

FACIT Fatigue Scale (Version 4)

Below is a list of statements that other people with your illness have said are important. **Please circle or mark one number per line to indicate your response as it applies to the past 7 days.**

		Not at all	A little bit	Some- what	Quite a bit	Very much
HI7	I feel fatigued	0	1	2	3	4
HI12	I feel weak all over	0	1	2	3	4
An1	I feel listless (“washed out”)	0	1	2	3	4
An2	I feel tired.....	0	1	2	3	4
An3	I have trouble <u>starting</u> things because I am tired.....	0	1	2	3	4
An4	I have trouble <u>finishing</u> things because I am tired	0	1	2	3	4
An5	I have energy	0	1	2	3	4
An7	I am able to do my usual activities.....	0	1	2	3	4
An8	I need to sleep during the day	0	1	2	3	4
An12	I am too tired to eat.....	0	1	2	3	4
An14	I need help doing my usual activities	0	1	2	3	4
An15	I am frustrated by being too tired to do the things I want to do	0	1	2	3	4
An16	I have to limit my social activity because I am tired.....	0	1	2	3	4

FACIT-Fatigue Subscale Scoring Guidelines (Version 4) – Page 1

- Instructions:*
1. Record answers in "item response" column. If missing, mark with an X
 2. Perform reversals as indicated, and sum individual items to obtain a score.
 3. Multiply the sum of the item scores by the number of items in the subscale, then divide by the number of items answered. This produces the subscale score.
 4. **The higher the score, the better the QOL.**

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Item Code</u>	<u>Reverse item?</u>		<u>Item response</u>	<u>Item Score</u>
FATIGUE SUBSCALE	HI7	4	-	_____	=_____
	HI12	4	-	_____	=_____
	An1	4	-	_____	=_____
	An2	4	-	_____	=_____
	An3	4	-	_____	=_____
	An4	4	-	_____	=_____
	An5	0	+	_____	=_____
	An7	0	+	_____	=_____
	An8	4	-	_____	=_____
	An12	4	-	_____	=_____
	An14	4	-	_____	=_____
	An15	4	-	_____	=_____
	An16	4	-	_____	=_____

Score range: 0-52

Sum individual item scores: _____

Multiply by 13: _____

Divide by number of items answered: _____

_____ = **Fatigue Subscale score**

FACIT Administration and Scoring Guidelines

Administration:

The FACIT scales are designed for patient self-administration, but can also be administered by interview format. For self-administration, patients should be instructed to read the brief directions at the top of the page. After the patient's correct understanding has been confirmed, he/she should be encouraged to complete every item in order without skipping any. Some patients may feel that a given question is not applicable to them and will therefore skip the item altogether. **Patients should be encouraged to circle the response that is most applicable.** If, for example, a patient is not currently receiving any treatment, the patient should circle "not at all" to the question "I am bothered by side effects of treatment."

During interview administration, it is helpful to have the patient hold a card on which the response options have been printed. Interview administration is considered appropriate given adequate training of interviewers so as to elicit non-biased patient responses. One of the aims of a large multi-center study of cancer and HIV patients (N=1227) was to test the psychometric properties and statistical equivalence of the English and Spanish language versions of the FACT subscales across literacy level (low vs. high) and **mode of administration** (self vs. interview). Technical equivalence across mode of administration was demonstrated in the high literacy patients; there were no differences in data quality or in mean QOL scores, after adjustment for performance status rating, socioeconomic status, gender and age. Technical equivalence between modes of administration with the FACT permits unbiased assessment of the impact of chronic illnesses and their treatments on patients from diverse backgrounds.

Scoring the FACT-G:

The FACT-G scoring guide identifies those items that must be reversed before being added to obtain subscale totals. Negatively stated items are reversed by subtracting the response from "4". After reversing proper items, all subscale items are summed to a total, which is the subscale score. **For all FACIT scales and symptom indices, the higher the score the better the QOL.**

Handling missing items. If there are missing items, subscale scores can be prorated. This is done by multiplying the sum of the subscale by the number of items in the subscale, then dividing by the number of items actually answered. This can be done on the scoring guide or by using the formula below:

$$\text{Prorated subscale score} = [\text{Sum of item scores}] \times [\text{N of items in subscale}] \div [\text{N of items answered}]$$

When there are missing data, prorating by subscale in this way is acceptable as long as **more than** 50% of the items were answered (e.g., a minimum of 4 of 7 items, 4 of 6 items, etc). The total score is then calculated as the sum of the un-weighted subscale scores. The FACT scale is considered to be an acceptable indicator of patient quality of life as long as **overall item response rate** is greater than 80% (e.g., at least 22 of 27 FACT-G items completed). This is not to be confused with individual subscale item response rate, which allows a subscale score to be prorated for missing items if greater than 50% of items are answered. In addition, a total score should only be calculated if ALL of the component subscales have valid scores.

NOTE: Computer programs written in SPSS and SAS for the FACIT scales and symptom indices are provided on diskette in Section 4 of the manual or can be downloaded from the website at www.facit.org for a nominal fee. Standard raw score scoring templates for all FACIT scales and symptom indices are also provided in Section 4 of the manual or under the “Validity and Interpretation” section of the website.

Scoring the Specific Scales & Symptom Indices:

For the "Additional Concerns" subscale (e.g., cancer-specific questions) and the symptom indices, the procedure for scoring is the same as described above for the FACT-G. Again, **over** 50% of the items (e.g., 5 of 9 items, 7 of 12 items) must be completed in order to consider each subscale score valid.

NOTE: scoring algorithms for the FACIT-TS-G and FACIT-TS-PS are different from other FACIT scales. Please refer to the specific scoring templates for more detail.

Deriving a Total Score:

The total score for the specific FACIT scales is the sum of the FACT-G (the first 4 subscales common to almost all scales) plus the "Additional Concerns" subscale. The symptom indices do not include the FACT-G in the total score. By following this scoring guide and transcribing the FACT-G score, the two totals can be summed to derive the **TOTAL FACT/FACIT SCORE**.

Notes:

1. Multilingual versions can be scored on the English language scoring guides.
2. Several scales have more items listed in the “Additional Concerns” subscale than are currently recommended for scoring. This is usually because additional work on a given subscale has suggested a need for additional items. However, it may take awhile for the new items to be validated so we don’t formally recommend they be included in the scoring until we know more about how the item(s) function. We include the items on the scale to encourage investigators who have the time or resources to evaluate their data according to the existing scoring recommendations and to test out the value of the new item(s). As always, we welcome collaborators to share any relevant data of this nature to help further reliability and validity testing of the FACIT questionnaires.

Selecting Scores for Analyses:

These scoring templates allow one to obtain two different total scores in addition to each individual subscale score. The FACT-G total score provides a useful summary of overall quality of life across a diverse group of patients. The disease-specific questionnaire total scores (i.e., FACT-G plus disease-specific subscale score) may further refine the FACT-G summary score. Two alternative approaches are noteworthy, however. One is to separately analyze the FACT-G total score and the specific subscale score. Another is to select subscales of the FACT which are most likely to be changed by an intervention being tested. For example, the Physical, Functional, and Cancer-specific subscales would be most likely to change in a chemotherapy clinical trial. One could also consider creating a separate a priori index which sums two or three subscales. This has been done with the FACT-L and many other FACIT scales, combining the Physical, Functional and 7-item Lung Cancer Subscales into a 21-item

Trial Outcome Index (Cella, Bonomi, Lloyd et al, 1994; Brady, Cella, Mo, 1997; Cella, 1997). On the other hand, the Emotional or Social Well-being subscale would be expected to change most when evaluating a psychosocial intervention.

Comparing Version 4 scores to Previously Published (Version 2 & 3) Scores:

Most of the questions from Version 3 remain intact in Version 4 (see item history table in section 3 of the manual for details), although some items have been reworded and a few have changed from being negatively stated to positively stated items. Comparison between scale scores in these two versions is fairly straightforward. Adjustments must be made, however, when comparing the total FACT/FACIT score and when comparing the Emotional Well-Being (EWB) subscale score between the two versions. To compare Version 3 and 4 EWB scales, item GE6 (#25 in Version 3) must be omitted from the scoring of version 4. This can be done by scoring the first 5 items of the EWB subscale, multiplying by 5 (not 6), and dividing by the number of questions answered (not including the sixth question). The Version 4 total FACT-G score has been affected by the dropping of the Relationship with Doctor subscale and the addition in the scoring of item GE6 (#25 in Version 3). One way to compare total scores is to drop item GE6 from the Version 4 scoring and add **6.85** (mean score of the RWD subscale as reported in Cella et al., 1993) to the sum of the four subscales (Physical Well-Being, Social/Family Well-Being, Emotional Well-Being, and Functional Well-Being). This will give you the best estimate for comparison of published FACT/FACIT data.