

Title: Characteristics of health-related quality of life and related factors in patients with brain tumors treated with rehabilitation therapy

Short title: HRQOL in patients with brain tumors

Authors

Takahiro Watanabe^{1,2} *, Shinichi Noto³ , Manabu Natsumeda^{4&}, Shinji Kimura^{1&},

Satoshi Tabata¹, Fumie Ikarashi¹, Mayuko Takano¹, Yoshihiro Tsukamoto⁴, Makoto

Oishi⁴

Affiliations

1 Rehabilitation Center, Niigata University Medical and Dental General Hospital,

Niigata, Japan

2 Major in Rehabilitation Sciences, Niigata University of Health and Welfare

Graduate School Niigata, Japan

3 Department of Rehabilitation, Niigata University of Health and Welfare, Niigata,

Japan

4 Department of Neurosurgery, Brain Research Institute, Niigata University, Niigata,

Japan

Corresponding author

E-mail address: tw112051@yahoo.co.jp (TW)

Abstract

Background: Rehabilitation therapy during hospitalization is effective in improving activities of daily living (ADL) and physical function in patients with brain tumors. However, there are few studies on the effect of rehabilitation therapy on health-related quality of life (HRQOL) in patients with brain tumors. Additionally, the EuroQol-5Dimension-5Level (EQ-5D-5L) index score has not been reported as an outcome. This study aimed to investigate the HRQOL of patients with brain tumors who underwent rehabilitation therapy and investigated the factors affecting the EQ-5D-5L index score from various perspectives, including various brain tumor types, treatment methods, and recurrence. In addition, we examined the relationship between the EQ-5D-5L index score, disease-specific HRQOL scale, and ADL.

Methods: Patients with brain tumors who underwent treatment and rehabilitation at Niigata University Medical & Dental Hospital were included in this cross-sectional study. We used the EQ-5D-5L, European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) quality of life questionnaire core 30, and EORTC quality of life questionnaire brain cancer module to evaluate HRQOL. ADL were assessed using the functional independence measure (FIM). The relationship between each HRQOL assessment score and the FIM was analyzed, and the influence of related factors was assessed by multiple regression analysis.

Results: This study included 76 patients. The EQ-5D-5L index score was 0.689 for all patients with brain tumors and 0.574 for those with glioblastomas, which was the lowest value. There was a strong correlation between the EQ-5D-5L index score and FIM ($r = 0.627$, $p < 0.001$). In addition, the EQ-5D-5L index score was significantly correlated with most of the items of the disease-specific HRQOL scale. Multiple regression analysis revealed that glioblastoma histology (coefficient: -0.570 , $p = 0.024$) and surgery (coefficient: 0.376 , $p = 0.030$) were independent factors affecting the EQ-5D-5L index score.

Conclusions: Patients with glioblastoma undergoing rehabilitation may have reduced HRQOL, which was influenced by glioblastoma histology and surgery.

55

56 Keywords: brain tumor, quality of life, activities of daily living, rehabilitation

57

58

59 Introduction

60 Brain tumors are broadly classified as primary and metastatic brain tumors (MBTs),

61 the latter of which are most commonly caused by the metastasis of lung cancer or

62 breast cancer. Primary brain tumors affect approximately 7 people per 100,000

63 population worldwide every year, and the incidence is on the rise [1]. The treatment

64 of brain tumors varies depending on the tumor category, generally consisting of

65 multidisciplinary treatment with surgery, radiation therapy, and chemotherapy [2].

66 There has been great progress in the treatment methods for brain tumors in recent

67 years, which have prolonged the survival of patients with brain tumors. Nevertheless,

68 in some malignant brain tumors, the prognosis remains poor even with the

69 aforementioned treatments. In particular, glioblastoma recurs at 6 months to 1 year

70 on average. The reported median overall survival (OS) in glioblastoma is >1.5 years,

71 but the 5-year survival rate is still only 15% [2]. Similarly, the median OS for MBTs

72 is 12.0 months, even for prostate cancer, which is considered to have the longest OS

[3]. In patients with difficult-to-cure brain tumors and poor prognoses, it is important to improve and maintain health-related quality of life (HRQOL), which is a patient-reported outcome, as well as OS and progression-free survival.

The European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) quality of life questionnaire core 30 (QLQ-C30) and EORTC quality of life questionnaire brain cancer module (BN20) are frequently used in the assessment of HRQOL in patients with brain tumors [4,5]. These HRQOL scales are intended to capture disease-specific psychosomatic functions and symptoms. In recent years, the need for the economic evaluation of medical treatments has been increasing worldwide, generating more interest in utility scales. The EuroQol-5Dimension-5Level (EQ-5D-5L) is one of the most popular scales for calculating the utility index [6], but only a few studies have employed this scale in the evaluation of patients with brain tumors [7-9].

Rehabilitation therapy during hospitalization is reportedly effective in improving activities of daily living (ADL) and physical function in patients with brain tumors. Studies comparing patients with brain tumors to those with stroke and cerebral infarction with similar symptoms found comparable improvements in physical function, ADL, and home discharge rates [10-13]. In addition, even in patients with

glioblastomas and MBTs, who are considered to have poor prognoses, a significant improvement in their total functional independence measure (FIM) score has been reported after rehabilitation[14,15].

In contrast, there are few previous studies on the effect of rehabilitation therapy on HRQOL in patients with brain tumors [16]. Furthermore, the efficacy of rehabilitation therapy on HRQOL has not been examined in detail [17-20]. Additionally, the EQ-5D-5L index score has not been reported as an outcome. Thus, the efficacy of rehabilitation therapy differs between patients with brain tumors and those with stroke in terms of ADL and HRQOL, but the relationship between the two has not been fully investigated. In addition to the impact of disease factors such as brain tumor type and recurrence, few previous studies have analyzed the multifaceted impact of treatments such as surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy on HRQOL before and after rehabilitation therapy.

Clarifying the characteristics of HRQOL, the relationship between HRQOL and ADL, and the factors that affect HRQOL in patients with brain tumors at the time of hospital discharge will provide useful information for implementing rehabilitation therapy. Further, investigating the EQ-5D-5L index score of patients with brain tumors may provide evidence for the cost-effectiveness of rehabilitation treatment in

the future. In the present report, we investigated the effects of brain tumor type, recurrence, and treatment on the EQ-5D-5L index score. In addition, this study aimed to clarify the characteristics of HRQOL in different brain tumor types and its relationship with ADL.

Methods

Study design

This study uses a single-center cross-sectional study design. The design followed the international recommendations for Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology [21]. This study was approved by the Niigata University Ethical Review Committee (Approval No.: 2020-0380). The authors obtained written informed consent from patients who were hospitalized between April and September 2021 and used an opt-out for subjects admitted between April 2016 and March 2021.

