

**Symptom Distress and Quality of Life
Among Black Americans With Cancer and Their Family Caregivers**

Katrina R. Ellis¹, Seyoung Oh¹, Hillary K. Hecht², and Laurel Northouse³

¹School of Social Work, University of Michigan

²Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

³School of Nursing, University of Michigan

Corresponding Author:

Katrina R. Ellis, PhD, MPH, MSW
University of Michigan, School of Social Work
1080 South University Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
kahe@umich.edu

Acknowledgements

The National Cancer Institute (R01CA107383, R01CA90739, Northouse; P30CA046592-S, Ellis); American Cancer Society (American Cancer Society (PBR 102, Northouse); the National Institutes of Health (P30 AG015281) and the Michigan Center for Urban African American Aging Research (Ellis); a grant from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute to the University of Mississippi Medical Center (Grant #2R25HL126145 – MPIs Beech and Norris; Ellis); and contributions from families, researchers and staff.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Keywords: Symptoms, quality of life, dyads, caregiving, adults, Black Americans, oncology, cancer, psycho-oncology

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as doi: [10.1002/pon.5691](https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.5691).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Abstract

Objective. Black Americans are disproportionately affected by cancer and chronic diseases. Black patients with cancer and their family caregivers may concurrently experience symptoms that influence their wellbeing. This study investigates the influence of mental and physical symptom distress on quality of life (QOL) among Black Americans with cancer and their family caregivers from a dyadic perspective.

Methods. 151 dyads comprised of a Black American with breast, colorectal, lung or prostate cancer and a Black family caregiver were included in this secondary analysis of pooled baseline data from three studies. Self-reports of problems managing thirteen symptoms were used to measure mental and physical symptom distress. Descriptive statistics and the actor-partner interdependence model were used to examine symptom prevalence and the influence of each person's symptom distress on their own and each other's QOL.

Results. Fatigue, sleep problems, pain and mental distress were prevalent. Patients and caregivers reported similar levels of mental distress; however, patients reported higher physical distress. Increased patient mental distress was associated with decreased patient QOL (overall, emotional, social, functional). Increased patient physical distress was associated with decreased patient QOL (overall, physical, emotional, functional) and decreased caregiver emotional wellbeing. Increased caregiver mental distress was associated with decreased caregiver QOL (overall, emotional, social, functional) and decreased patient overall QOL. Increased caregiver physical distress was associated with decreased caregiver QOL (overall, physical, functional), decreased patient emotional wellbeing, and better patient social wellbeing.

Conclusions. Supporting symptom management in Black patient/caregiver dyads may improve their QOL.

Introduction

It is estimated that there over one million Black Americans with a history of cancer living in the United States.¹ While there has been progress in decreasing racial disparities in cancer, Black men currently have the highest cancer incidence rate (549.1 per 100,000) and Black men and Black women have lower 5-year survival rates compared to White Americans (62% vs. 67%).¹ Among Black Americans with cancer, quality of life (QOL) is a pressing concern. QOL is a multidimensional concept, which encompasses individual health status and interpersonal aspects of health and wellbeing². Studies of common cancer sites have noted racial disparities in quality of life among Blacks compared to Whites, including poorer urinary functioning among Blacks prior to prostate treatment³; poorer mental wellbeing following lung cancer surgery⁴; and poorer health-related QOL among older, long-term Black colorectal cancer survivors.⁵

Symptom distress - or the perceived presence and intensity of physical or mental changes in functioning⁶ - is one factor that affects the QOL of individuals after a cancer diagnosis. Inverse associations between patient symptom distress and QOL are documented.⁷⁻⁹ Limited research, however, has concurrently examined symptom distress among Black patients and their family caregivers (hereafter referred to as caregivers). In addition to the well-known racial disparities in cancer,¹ chronic disease disproportionately affects Black Americans. For example, researchers have reported odds of multimorbidity 30% higher among Blacks ages 30-64 compared to Whites in this age group.¹⁰ When comparing Medicare beneficiaries across race/ethnicity and gender, Black men ages 65-84 had a higher prevalence of four or more conditions compared to men of other races.¹¹ Similarly, Black women ages 65 and older had a higher prevalence rate of two or more conditions compared to women of other races. Thus, Black

cancer caregivers may be managing health problems of their own (and associated symptoms) while also supporting a loved one in cancer treatment.

