

9.

**QUALITY OF LIFE ASSESSMENT - RESULTS AND COMPARISON OF TWO CELL LUNG CANCER CLINICAL TRIALS (EORTC - GERMAN COOPERATIVE GROUP BMFT).** H Flechtner, (1) R Holle, (2) N Aaronson, (3) M Heim (1): (1)= Oncology Centre Mannheim, Theod. Kutz. Ufer, 6800 Mannheim, FRG, (2)= University of Heidelberg, FRG, (3)= The Netherlands Cancer Inst., NL.

Eighty patients from an EORTC and 161 patients from a German multicentre chemotherapy trial for small cell lung cancer (SCLC) completed quality of life (QL) questionnaires before commencement of treatment. The EORTC QL quest'aire consisted of 45 items concerning 7 dimensions of QL: personal functioning, role functioning, symptoms of lung cancer, side effects of treatment, fatigue and malaise, psychological distress, sense of well-being and satisfaction, social interaction. The German version used identical questions for the two Guttman scales of personal functioning and role functioning and for the single items and Likert scales concerning symptoms of lung cancer, side effects of treatment, fatigue and malaise, and psychological distress. Scales for sense of well-being and satisfaction and for social interaction were construed differently in the German questionnaire. Results from the latter scales are not readily comparable to the EORTC data.

**Results:** A series of factor analyses confirmed the construction of the different scales. No major differences in factorial structure occurred in comparison of the two samples. Bivariate correlations between QL scales (including ECOG/Karnofsky performance rating) showed very similar figures, although in the German sample correlations between QL scales and ECOG/Karnofsky were higher than in the EORTC trial. Guttman scale analysis, frequency distribution of items and reliability coefficients of the different scales yielded no gross differences and were mostly almost identical for both patient populations.

**Conclusion:** The used QL questionnaire produced very similar and comparable results in two independent multicentre clinical trials for SCLC. Reliability and construct validity of the instrument does not change if used in different cultural settings. It seems a valuable instrument for use in clinical trials.