Patients

The participants comprised patients aged ≥ 20 years who were admitted to The Niigata University Medical & Dental Hospital for the treatment of brain tumors

between April 2016 and September 2021. The patients were also undergoing physical and occupational therapy, or physical and occupational therapy with speech therapy. The exclusion criteria were based on previous studies [19,22] and included: those who scored <23 on the Mini Mental State Examination, those who had difficulty answering the HRQOL questions due to aphasia or severe higher brain dysfunction, and those who had difficulty answering the questions due to poor general health.

Assessment of general health and HRQOL

The FIM was used to assess ADL, and the Karnofsky performance status (KPS) was used to assess general health. HRQOL was assessed using the QLQ-C30, BN20, and EQ-5D-5L. All parameters were assessed at the time of discharge. FIM and KPS were assessed by the therapist in charge, whereas in principle, patients were required to answer the HRQOL questions by themselves. The therapist in charge of the patient was allowed to assist the patient in answering the questions if the patient had certain limitations that impaired them from filling out the form. These limitations included reading impairment due to motor paralysis or visual field impairment caused by central nervous system disorders. Age, sex, brain tumor type, tumor location (right,

left, other), surgery, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, first occurrence or recurrence, and destination were extracted from the medical records. Brain tumors were classified based on the results of pathological examination according to the WHO 2016 Pathological Classification of Brain Tumors [23]. Finally, based on previous studies [15,22], the patients were classified into five groups: glioblastoma, grade III brain tumors (WHO grade III), primary central nervous system lymphomas (PCNSLs), MBTs, and grade I brain tumors (WHO grade I). The criteria used to determine whether surgery was performed were based on a previous study [24] and excluded biopsy from being considered a surgery. In order to examine the effect of treatment during hospitalization, we did not include a history of previous surgery, radiotherapy, or chemotherapy in patients with recurrence.

Measurements

FIM

The FIM is an assessment of ADL, consisting of a motor category for self-care tasks (eating, grooming, bathing, dressing, toileting), sphincter control tasks (bladder management, bowel management), transfer tasks (bed-to-chair transfer, toilet transfer, tub or shower transfer), and locomotion tasks (walk or wheelchair, stairs), and a

163 cognitive category for communication tasks (comprehension, expression) and social
164 cognition tasks (social interaction, problem solving, memory). Each task is scored on
165 a scale of 1 to 7 according to the level of independence, with 1 representing complete
166 assistance and 7 representing complete independence. The total score ranges from 18
167 to 126, with a higher score indicating a greater degree of independence.

168

169 **QLQ-C30 and BN20**

170 In this study, QLQ-C30 Japanese version (3rd edition) and BN20 were used for
171 evaluation. These are the HRQOL questionnaires developed by the EORTC, which
172 have been reported to be valid and reliable [4,5]. The QLQ-C30 is a disease-specific
173 HRQOL assessment scale for patients with cancer. It consists of five functional
174 scales (physical, role, cognitive, emotional functioning, and social functioning), nine
175 symptom scales (nausea and vomiting, fatigue, dyspnea, pain, insomnia, appetite loss,
176 constipation, diarrhea, and financial difficulties), and global health status.

177 The BN20 is a disease-specific measure of brain tumor symptoms. The BN20 is
178 divided into the following symptom scales: future uncertainty, visual disorder, motor
179 dysfunction, communication deficit, headache, seizure, drowsiness, hair loss, itchy
180 skin, weakness of legs, and loss of bladder control.

181 The use of the above rating scales was approved by the EORTC Quality of Life
182 Group. The QLQ-C30 and BN20 subscales are scored from 0 to 100 according to the
183 scoring manual. A higher score on the QLQ-C30 functional scale and general health
184 indicates better health, while a lower score on the QLQ-C30 symptom scale and
185 BN20 indicates fewer complaints or better health.

186

187 **EQ-5D-5L**

188 The EQ-5D-5L is a generic preference-based measure of HRQOL developed by the
189 EuroQol Group. EQ-5D-5L consists of five dimensions related to mobility, self-care,
190 common activities, pain/discomfort, and anxiety/depression. Patients answer each
191 item on a scale of 1 to 5 (no problems, slight problems, moderate problems, severe
192 problems, and extreme problems). Initially developed by the EuroQol Group in 1987,
193 the EuroQol-5Dimension-3Level (EQ-5D-3L) index was a five-item, three-level
194 instrument. However, its sensitivity was insufficient, and a ceiling effect was
195 identified. As a result, the five-level EQ-5D-5L was released to overcome these
196 shortcomings [25]. In Japan, the EQ-5D-5L conversion table was completed in 2015,
197 and the EQ-5D-5L index score reflecting Japanese values can be calculated [6]. The
198 EQ -5D-5L utility index ranges from -0.025 to 1.00 (full health status).

199

200 **Statistical analysis**

201 A one-way analysis of variance was performed to compare FIM total score, KPS, and
 202 HRQOL among the glioblastoma, WHO grade III, PCNSL, MBT, and WHO grade I
 203 groups. An unpaired t-test was used to compare the total FIM scores, KPS, and
 204 HRQOL between the two groups of patients who did and did not undergo surgery,
 205 radiotherapy, or chemotherapy, and those with first or recurrent disease. Pearson's
 206 correlation analysis was used to investigate the relationship between the EQ-5D-5L
 207 index score, FIM, and disease-specific HQOL scale. In accordance with Guilford's
 208 Rule of Thumb [26], the criterion for the strength of correlation was set as follows: $|r|$
 209 = 0-0.2 as "almost no correlation", 0.2-0.4 as "weak correlation", 0.4-0.7 as
 210 "moderately correlated", and 0.7-1.0 as "strongly correlated". Finally, a multiple
 211 regression analysis was performed to investigate the factors affecting the EQ-5D-5L
 212 index score at the time of hospital discharge, with the EQ-5D-5L index score as the
 213 dependent variable and age, sex, brain tumor type, surgery, radiotherapy,
 214 chemotherapy, and newly diagnosed or recurrent disease as independent variables. In
 215 this study, the forced imputation method of analysis was used to visually compare all
 216 independent variables with one other. The independent variables were selected with

reference to previous studies that used the HRQOL scale and FIM total score as independent variables [15,27]. Categorical data were transformed into dummy variables, and WHO grade I was used as the reference category for brain tumor type. A P-value of <0.05 was regarded as being statistically significant, and all reported P-values were two-tailed. All statistical procedures were conducted using SPSS for Windows version 24.

Results

Patient characteristics

The patient characteristics are summarized in Table 1. The mean age of the patients was 61.1 years, and 59% were male. In addition, 74% of all patients were newly diagnosed, and 79% were discharged to home. The number of patients in each group was 21 in the glioblastoma group (27.6%), 10 in the WHO grade III group (13.2%), 10 in the PCNSL group (13.2%), 9 in the MBT group (11.8%), and 26 in the WHO grade I group (34.2%). None of the 10 patients in the PCNSL group had undergone surgical resection, whereas all patients in the MBT and WHO grade I groups had undergone surgery. In addition, none of patients in the WHO Grade I group received

radiotherapy or chemotherapy.

Table 1. Patient characteristics.

	All patients n = 76	Glioblastoma n = 21	WHO grade III n = 10
Sex, n (%)			
Male	45 (59)	15 (71)	6 (60)
Female	31 (41)	6 (29)	4 (40)
Age, years, mean $\pm$ SD	61.1 $\pm$ 12.5	58.7 $\pm$ 10.8	55.6 $\pm$ 11.7
Tumor histology, n			Anaplastic astrocytoma 4 Anaplastic oligodendroglioma 2 Anaplastic pleomorphic xanthoastrocytoma 2 anaplastic ependymoma 1 NOS 1
Tumor location, n (%)			
Right	27 (35)	10 (48)	6 (60)
Left	21 (28)	9 (43)	3 (30)
Both/other	28 (37)	2 (9)	1 (10)
Treatment, n (%)			
Surgical resection	59 (78)	17 (81)	7 (70)
Radiation	34 (45)	15 (71)	7 (70)
Chemotherapy	38 (50)	20 (95)	9 (90)
Recurrence, n (%)			
Yes	20 (26)	8 (38)	5 (50)
No	56 (74)	13 (62)	5 (50)
Discharge disposition, n (%)			
Discharged home	60 (79)	16 (76)	7 (70)
Transfer to a different hospital	16 (21)	5 (24)	3 (30)

PCNSL: Primary central nervous system lymphoma, MBT: Metastatic brain tumor, SD: Standard deviation, NOS: Not otherwise specified

Comparison of assessment scores among brain tumor types

The assessment scores are summarized in Table 2. The FIM total score and KPS did

not differ significantly among the brain tumor types. In contrast, the EQ-5D-5L

index score ($p = 0.048$), emotional functioning ($p = 0.015$), financial difficulties ($p =$

0.002), and future uncertainty ($p = 0.014$) significantly differed among the groups.

The EQ-5D-5L index score for all patients was 0.689 ± 0.205 . The glioblastoma group

received the lowest score (0.574 ± 0.229) and the WHO grade I group received the highest score (0.762 ± 0.135). In addition, the glioblastoma group received the lowest score for emotional functioning and the highest scores for financial difficulties and future uncertainty among all groups.

Table 2. Comparison of FIM and KPS with HRQOL in tumor classification.

	All patients n = 76	Glioblastoma n = 21	WHO grade III n = 10	PCNSL n = 10	
	Mean $\pm$ SD	Mean $\pm$ SD	Mean $\pm$ SD	Mean $\pm$ SD	
FIM	115.3 $\pm$ 12.2	112.4 $\pm$ 15.8	116.6 $\pm$ 8.7	120.0 $\pm$ 8.8	
KPS	86.3 $\pm$ 13.5	84.8 $\pm$ 15.7	77.0 $\pm$ 12.5	92.0 $\pm$ 10.3	
EQ-5D-5L index score	0.689 $\pm$ 0.205	0.574 $\pm$ 0.229	0.655 $\pm$ 0.230	0.731 $\pm$ 0.116	
QLQ-C30 functional domains ^a					
Physical functioning	67.5 $\pm$ 27.7	61.0 $\pm$ 31.6	61.3 $\pm$ 35.7	69.3 $\pm$ 25.8	
Role functioning	56.4 $\pm$ 33.0	52.4 $\pm$ 28.5	53.3 $\pm$ 44.3	50.0 $\pm$ 31.4	
Cognitive functioning	68.0 $\pm$ 25.2	63.5 $\pm$ 19.4	63.3 $\pm$ 35.8	61.7 $\pm$ 29.4	
Emotional functioning	78.4 $\pm$ 16.1	68.7 $\pm$ 19.3	75.8 $\pm$ 12.1	82.5 $\pm$ 9.2	
Social functioning	66.9 $\pm$ 29.4	57.1 $\pm$ 28.2	60.0 $\pm$ 28.5	76.7 $\pm$ 23.8	
Global Health Status	52.3 $\pm$ 23.8	46.0 $\pm$ 24.2	48.3 $\pm$ 15.6	50.0 $\pm$ 27.5	
QLQ-C30 symptom domains ^a					
Nausea and vomiting	5.7 $\pm$ 14.5	3.2 $\pm$ 6.7	18.3 $\pm$ 30.9	5.0 $\pm$ 11.2	
Fatigue	40.3 $\pm$ 21.1	43.4 $\pm$ 12.6	46.7 $\pm$ 28.6	44.4 $\pm$ 18.1	
Dyspnea	18.9 $\pm$ 27.9	19.0 $\pm$ 30.9	13.3 $\pm$ 23.3	26.7 $\pm$ 34.4	
Pain	21.1 $\pm$ 21.3	30.2 $\pm$ 18.7	13.3 $\pm$ 17.2	18.3 $\pm$ 21.4	
Insomnia	29.8 $\pm$ 29.1	33.3 $\pm$ 33.3	26.7 $\pm$ 34.4	36.7 $\pm$ 36.7	
Appetite loss	21.1 $\pm$ 26.6	17.5 $\pm$ 22.7	20.0 $\pm$ 28.1	20.0 $\pm$ 23.3	
Constipation	28.5 $\pm$ 29.2	33.3 $\pm$ 29.8	30.0 $\pm$ 33.1	30.0 $\pm$ 29.2	
Diarrhea	10.1 $\pm$ 16.3	11.1 $\pm$ 16.1	3.3 $\pm$ 10.5	10.0 $\pm$ 16.1	
Financial difficulties	33.3 $\pm$ 31.3	55.6 $\pm$ 28.5	26.7 $\pm$ 34.4	36.7 $\pm$ 33.1	
BN20 symptom domains ^b					
Future uncertainty	34.3 $\pm$ 24.3	47.6 $\pm$ 24.0	36.7 $\pm$ 23.6	37.5 $\pm$ 26.7	
Visual disorder	17.5 $\pm$ 28.3	10.1 $\pm$ 17.9	15.6 $\pm$ 32.8	15.6 $\pm$ 30.6	
Motor dysfunction	23.4 $\pm$ 24.2	33.3 $\pm$ 27.2	28.9 $\pm$ 32.4	20.0 $\pm$ 30.5	
Communication deficit	17.8 $\pm$ 22.4	22.8 $\pm$ 26.2	12.2 $\pm$ 15.2	10.0 $\pm$ 11.0	
Headache	22.8 $\pm$ 23.9	19.0 $\pm$ 19.9	20.0 $\pm$ 23.3	16.7 $\pm$ 23.6	
Seizure	1.3 $\pm$ 6.5	1.6 $\pm$ 7.3	6.7 $\pm$ 14.1	0.0 $\pm$ 0.0	
Drowsiness	33.8 $\pm$ 28.5	36.5 $\pm$ 31.5	53.3 $\pm$ 28.1	26.7 $\pm$ 26.3	
Hair loss	25.0 $\pm$ 30.9	34.9 $\pm$ 37.2	36.7 $\pm$ 33.1	23.3 $\pm$ 31.6	
Itchy skin	18.0 $\pm$ 19.2	27.0 $\pm$ 22.7	20.0 $\pm$ 17.2	16.7 $\pm$ 17.6	
Weakness of legs	40.8 $\pm$ 30.1	44.4 $\pm$ 26.5	46.7 $\pm$ 32.2	46.7 $\pm$ 32.2	
Loss of bladder control	14.5 $\pm$ 23.9	14.3 $\pm$ 27.0	10.0 $\pm$ 16.1	13.3 $\pm$ 23.3	

SD: Standard deviation, PCNSL: Primary central nervous system lymphoma, MBT: Metastatic brain tumor, KPS: Karnofsky performance measure.

^a In EORTC QLQ-C30, functional domains—higher scores are better; symptom domains—lower scores are better.

^b In EORTC BN20 symptom domains, lower scores are better.

P value <0.05 were written in boldface.

248

249 **Comparison of the different treatment groups and relapse** 250 **and newly diagnosed groups**

251 The results of the comparisons of the different treatment groups and relapse and
252 newly diagnosed groups are presented in Table 3. The role functioning score was
253 significantly higher ($p = 0.027$) and the scores for fatigue ($p = 0.030$), future
254 uncertainty ($p = 0.025$), and weakness of legs ($p = 0.020$) were significantly lower in
255 the group that underwent surgery than in the group that did not undergo surgery. The
256 score for headache ($p = 0.006$) was significantly lower and the scores for hair loss (p
257 $= 0.001$) and itchy skin ($p = 0.002$) were significantly higher in the group that
258 received radiotherapy than in the group that did not receive radiotherapy. The
259 EQ-5D-5L index ($p = 0.029$), emotional functioning ($p = 0.027$), and visual disorder
260 ($p = 0.038$) scores were significantly lower and the financial difficulties ($p = 0.013$),
261 future uncertainty ($p = 0.044$), hair loss ($p = 0.018$), and itchy skin ($p = 0.002$) scores
262 were significantly higher in the group that received chemotherapy than in the group
263 that did not receive chemotherapy. The KPS ($p = 0.009$), FIM total score ($p = 0.048$),
264 EQ-5D-5L index score ($p = 0.016$), physical functioning score ($p = 0.004$), and role
265 functioning score ($p = 0.032$) were significantly lower and the fatigue ($p = 0.002$),

266 future uncertainty ($p = 0.032$), and drowsiness ($p = 0.033$) were significantly higher

267 in the recurrence group than in the newly-diagnosed group.

268

Table 3. Comparison of FIM, KPS and HRQOL with and without each treatment and with and without recurrence

	Surgical resection		Radiation therapy		Chemotherapy
	Yes n = 59	No n = 17	Yes n = 34	No n = 42	Yes n = 38
	Mean $\pm$ SD	Mean $\pm$ SD	Mean $\pm$ SD	Mean $\pm$ SD	Mean $\pm$ SD
FIM	114.9 $\pm$ 12.9	16.5 $\pm$ 9.81	115.6 $\pm$ 10.5	115.0 $\pm$ 13.5	115.3 $\pm$ 13.2
KPS	86.3 $\pm$ 13.6	86.5 $\pm$ 13.2	86.8 $\pm$ 10.7	86.0 $\pm$ 15.5	85.0 $\pm$ 14.3
EQ-5D-5L index score	0.709 $\pm$ 0.209	0.620 $\pm$ 0.180	0.679 $\pm$ 0.198	0.697 $\pm$ 0.212	0.638 $\pm$ 0.215
QLQ-C30 functional domains ^a					
Physical functioning	70.4 $\pm$ 25.5	57.6 $\pm$ 33.3	65.1 $\pm$ 30.0	69.5 $\pm$ 25.9	65.1 $\pm$ 30.8
Role functioning	61.0 $\pm$ 32.0	40.2 $\pm$ 32.3	56.9 $\pm$ 30.7	56.0 $\pm$ 35.1	54.8 $\pm$ 31.7
Cognitive functioning	71.5 $\pm$ 22.5	55.9 $\pm$ 30.6	63.7 $\pm$ 29.1	71.4 $\pm$ 21.2	63.6 $\pm$ 26.8
Emotional functioning	79.5 $\pm$ 15.0	74.5 $\pm$ 19.4	76.5 $\pm$ 13.7	80.0 $\pm$ 17.9	74.3 $\pm$ 16.3
Social functioning	66.9 $\pm$ 29.8	66.7 $\pm$ 28.9	65.7 $\pm$ 28.4	67.9 $\pm$ 30.4	61.8 $\pm$ 27.6
Global Health Status	53.4 $\pm$ 23.8	48.5 $\pm$ 24.3	51.2 $\pm$ 24.0	53.2 $\pm$ 23.9	49.8 $\pm$ 22.0
QLQ-C30 symptom domains ^a					
Nausea and vomiting	4.2 $\pm$ 9.6	10.8 $\pm$ 25.0	6.9 $\pm$ 18.4	4.8 $\pm$ 10.6	7.9 $\pm$ 18.1
Fatigue	37.3 $\pm$ 20.1	51.0 $\pm$ 21.9	43.1 $\pm$ 22.4	38.1 $\pm$ 20.1	42.1 $\pm$ 18.8
Dyspnea	16.4 $\pm$ 25.0	27.5 $\pm$ 35.8	12.7 $\pm$ 23.2	23.8 $\pm$ 30.6	19.3 $\pm$ 29.6
Pain	21.2 $\pm$ 21.6	20.6 $\pm$ 20.9	21.1 $\pm$ 23.7	21.0 $\pm$ 19.5	23.2 $\pm$ 20.3
Insomnia	27.7 $\pm$ 24.9	37.3 $\pm$ 40.6	29.4 $\pm$ 28.1	30.2 $\pm$ 30.2	32.5 $\pm$ 34.2
Appetite loss	20.3 $\pm$ 26.3	23.5 $\pm$ 28.3	21.6 $\pm$ 29.5	20.6 $\pm$ 24.4	19.3 $\pm$ 24.1
Constipation	26.6 $\pm$ 26.8	35.3 $\pm$ 36.3	27.4 $\pm$ 30.1	29.4 $\pm$ 28.7	30.7 $\pm$ 30.4
Diarrhea	10.7 $\pm$ 16.9	7.8 $\pm$ 14.6	11.8 $\pm$ 18.1	8.7 $\pm$ 14.8	10.5 $\pm$ 15.7
Financial difficulties	31.1 $\pm$ 30.2	41.2 $\pm$ 34.4	35.3 $\pm$ 28.4	31.7 $\pm$ 33.7	42.1 $\pm$ 30.7
BN20 symptom domains ^b					
Future uncertainty	30.5 $\pm$ 22.4	47.5 $\pm$ 26.6	37.3 $\pm$ 21.6	31.9 $\pm$ 26.2	39.9 $\pm$ 21.2
Visual disorder	16.6 $\pm$ 27.2	20.9 $\pm$ 32.6	17.0 $\pm$ 30.6	18.0 $\pm$ 26.7	10.8 $\pm$ 21.4
Motor dysfunction	19.2 $\pm$ 17.4	37.9 $\pm$ 36.9	26.1 $\pm$ 27.5	21.2 $\pm$ 21.2	26.9 $\pm$ 26.7
Communication deficit	18.3 $\pm$ 21.9	16.3 $\pm$ 24.9	20.3 $\pm$ 24.1	15.9 $\pm$ 21.1	17.3 $\pm$ 21.9
Headache	23.7 $\pm$ 24.0	19.6 $\pm$ 23.7	14.7 $\pm$ 20.4	29.4 $\pm$ 24.6	18.4 $\pm$ 21.5
Seizure	1.1 $\pm$ 6.1	2.0 $\pm$ 8.1	0.0 $\pm$ 0.0	2.4 $\pm$ 8.7	1.8 $\pm$ 7.5
Drowsiness	30.5 $\pm$ 25.7	45.1 $\pm$ 35.2	33.3 $\pm$ 30.7	34.1 $\pm$ 27.0	36.8 $\pm$ 30.8
Hair loss	23.7 $\pm$ 31.0	29.4 $\pm$ 30.9	38.2 $\pm$ 34.0	14.3 $\pm$ 23.4	33.3 $\pm$ 35.5
Itchy skin	17.5 $\pm$ 17.9	19.6 $\pm$ 23.7	25.5 $\pm$ 18.5	11.9 $\pm$ 17.8	24.6 $\pm$ 20.0
Weakness of legs	36.2 $\pm$ 28.6	56.9 $\pm$ 30.7	48.0 $\pm$ 28.7	34.9 $\pm$ 30.3	43.9 $\pm$ 28.1
Loss of bladder control	13.6 $\pm$ 22.4	17.6 $\pm$ 29.1	13.7 $\pm$ 21.9	15.1 $\pm$ 25.7	11.4 $\pm$ 22.3