Considerable research has highlighted the need to investigate experiences of patients and caregivers as a dyad, acknowledging that the experiences of individuals who comprise relationally close dyads are often interdependent.¹² Moreover, a family comorbidity perspective recognizes how co-occurring health issues within families influence both individual and collective wellbeing.¹³ Many existing studies of patients and caregivers in the context of cancer compare the experiences between racial groups. While racially comparative studies have merit, these studies are not sufficient for investigating and understanding experiences of people within specific racial groups.¹⁴ Thus, the purpose of this study was to investigate symptom prevalence and independent and interdependent associations between symptom distress and QOL among Black American patient/caregiver dyads following a cancer diagnosis. Our hypotheses were as follows:

H1: Patients will have a higher prevalence of common symptoms and more mental and physical distress, on average, than caregivers.

H2: Mental and physical symptom distress reported by patients and caregivers will be negatively associated with their own QOL (actor effects).

H3: Mental and physical symptom distress of one dyad member will be negatively associated with the other dyad members' QOL (partner effects).

Methods

Study Design

Secondary analyses of pooled baseline data from three randomized controlled trials (RCTs) were conducted. Participants provided written informed consent and agreed to have their

information used for subsequent research. Detailed information regarding study designs, procedures, and outcomes from the RCTs has been reported.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ Institutional Review Board approvals for this study and the parent RCTs were obtained from the University of Michigan (#HUM00151748).

Participants

The RCTs included 936 dyads (combined), with an adult diagnosed with breast, colorectal, lung, or prostate cancer and a family/friend caregiver (see Appendix A). The pooled analytic sample included middle-aged and older Black American patients with cancer (age 40 or older) and their Black American caregivers. Middle age is often conceptualized as beginning between the ages of 40-50 and cancer incidence rises substantially at this age compared to adolescents and young adults.¹⁸ After excluding dyads due to non-Black patient race (n=773), patient age < 40 (n=6), and non-Black caregiver race (n=6), the sample included 151 dyads..

Measures

Physical

Sy
caregiver
because
reported
included
included
weight
sensation,
problems,

rating scale of (0) no trouble, (1) some trouble, and (2) a lot of trouble, with descriptive information for each symptom. For example, response options for “pain” were: (0) no trouble (no pain present), (1) some trouble (some pain present, but it’s tolerable), and (2) a lot of trouble (pain is severe; I’m very uncomfortable). Scores for each physical symptom were summed to create a physical distress score (possible range: 0-24); mental distress was based the score of the single mental distress item (possible range: 0-2). Higher scores indicated more symptom distress.

Quality of Life

The Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy: General (FACT-G version 4) measured patient QOL.¹⁹ Caregivers answered a modified version of this scale (adapted with developer permission) measuring caregivers’ own QOL.¹⁷ The measure includes four dimensions of wellbeing - physical, social, emotional, and functional wellbeing - and a five-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (very much). Some items were reverse scored, with total higher scores indicating better QOL. In this analysis, overall QOL scores and scores for each dimension of wellbeing were included (patient range: $\alpha = .767$ to $.896$; caregiver range: $\alpha = .736$ to $.898$).

Covariates

Age, gender, education, cancer type, current treatment (yes/no), spousal caregiver (yes/no), income, advanced cancer (yes/no), metastatic disease (yes/no), cancer recurrence (yes/no), and caregiver living with patient (yes/no) were included as covariates in the analytic models.

Data Analysis Strategy

The first hypothesis was tested using McNemar’s tests and paired sample t-tests. The remaining hypotheses were tested using the actor-partner interdependence model (APIM).²⁰ The APIM consists of pairs of key study variables corresponding to each dyad member: predictor

variables (patient/caregiver mental distress and physical distress scores, tested in the same model) and outcome variables (patient/caregiver QOL; see Figure 1). Path analysis was used to estimate the model parameters using MPlus version 7. To account for missing data, we used full information maximum likelihood estimation. The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA < .06), comparative fit index (CFI > 0.95), standardized root mean square residual (SRMR < 0.08), and chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio (χ^2/df ratio < 5) were used to determine adequacy of model fit.²¹

Results

Sample Characteristics

As noted in Table 1, patients in the sample were older on average (mean: 59.1 years, SD: 9.9; $p < .001$) than caregivers (mean: 51.5 years, SD: 14.9). Most of the caregivers were the spouse or intimate partner of the patient (73.5%). Patients had breast (41.1%), prostate (33.1%), colorectal (13.9%), or lung (11.9%) cancer. Most patients were in treatment (92.7%) for advanced (76.2%) and/or metastatic (74.2%) cancer; many were recurrent cancers (45%).

Symptom Prevalence & