

Supplementary Materials:

Table S1. Multiple and hierarchical ordinary least squares (OLS) regression showing the total FACT-M score regressed on patient characteristics (sex, age) in Step 1, and tumor burden (number of tumors, tumor size, localization, lymph node metastasis) in Step 2.

	Step 1					Step 2				
	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p
		LL	UL				LL	UL		
Sex ^a	8.42	-27	17.11	.21	.057	11.64	2.91	20.36	.28	.010
Age	.26	-.12	-.64	.15	.179	.25	-.14	.64	.14	.199
Number						-.40	-.64	-.17	-.37	.001
Size						-.15	-.35	.06	-.15	.164
Localization ^b						6.99	-6.28	20.26	.11	.297
Metastasis ^c						.94	-8.01	9.89	.02	.835
F(2, 81)=2.78, <i>p</i> =.068; <i>R</i> ² =.04					F(6, 71)=3.38, <i>p</i> =.005; <i>R</i> ² =.16					

^aFemale vs. male

^bLeg vs. arm

^cNo vs. Yes

Table S2. Multiple and hierarchical ordinary least squares (OLS) regression showing the FACT-M subscale FACT-G score regressed on patient characteristics (sex, age) in Step 1, and tumor burden (number of tumors, tumor size, localization, and lymph node metastasis) in Step 2.

	Step 1					Step 2				
	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p
		LL	UL				LL	UL		
Sex ^a	4.44	-1.31	10.19	.16	.128	6.69	.57	12.82	.24	.033
Age	.10	-.16	.36	.08	.463	.07	-.21	.34	.06	.612
Number						-.22	-.39	-.05	-.29	.010
Size						-.11	-.25	.04	-.16	.159
Localization ^b						3.93	-5.56	13.43	.09	.412
Metastasis ^c						.04	-6.30	6.38	.00	.990
F(2, 88)=1.42, <i>p</i> =.247; <i>R</i> ² =.01					F(6, 75)=2.09, <i>p</i> =.064; <i>R</i> ² =.07					

^aFemale vs. male

^bLeg vs. arm

^cNo vs. Yes

Table S3. Multiple and hierarchical ordinary least squares (OLS) regression showing the FACT-M subscale PWB score regressed on patient characteristics (sex, age) in Step 1, and tumor burden (number of tumors, tumor size, localization, and lymph node metastasis) in Step 2.

	Step 1					Step 2				
	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p
		LL	UL				LL	UL		
Sex ^a	1.66	.13	3.19	.22	.034	2.40	.91	3.90	.31	.002
Age	.06	-.01	.13	.18	.074	.06	-.01	.12	.16	.098
Number						-.08	-.12	-.04	-.36	.000
Size						-.05	-.09	-.01	-.27	.009
Localization ^b						.90	-1.38	3.17	.08	.434
Metastasis ^c						.54	-1.01	2.10	.07	.489
F(2, 91)=3.96, <i>p</i> =.022; <i>R</i> ² =.06					F(6, 78)=5.06, <i>p</i> < .001; <i>R</i> ² =.22					

^aFemale vs. male

^bLeg vs. arm

^cNo vs. Yes

Table S4. Multiple and hierarchical ordinary least squares (OLS) regression showing the FACT-M subscale SWB score regressed on patient characteristics (sex, age) in Step 1, and tumor burden (number of tumors, tumor size, localization, and lymph node metastasis) in Step 2.

	Step 1				Step 2			
	B	[95% CI]		p	B	[95% CI]		p
		LL	UL			LL	UL	
Sex ^a	.03	-1.90	1.97	.972	-.27	-2.46	1.93	.809
Age	.01	-.08	.10	.829	-.00	-.10	.10	.961
Number					.01	-.05	.07	.642
Size					-.01	-.06	.05	.822
Localization ^b					.46	-2.87	3.78	.786
Metastasis ^c					.55	-1.73	2.82	.633
F(2, 90)=0.02, <i>p</i> =.976; <i>R</i> ² =.00					F(6, 77)=0.11, <i>p</i> =.995; <i>R</i> ² =.00			

^aFemale vs. male

^bLeg vs. arm

^cNo vs. Yes

Table S5. Multiple and hierarchical ordinary least squares (OLS) regression showing the FACT-M subscale EWB score regressed on patient characteristics (sex, age) in Step 1, and tumor burden (number of tumors, tumor size, localization, and lymph node metastasis) in Step 2.