SD: Standard deviation, KPS: Karnofsky performance status, FIM: Functional independence measure.

^a In EORTC QLQ-C30, functional domains—higher scores are better; symptom domains—lower scores are better.

^b In EORTC BN20 symptom domains, lower scores are better.

P value <0.05 were written in boldface.

269

270

271 **Correlations among the EQ-5D-5L index score, FIM, and** 272 **disease-specific HRQOL scale**

273 The correlations among the EQ-5D-5L index score, FIM, and disease-specific
274 HRQOL scale are shown in Table 4. There was a strong correlation between the
275 EQ-5D-5L index score and FIM ($r = 0.627$, $p < 0.001$). Furthermore, the EQ-5D-5L
276 index score and the disease-specific HRQOL scale showed significant correlations
277 for all items with the exception of headache, hair loss, and itchy skin. In particular,
278 strong correlations were observed with physical functioning ($r = 0.723$, $p < 0.001$). In
279 contrast, only physical functioning ($r = 0.610$, $p < 0.001$) and dyspnea ($r = -0.433$,
280 $p < 0.001$) showed more than a moderate correlation between FIM and the
281 disease-specific HRQOL measure.

Table 4. Correlation between EQ-5D-5L index score, FIM, and disease-specific HRQOL scale.

	FIM	EQ-5D-5L index score
	Pearson's r	Pearson's r
EQ-5D-5L index score	0.627**	
QLQ-C30 functional domains ^a		
Physical functioning	0.610**	0.723**
Role functioning	0.325**	0.602**
Cognitive functioning	0.354**	0.584**
Emotional functioning	0.213	0.651**
Social functioning	0.171	0.482**
Global Health Status	0.129	0.430**
QLQ-C30 symptom domains ^a		
Nausea and vomiting	-0.098	-0.228*
Fatigue	-0.331**	-0.669**
Dyspnea	-0.433**	-0.496**
Pain	-0.281*	-0.533**
Insomnia	-0.184	-0.400**
Appetite loss	-0.139	-0.412**

Constipation	−0.110	−0.274*
Diarrhea	−0.157	−0.249*
Financial difficulties	−0.077	−0.406**
BN20 symptom domains ^b		
Future uncertainty	−0.174	−0.566**
Visual disorder	−0.142	−0.256*
Motor dysfunction	−0.095	−0.448**
Communication deficit	−0.145	−0.374**
Headache	0.115	0.003
Seizure	0.073	−0.231*
Drowsiness	−0.180	−0.524**
Hair loss	0.124	−0.141
Itchy skin	0.081	−0.030
Weakness of legs	0.017	−0.273*
Loss of bladder control	−0.265*	−0.377**

FIM: Functional independence measure.

^a In EORTC QLQ-C30, functional domains—higher scores are better; symptom domains—lower scores are better.

^b In EORTC BN20 symptom domains, lower scores are better.

Pearson's $r \geq |0.400|$ were written in boldface.

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

282

283 Multiple regression analysis for 5EQ-5D-5L index score

284 Multiple regression analysis was performed on the 5EQ-5D-5L index score, with age,

285 sex, brain tumor type, surgery, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, and first occurrence or

286 recurrence as independent variables (Table 5). Glioblastoma (standard partial

287 regression coefficient: -0.570 , $p = 0.024$) and surgery (standard partial regression

288 coefficient: 0.376 , $p = 0.030$) were identified as factors affecting the EQ-5D-5L

289 index score.

Table 5. Multiple regression analysis with EQ-5D-5L index score as the dependent variable.

	B	β	95% Confidence interval		P value
			Lower	Upper	
Intercept	0.684		0.341	1.027	<0.001**
Age	−0.002	−0.109	−0.005	0.002	0.339
Sex					
Female (ref)					
Male	−0.012	−0.028	−0.083	0.106	0.807
Tumor histology					

WHO grade I (ref)					
Glioblastoma	-0.259	-0.570	-0.484	-0.035	0.024*
WHO grade III	-0.151	-0.250	-0.388	0.086	0.209
PCNSL	-0.087	-0.144	-0.165	0.339	0.495
MBT	-0.115	-0.183	-0.296	0.065	0.201
Surgical resection					
No (ref)					
Yes	0.183	0.376	0.018	0.348	0.030*
Radiation therapy					
No (ref)					
Yes	0.097	0.236	-0.033	0.227	0.142
Chemotherapy					
No (ref)					
Yes	0.057	0.139	-0.124	0.238	0.534
Recurrence					
No (ref)					
Yes	-0.085	-0.183	-0.194	0.025	0.126

B: Partial regression coefficient, β : Standardized regression coefficient, PCNSL: Primary central nervous system lymphoma, MBT: Metastatic brain tumor.

Adjusted R²: 0.188.

