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Purpose/Objectives: To evaluate the psychometric properties of two adapted scales, one for functional status and one for peripheral neuropathy secondary to neurotoxic chemotherapy.

Design: Repeated measures methodologic design conducted within a Gynecologic Oncology Group (GOG) phase III clinical trial that randomly assigned patients with advanced epithelial ovarian cancer to cisplatin and cyclophosphamide or cisplatin and paclitaxel.

Setting: 8 GOG institutions participating in the GOG clinical trial.

Sample: 88 evaluable outpatients enrolled in the GOG clinical trial. Sample size at time 1 (T1) was 88 patients and at time 2 (T2) was 67 patients.

Methods: All scales were administered at T1 (prior to initiation of chemotherapy) and T2 (after six cycles of chemotherapy but prior to second-look laparotomy). Internal consistency reliability, criterion validity, and construct validity were evaluated, and clinical application was explored.

Main Research Variables: Self-reported peripheral neuropathy and functional status (comprised of physical function and role function subscales), the GOG performance status scale, and the GOG toxicity criteria.

Findings: Reliability coefficients at T1 were physical function = 0.83, role function = 0.96, and peripheral neuropathy = 0.91; at T2, they were physical function = 0.83, role function = 0.92, and peripheral neuropathy = 0.89. At T1, physical function and role function correlated positively with performance status. Peripheral neuropathy correlated positively with GOG toxicity criteria used at T2. Principal component factor analysis suggested that the functional status scale had a two-factor structure with factors representing general and specific mobility and that the peripheral neuropathy scale also had a two-factor structure with factors representing foot and hand neuropathy.

Conclusions: The physical function, role function, and peripheral neuropathy scales have internal consistency, reliability, criterion validity, and construct validity. However, revision of the scales should address modification of specific questions and consider increasing the Likert scale from a four-point to a five- or seven-point scale to enhance clinical sensitivity and application.

Implications for Nursing: With minor modifications, these scales may be useful in assessing peripheral neuropathy symptoms in patients who receive neurotoxic chemotherapy.

Key Points...

➤ Peripheral neuropathy is a principal toxic effect of chemotherapy for ovarian cancer.
➤ Peripheral neuropathy interferes with self-care activities, mobility, and physical and role activities, and this may reduce domains of quality of life related to functional and role status.
➤ Self-report instruments may be a useful adjunct to measuring the subjective symptoms of peripheral neuropathy just as they have with pain and fatigue.
➤ With minor modifications and testing, these scales may be useful in assessing peripheral neuropathy symptoms in patients who receive neurotoxic chemotherapy.
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