

**Table 4. Cancer Studies – Quality of Life – Social Functioning**

Study, Year Interventions	Physical Condition	Baseline Functional Level	Quality of Life Assessment Scale	Baseline	Post-Treatment	Follow-up* (time assessed)
Blanchard, 1996 <sup>37</sup> 1) Spouse directed problem-solving intervention (n=25 couples) 2) Treatment-as-usual (TAU) (n=32 couples)	Any cancer	Diagnosed more than 3 months before recruitment but patient not eligible for hospice	Social functioning subscale of the Medical Outcomes Scales SF-20	1) 75.2 (31.6) 2) 81.1 (22.1) p=ns (NR)	1) 74.8 (32.6) 2) 78.9 (27.4) p=ns (NR)	NR
Budin, 2008 <sup>30</sup> 1) Psychoeducation (SE) +DM, n=66 2) Telephone counseling (TC) + DM, n=66 3) SE+TC+DM, n=58 4) Disease Management (DM), n=59	Breast cancer	Lesion with confirmed or strongly suspected diagnosis of cancer	Psychosocial Adjustment to Illness Scale (PAIS) – Domestic, Social, Vocational Environments (social adjustment) – higher score = poorer adjustment	Domestic Environment 1) 3.1 (3.3) 2) 3.6 (3.1) 3) 2.6 (3.0) 4) 3.1 (2.5)	Values NR Main group effect for patients (p=NR, ns) Main effect for time (p=NR, ns) Group x time interaction (p=NR, ns)	NR
				Social Environment 1) 4.0 (3.5) 2) 3.7 (3.6) 3) 2.7 (3.9) 4) 3.6 (4.0)	Values NR Main group effect for patients (p=0.92) <b>Main effect for time (p&lt;0.0001)</b> Group x time interaction (p=0.63)	NR
				Vocational Environment 1) 3.4 (2.3) 2) 3.8 (3.5) 3) 3.3 (2.9) 4) 3.5 (3.6)	Values NR Main group effect for patients (p=0.52) Main effect for time (p=0.08) Group x time interaction (p=0.37)	NR
Giesler, 2005 <sup>22</sup> 1) Cancer care intervention (n=48) 2) Standard care (n=51)	Prostate cancer (post-treatment)	T1a-T2c	SF-36 Short Form Health Survey (higher score = better functioning)	NR	Social Functioning d=0.00, p=0.99 1 month post-intervention, n=NR	Social Functioning d=0.21, p=0.35 6 months post-intervention (n=85)
Keefe, 2005 <sup>34</sup> 1) Partner guided (n=41) 2) Usual care (n=37)	Cancer (any)	Eligible for hospice care; life expectancy ≤ 6 months	Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-General (FACT-G, v4) (scale 0-4, higher score = problem with function)	Social/family well-being NR; but reported p=ns between groups (n=78)	Social/family well- being 1) 3.6 (0.5) (n=28) 2) 3.3 (0.5) (n=28) p=0.13	NR

Study, Year Interventions	Physical Condition	Baseline Functional Level	Quality of Life Assessment Scale	Baseline	Post-Treatment	Follow-up* (time assessed)
Kurtz, 2005 <sup>39</sup> 1) Clinical nursing intervention (n=118) 2) Usual care (UC) (n=119)	Cancer (any)	Recent diagnosis of a solid tumor (breast, lung, other); early stage, 3%; late stage, 67.0%	MOS SF-36 (scale 0-100, higher score = fewer limitations on social activity)	Social Functioning 1) 57.0 (28.3) 2) 57.2 (30.0) n=NR	Social Functioning 1) 80.0 (26.8) 2) 69.8 (30.4) n=NR p=NR	
Porter, 2011 <sup>45</sup> 1) Coping skills training (CST) (n=117) 2) Education (EDU) (n=116)	Lung cancer	Stage I-III	FACT-L: Social Well-Being	1) NR 2) NR	1) NR 2) NR Time x Treatment interaction: p=ns Time x Treatment x Cancer Stage interaction: p=ns	NR

\*Last follow-up reported only if > 6 months post-treatment

<sup>1</sup>Scale of -3 to +3; higher score indicates better well-being

d or ES=effect size, NR=not reported, ns=not statistically significant