	Step 1					Step 2				
	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p
		LL	UL				LL	UL		
Sex ^a	1.92	.12	3.73	.22	.037	2.56	.73	4.39	.29	.007
Age	.04	-.04	.12	.10	.313	.03	-.05	.11	.07	.498
Number						-.06	-.11	-.01	-.23	.029
Size						-.02	-.06	.03	-.09	.425
Localization ^b						1.91	-.99	4.81	.14	.194
Metastasis ^c						-1.39	-3.28	.51	-.15	.149
F(2, 91)=2.71, <i>p</i> =.072; <i>R</i> ² =.04					F(6, 78)=2.87, <i>p</i> =.014; <i>R</i> ² =.12					

^aFemale vs. male

^bLeg vs. arm

^cNo vs. Yes

Table S6. Multiple and hierarchical ordinary least squares (OLS) regression showing the FACT-M subscale FWB score regressed on patient characteristics (sex, age) in Step 1, and tumor burden (number of tumors, tumor size, localization, and lymph node metastasis) in Step 2.

	Step 1					Step 2				
	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p
		LL	UL				LL	UL		
Sex ^a	1.37	-1.01	3.75	.12	.256	2.26	-.22	4.74	.19	.074
Age	-.03	-.14	.07	-.06	.547	-.03	-.14	.08	-.06	.594
Number						-.12	-.19	-.05	-.36	.001
Size						-.03	-.09	.03	-.11	.295
Localization ^b						.84	-3.11	4.78	.05	.674
Metastasis ^c						.02	-2.55	2.60	.00	.986

	F(2, 91)=0,85, $p=.430$; $R^2=.00$	F(6, 78)=2,61, $p=.023$; $R^2=.10$
^a Female vs. male		
^b Leg vs. arm		
^c No vs. Yes		

Table S7. Multiple and hierarchical ordinary least squares (OLS) regression showing the FACT-M subscale MS score regressed on patient characteristics (sex, age) in Step 1, and tumor burden (number of tumors, tumor size, localization, and lymph node metastasis) in Step 2.

	Step 1					Step 2				
	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p
		LL	UL				LL	UL		
Sex ^a	2.23	-.80	5.25	.15	.147	3.80	.78	6.83	.25	.014
Age	.14	.00	.28	.21	.043	.16	.02	.30	.23	.023
Number						-.17	-.25	-.08	-.40	.000
Size						-.04	-.11	.04	-.10	.316
Localization ^b						2.04	-2.60	6.68	.09	.384
Metastasis ^c						.49	-2.65	3.64	.03	.757
	F(2, 92)=3,13, $p=.048$; $R^2=.04$					F(6, 79)=4,37, $p < .001$; $R^2=.19$				

^aFemale vs. male

^bLeg vs. arm

^cNo vs. Yes

Table S8. Multiple and hierarchical ordinary least squares (OLS) regression showing the FACT-M subscale MSS score regressed on patient characteristics (sex, age) in Step 1, and tumor burden (number of tumors, tumor size, localization, and lymph node metastasis) in Step 2.

	Step 1					Step 2				
	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p	B	[95% CI]		Beta	p
		LL	UL				LL	UL		
Sex ^a	1.92	-.76	4.60	.14	.158	2.87	.35	5.39	.22	.026
Age	.22	.11	.34	.38	.000	.25	.14	.37	.43	.000
Number						-.09	-.15	-.02	-.24	.016
Size						-.06	-.12	.00	-.18	.070
Localization ^b						2.38	-1.35	6.11	.12	.207
Metastasis ^c						-1.98	-4.59	.63	-.14	.134
	F(2, 83)=8,35, $p < .001$; $R^2=.15$					F(6, 73)=6,74, $p < .001$; $R^2=.30$				

^aFemale vs. male

^bLeg vs. arm

^cNo vs. Yes