with the  
14

15 Declaration of Helsinki and the relevant ethical guidelines and regulations in China.  
16

17  
18 Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**DATA SHARING STATEMENT**

The data sets generated and analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

For peer review only

**Table 1 Demographic, clinical, and psychosocial characteristics of inpatients with lung cancer\***

Characteristics	Total sample (n=148)	
	n	%
Gender: male	94	63.5
female	54	36.5
Marital status: married	140	94.6
never married	1	0.7
separated/divorced	5	3.4
widowed	2	1.4
Self-rated economic status: poor	54	36.5
fair	81	54.7
good	13	8.8
Cancer staging: metastatic	38	25.7
not metastatic	110	74.3
Current treatment regimen: chemotherapy	135	91.2
radiotherapy	8	5.4
surgery	5	3.4
Pathological type: small cell	32	21.6
non-small cell	116	78.4
	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age (years)	64.8	11.5

Education (years)	8.1	3.0
Score of pain intensity	1.9	1.1
Time since cancer diagnosis (months)	24.9	18.4
ECOG Scale score of performance status	2.0	1.0
Depressive symptoms: HADS-D score	8.2	3.2
Anxiety symptoms: HADS-A score	7.8	3.2
SSRS: objective social support score	7.7	1.8
SSRS: subjective social support score	24.7	4.0
SSRS: utilization of social support score	7.7	1.9

\* ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. HADS, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. SSRS, Social Support Rating Scale. Demographic factors included gender, age, education, marital status, and self-rated economic status. Clinical factors included cancer stage, pathological type, pain intensity, time since the diagnosis of cancer, ECOG scale, and current treatment regime. Psychosocial factors included HADS-D, HADS-A, and SSRS. In this study, the ECOG scale score ranged between 0 and 4: 1=Restricted in physically strenuous activity but ambulatory and able to carry out work of a light or sedentary nature, e.g., light house work, office work; 2=Ambulatory and capable of all self-care but unable to carry out any work activities; up and about more than 50% of waking hours; 3=Capable of only limited self-care; confined to bed or chair more than 50% of waking hours; 4=Completely disabled; cannot carry on any self-care; totally confined to bed or chair.

**Table 2 Comparison of QOL between inpatients with lung cancer and the general population**

QOL	Patients (n=148)		Normative data of the Chinese general population (n=1052) <sup>39</sup>		t	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Physical	39.02	10.62	66.00	12.56	-25.860	<0.001
Psychological	38.85	10.28	60.55	13.96	-18.225	<0.001

**Table 3 Multivariable linear regression analyses on correlates of physical and psychological QOL**

Variables	Physical QOL			Psychological QOL		
	Unstandardized coefficient	P	95% Confidence interval for unstandardized coefficient	Unstandardized coefficient	P	95% Confidence interval for unstandardized coefficient
Gender: female	-0.700	0.235	-1.010, 2.500	-1.494	0.001	-0.649, -2.339
Age (years)	-0.018	0.489	-1.238, 1.202	-0.024	0.283	-0.106, 0.058
Education (years)	-0.135	0.173	-0.357, 0.087	-0.209	0.013	-0.294, -0.123
Marital status: unmarried*	-2.471	0.032	-4.908, -0.034	-0.456	0.652	-2.644, 1.732
Self-rated economic status: poor	-1.764	0.004	-2.964, -0.564	-0.355	0.474	-10.920, 10.210
Cancer staging: metastatic	-1.328	0.032	-2.632, -0.024	-0.835	0.106	-2.047, 0.377
Current treatment regimen: chemotherapy	-1.068	0.281	-4.577, 2.441	-1.536	0.043	-3.051, -0.021

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Pathological type: small cell	-0.725	0.273	-2.979, 1.529	-1.157	0.026	-2.223, -0.091
Score of pain intensity	0.170	0.556	-2.097, 2.437	-0.535	0.015	-0.919, -0.151
Time since cancer diagnosis (months)	0.028	0.083	-0.030, 0.086	0.009	0.503	-2.238, 2.256
ECOG Scale score of performance status	-0.959	0.003	-1.542, -0.376	-0.930	<0.001	-1.383, -0.477
Depressive symptoms: HADS-D score	-0.465	<0.001	-0.631, -0.299	-0.016	0.881	-0.087, 0.055
Anxiety symptoms: HADS-A score	-0.208	0.048	-0.354, -0.062	-0.178	0.019	-0.248, -0.108
SSRS: objective social support	0.018	0.918	-0.055, 0.091	0.191	0.195	-0.146, 0.528
SSRS: subjective social support	0.120	0.153	-0.012, 0.252	0.137	<0.001	0.121, 0.153
SSRS: utilization of social support	0.344	0.042	0.111, 0.577	0.145	0.267	-0.214, 0.504

\*"Unmarried" included never married, separated/divorced, and widowed.

**STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies***

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	6
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	7-8
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	8-9
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	8-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	NA
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
<b>Results</b>			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	9-10
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9-10
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9-10
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9-10
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	9-10
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	9-10
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	9-10
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	NA
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	10-11
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	13-14
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	10-13
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13-14
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	25

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).