**p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

290

291

292 Discussion

293 This study aimed to investigate the effects of brain tumor type, recurrence, and

294 treatment on the EQ-5D-5L index score and to clarify the characteristics of HRQOL

295 in different brain tumor types and its relationship with ADL.

296 The mean EQ-5D-5L index score at the time of hospital discharge for all patients

297 with brain tumors in this study was 0.689±0.205 (mean age 61.1 years). The WHO

298 grade I group had the highest score of 0.762±0.135 (mean age 61.8 years) and the

299 glioblastoma group had the lowest score of 0.574±0.229 (mean age 58.7 years). In

300 Japan, the EQ-5D-5L index score for patients with brain tumors has not been
301 reported previously, and in other countries, Wagner et al [7] reported a mean index
302 score of 0.72 in 3-month postoperative patients with benign meningiomas. The
303 EQ-5D-5L index score of the WHO grade I group in this study was comparable,
304 although simple comparison is difficult because the EQ-5D-5L index score is
305 calculated using a country-specific conversion table. However, the mean EQ-5D-5L
306 index score of the general population in Japan was reported to be 0.936 in the 50s
307 and 0.911 in the 60s [28]. In the case of patients with various types of outpatient
308 cancers aside from brain tumors, the reported value was 0.827 [29]. In addition, the
309 mean score was 0.52 (mean age 57 years) in stroke patients, who are expected to
310 present with similar functional impairment [30]. The EQ-5D-5L index score of the
311 brain tumor patients in this study was lower than that of the general population and
312 patients with other cancers, although the results should be interpreted with caution
313 regarding the different effects of the time of assessment, age, and disease.
314 Furthermore, the values were similar between the current glioblastoma group and
315 previous reports of stroke. In the present study, there were significant differences in
316 emotional functioning, financial difficulties, and future uncertainty among brain
317 tumor types. In addition, the glioblastoma group showed the lowest values for all

318 scales. Budrukkar et al [22] reported that the Global Health Status of the QLQ-C30
319 was significantly lower in the high-grade glioma (HGG) group than in the low-grade
320 glioma (LGG) group. In a study of glioma patients treated with rehabilitation therapy
321 during hospitalization, Umezaki et al [27] found that the HGG group had fewer
322 complaints of QLQ-C30 constipation and more complaints of BN-20 hair loss and
323 itchy skin than did the LGG group. These previous studies and the current results
324 differed in the items that showed significant differences. This may have been due to
325 the differences in the brain tumor type and the individuality of the hospitals in the
326 study area. However, it is interesting to note that in the present study, the scores of
327 the HRQOL items reflecting psychological aspects were lower in the glioblastoma
328 group than in the other groups. Glioblastomas carry a poorer prognosis than other
329 brain tumors, aside from MBTs, and may cause psychological problems. Indeed,
330 patients with glioblastoma have been reported to have more depressive symptoms
331 than patients with gastric, urological, breast, and lung cancers [31]. Further, most
332 brain tumors classified as WHO grade I can be treated with surgery alone, but brain
333 tumors classified as WHO grade II or higher often require radiation therapy or
334 chemotherapy in addition to surgery. Moreover, these treatments may be continued
335 after hospital discharge. These factors may be related to the emotional functioning,

336 financial difficulties, and future uncertainty scores of the glioblastoma group.

337 However, within the scope of this study, we have not been able to examine the above

338 points, and they are only inferred.

339

340 A previous study in acute stroke patients reported a significant correlation between

341 the EQ-5D-5L index score and FIM motor items [32] and Barthel index [33]. In

342 contrast, a previous study of patients with brain tumors reported no correlation

343 between the total FIM score at discharge and the Functional Assessment of Cancer

344 Therapy-Brain (FACT-Br), a disease-specific HRQOL scale [18]. In the present

345 study, we also found a significant correlation between the FIM and EQ-5D-5L index

346 score. However, in the FIM total score and disease-specific HRQOL scale, the items

347 that showed significant correlations were limited to those related to physical function.

348 This finding was similar to those of previous studies, although the HRQOL scale

349 used was different. However, our results are noteworthy in that the EQ-5D-5L index

350 score and the disease-specific HRQOL scale showed significant correlations for all

351 items with the exception of headache, hair loss, and itchy skin on the BN20. Hirose

352 et al [29] reported a correlation between changes in adverse events and EQ-5D-5L

353 index scores in patients with cancer. In addition, the EQ-5D-3L index score of

354 patients with brain tumors is reportedly associated with the emotional well-being
 355 item of the FACT-Br [34] and anxiety and depression symptoms [35]. The
 356 correlations between EQ-5D-5L index scores and the QLQ-C30 and BN20 in this
 357 study were similar to those in previous studies, although the target diseases and
 358 HRQOL assessment scales were different. Coomans et al [24] reported the impact of
 359 HRQOL on OS in patients with gliomas, but the added value was low, indicating the
 360 limitations of using HRQOL as a prognostic indicator of OS. However, Edelstein et
 361 al [31] stated that the limitation of activity and participation due to glioblastoma is a
 362 factor that interferes with subjective well-being and mentioned the possibility of
 363 rehabilitation therapy to improve HRQOL. Similarly, in addition to training to
 364 improve ADL as indicated by the HRQOL assessment, the importance of
 365 rehabilitation treatment for patients with brain tumors, which is largely affected by
 366 individual complaints, is demonstrated in this study.

367

368 Furthermore, we investigated the influence of factors such as brain tumor type,
 369 surgery, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, and recurrence on the EQ-5D-5L index score.
 370 The results of multiple regression analysis showed that glioblastoma and surgery
 371 were the most influential factors. It has been reported that surgery in patients with

brain tumors prolongs survival and improves EQ-5D-3L index scores more in patients who undergo tumorectomy than in those who undergo biopsy [36,37]. Furthermore, tumorectomy has been suggested to improve HRQOL by providing a mass effect and improvement in hydrocephalus [22]. These previous findings support the results of the present study that surgery was a factor in improving the EQ-5D-5L index score. Vera et al [38] investigated the effect of different brain tumor classifications on the EQ-5D-3L index score in patients with gliomas who were undergoing outpatient treatment. After dividing the patients into two groups, grade II/III and grade IV, we reported that the grade of the brain tumor was not a factor affecting the EQ-5D-3L index score. Similar results were also reported in a study of postoperative HGG and LGG patients [39]. In the present study, glioblastoma reduced the EQ-5D-5L index score, and this finding differed from those of previous studies. However, these previous studies were limited to the glioma population. In our study, we used the EQ-5D-5L index and further divided the brain tumor classifications into five groups, which we believe is a new finding.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. First, this study was conducted at a single

390 institution and was limited to patients with brain tumors who underwent
391 rehabilitation treatment. In addition, patients with poor general health, cognitive
392 decline, or aphasia were excluded. Therefore, the results are not generalizable to all
393 patients with brain tumors. In addition, because this was a cross-sectional study, we
394 were not able to compare the findings before and after rehabilitation treatment, nor
395 were we able to examine changes after hospital discharge.

396 Second, brain tumor type may affect the choice of treatment for newly diagnosed and
397 recurrent brain tumors. In the PCNSL group, the main treatment was chemotherapy
398 and radiation therapy without radical surgical resection. For patients with other
399 tumor types, it is important to removing as much tumor as possible, but complete
400 tumor resection cannot be performed if the tumor is located in the brainstem or
401 similar areas, or if the disease is intractable, including distant recurrence. Thus, the
402 group of patients who did not undergo surgery may have included more
403 difficult-to-treat cases, which may have influenced the results. Third, previous
404 studies have reported that a history of epilepsy and impaired cognitive function [40],
405 as well as tumor location and size [41], affect HRQOL, but we were unable to
406 examine their effects in this study. In addition, the late effects of radiotherapy and
407 chemotherapy may have affected HRQOL after the study. Since brain tumors are rare,

there is a need to evaluate a greater number of cases by conducting multicenter studies. Furthermore, in the present study, the analysis was only performed at discharge after rehabilitation therapy. We are currently conducting continuous surveys before and after rehabilitation treatment and after discharge from the hospital in order to longitudinally understand the effect of rehabilitation on ADL and HRQOL.

Conclusion

This study investigated the HRQOL of patients with brain tumors who underwent rehabilitation therapy and investigated the factors affecting the EQ-5D-5L index score from various perspectives, including various brain tumor types, treatment methods, and recurrence. In addition, we examined the relationship between the EQ-5D-5L index score, disease-specific HRQOL scale, and FIM total score. The EQ-5D-5L index score of the patients in this study was lower than that of the general adult population. In addition, the glioblastoma group had the lowest EQ-5D-5L index score among all brain tumor types. In addition, the EQ-5D-5L index score was significantly correlated with most of the items of the disease-specific HRQOL scale in addition to the total FIM score. Multiple regression analysis revealed that

glioblastoma and surgery were factors that significantly influenced the EQ-5D-5L index score. The results of our study may provide useful information for the rehabilitation of patients with brain tumors.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the patients who cooperated in this study, and to the Department of Neurosurgery and Rehabilitation Medicine and therapists at The Niigata University Medical & Dental Hospital.

References

1. Khan F, Amatya B, Ng L, Drummond K, Galea M. Multidisciplinary rehabilitation after primary brain tumour treatment. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2015(8):CD009509. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009509.pub3
2. Nagane M. Diagnosis and Treatment for Malignant Brain Tumors. Article in Japanese. Jpn J Rehabil Med. 2019;56(8):602-8. doi:10.2490/jjrmc.56.602
3. Cagney DN, Martin AM, Catalano PJ, Redig AJ, Lin NU, Lee EQ, et al. Incidence and prognosis of patients with brain metastases at diagnosis of systemic malignancy: a population-based study. Neuro Oncol.

- 2017;19(11):1511-21. doi:10.1093/neuonc/nox077
4. Aaronson NK, Ahmedzai S, Bergman B, Bullinger M, Cull A, Duez NJ, et al. The European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer QLQ-C30: a quality-of-life instrument for use in international clinical trials in oncology. J Natl Cancer Inst. 1993;85(5):365-76. doi:10.1093/jnci/85.5.365
5. Taphoorn MJ, Claassens L, Aaronson NK, Coens C, Mauer M, Osoba D, et al. An international validation study of the EORTC brain cancer module (EORTC QLQ-BN20) for assessing health-related quality of life and symptoms in brain cancer patients. Eur J Cancer. 2010;46(6):1033-40. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2010.01.012
6. Ikeda S, Shiroywa T, Igarashi A. Developing a Japanese version of the EQ-5D-5L value set. 2015;64:47-55.
7. Wagner A, Shibani Y, Lange N, Joerger AK, Hoffmann U, Meyer B, et al. The relevant psychological burden of having a benign brain tumor: a prospective study of patients undergoing surgical treatment of cranial meningiomas. J Neurosurg. 2019;131(6):1840-7. doi:10.3171/2018.8.JNS181343
8. Rahman MA, Brekke J, Arnesen V, Hannisdal MH, Navarro AG, Waha A, et al. Sequential bortezomib and temozolomide treatment promotes immunological

- 462 responses in glioblastoma patients with positive clinical outcomes: A phase 1B
463 study. *Immun Inflamm Dis.* 2020;8(3):342-59. doi:10.1002/iid3.315
- 464 9. Tanaka S, Sato I, Takahashi M, Armstrong TS, Cleeland CS, Mendoza TR, et al.
465 Validation study of the Japanese version of MD Anderson Symptom Inventory
466 for Brain Tumor module. *Jpn J Clin Oncol.* 2020;50(7):787-93.
467 doi:10.1093/jjco/hyaa036
- 468 10. Huang ME, Cifu DX, Keyser-Marcus L. Functional outcome after brain tumor
469 and acute stroke: a comparative analysis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.*
470 1998;79(11):1386-90. doi:10.1016/s0003-9993(98)90232-5
- 471 11. Geler-Kulcu D, Gulsen G, Buyukbaba E, Ozkan D. Functional recovery of
472 patients with brain tumor or acute stroke after rehabilitation: a comparative study.
473 *J Clin Neurosci.* 2009;16(1):74-8. doi:10.1016/j.jocn.2008.04.014
- 474 12. O'Dell MW, Barr K, Spanier D, Warnick RE. Functional outcome of inpatient
475 rehabilitation in persons with brain tumors. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.*
476 1998;79(12):1530-4. doi:10.1016/s0003-9993(98)90414-2
- 477 13. Huang ME, Cifu DX, Keyser-Marcus L. Functional outcomes in patients with
478 brain tumor after inpatient rehabilitation: comparison with traumatic brain injury.
479 *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.* 2000;79(4):327-35.

- doi:10.1097/00002060-200007000-00003
14. Roberts PS, Nuño M, Sherman D, Asher A, Wertheimer J, Riggs RV, et al. The impact of inpatient rehabilitation on function and survival of newly diagnosed patients with glioblastoma. PM R. 2014;6(6):514-21. doi:10.1016/j.pmrj.2013.12.007
15. Tang V, Rathbone M, Park Dorsay J, Jiang S, Harvey D. Rehabilitation in primary and metastatic brain tumours: impact of functional outcomes on survival. J Neurol. 2008;255(6):820-7. doi:10.1007/s00415-008-0695-z
16. Hansen A, Rosenbek Minet LK, Sogaard K, Jarden JO. The effect of an interdisciplinary rehabilitation intervention comparing HRQoL, symptom burden and physical function among patients with primary glioma: an RCT study protocol. BMJ Open. 2014;4(10):e005490. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005490
17. Khan F, Amatya B, Drummond K, Galea M. Effectiveness of integrated multidisciplinary rehabilitation in primary brain cancer survivors in an Australian community cohort: a controlled clinical trial. J Rehabil Med. 2014;46(8):754-60. doi:10.2340/16501977-1840
18. Huang ME, Wartella JE, Kreutzer JS. Functional outcomes and quality of life in patients with brain tumors: a preliminary report. Arch Phys Med Rehabil.

- 2001;82(11):1540-6. doi:10.1053/apmr.2001.26613
19. Hansen A, Pedersen CB, Jarden JO, Beier D, Minet LR, Sogaard K. Effectiveness of Physical Therapy- and Occupational Therapy-Based Rehabilitation in People Who Have Glioma and Are Undergoing Active Anticancer Treatment: Single-Blind, Randomized Controlled Trial. *Phys Ther*. 2020;100(3):564-74. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzz180
20. McCarty S, Eickmeyer SM, Kocherginsky M, Keeshin S, Shahpar S, Semik P, et al. Health-Related Quality of Life and Cancer-Related Symptoms During Interdisciplinary Outpatient Rehabilitation for Malignant Brain Tumor. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2017;96(12):852-60. doi:10.1097/PHM.0000000000000756
21. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2008;61(4):344-9. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008
22. Budrukkar A, Jalali R, Dutta D, Sarin R, Devlekar R, Parab S, et al. Prospective assessment of quality of life in adult patients with primary brain tumors in routine neurooncology practice. *J Neurooncol*. 2009;95(3):413-9. doi:10.1007/s11060-009-9939-8

- 516 23. Board. WCoTE. World Health Organization Classification of Tumours of the
517 Central Nervous System. 2021.
- 518 24. Coomans M, Dirven L, K Aaronson N, Baumert BG, van den Bent M,
519 Bottomley A, et al. The added value of health-related quality of life as a
520 prognostic indicator of overall survival and progression-free survival in glioma
521 patients: a meta-analysis based on individual patient data from randomised
522 controlled trials. Eur J Cancer. 2019;116:190-8. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2019.05.012
- 523 25. Herdman M, Gudex C, Lloyd A, Janssen M, Kind P, Parkin D, et al.
524 Development and preliminary testing of the new five-level version of EQ-5D
525 (EQ-5D-5L). Qual Life Res. 2011;20(10):1727-36.
526 doi:10.1007/s11136-011-9903-x
- 527 26. Guilford JP. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. 1950.
- 528 27. Umezaki S, Shinoda Y, Mukasa A, Tanaka S, Takayanagi S, Oka H, et al.
529 Factors associated with health-related quality of life in patients with glioma:
530 impact of symptoms and implications for rehabilitation. Jpn J Clin Oncol.
531 2020;50(9):990-8. doi:10.1093/jjco/hyaa068
- 532 28. Shirowa T, Fukuda T, Ikeda S, Igarashi A, Noto S, Saito S, et al. Japanese
533 population norms for preference-based measures: EQ-5D-3L, EQ-5D-5L, and

- 534 SF-6D. Qual Life Res. 2016;25(3):707-19. doi:10.1007/s11136-015-1108-2
- 535 29. Hirose C, Fujii H, Iihara H, Ishihara M, Nawa-Nishigaki M, Kato-Hayashi H, et
- 536 al. Real-world data of the association between quality of life using the EuroQol 5
- 537 Dimension 5 Level utility value and adverse events for outpatient cancer
- 538 chemotherapy. Support Care Cancer. 2020;28(12):5943-52.
- 539 doi:10.1007/s00520-020-05443-8
- 540 30. Izumi R, Noto S, Ikeda S, Fukuda T, Shiroyiwa T, Igarashi A. Comparison of
- 541 three utility measures in stroke patients using item response theory analysis.
- 542 Niigata journal of health and welfare. 2013;13(1):1-12.
- 543 31. Edelstein K, Coate L, Massey C, Jewitt NC, Mason WP, Devins GM. Illness
- 544 intrusiveness and subjective well-being in patients with glioblastoma. J
- 545 Neurooncol. 2016;126(1):127-35.doi:10.1007/s11060-015-1943-6
- 546 32. Takane K, Hirasawa N, Hayashi S, Igarashi T, Miyata K. Relationship between
- 547 Health-related Quality of Life, Physical Function and Activities of Daily Living
- 548 in Acute Stroke Patients Discharged to Home. Article in Japanese. Rigakuryoho
- 549 Kagaku 34(5): 661–5, 2019.
- 550 33. Golicki D, Niewada M, Buczek J, Karlińska A, Kobayashi A, Janssen MF, et al.
- 551 Validity of EQ-5D-5L in stroke. Qual Life Res. 2015;24(4):845-50.

552 doi:10.1007/s11136-014-0834-1

553 34. O'Kane GM, Su J, Tse BC, Tam V, Tse T, Lu L, et al. The Impact of Brain

554 Metastases and Associated Neurocognitive Aspects on Health Utility Scores in

555 EGFR Mutated and ALK Rearranged NSCLC: A Real World Evidence Analysis.

556 Oncologist. 2019;24(7):e501-e9. doi:10.1634/theoncologist.2018-0544

557 35. Rogers JL, Vera E, Acquaye A, Briceno N, Jammula V, King AL, et al. Living

558 with a central nervous system (CNS) tumor: findings on long-term survivorship

559 from the NIH Natural History Study. Neurooncol Pract. 2021;8(4):460-74.

560 doi:10.1093/nop/npab022

561 36. Jakola AS, Unsgård G, Myrnes KS, Kloster R, Torp SH, Sagberg LM, et al.

562 Surgical strategies in low-grade gliomas and implications for long-term quality

563 of life. J Clin Neurosci. 2014;21(8):1304-9. doi:10.1016/j.jocn.2013.11.027

564 37. Sagberg LM, Solheim O, Jakola AS. Quality of survival the 1st year with

565 glioblastoma: a longitudinal study of patient-reported quality of life. J Neurosurg.

566 2016;124(4):989-97. doi:10.3171/2015.4.JNS15194

567 38. Vera E, Acquaye AA, Mendoza TR, Gilbert MR, Armstrong TS. Relationship

568 between symptom burden and health status: analysis of the MDASI-BT and

569 EQ-5D. Neurooncol Pract. 2018;5(1):56-63. doi:10.1093/nop/npx010

- 570 39. Jakola AS, Unsgård G, Solheim O. Quality of life in patients with intracranial
571 gliomas: the impact of modern image-guided surgery. J Neurosurg.
572 2011;114(6):1622-30. doi:10.3171/2011.1.JNS101657
- 573 40. Aaronson NK, Taphoorn MJ, Heimans JJ, Postma TJ, Gundy CM, Beute GN, et
574 al. Compromised health-related quality of life in patients with low-grade glioma.
575 J Clin Oncol. 2011;29(33):4430-5. doi:10.1200/JCO.2011.35.5750
- 576 41. Salo J, Niemelä A, Joukamaa M, Koivukangas J. Effect of brain tumour
577 laterality on patients' perceived quality of life. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry.
578 2002;72(3):373-7. doi:10.1136/jnnp.72.3.373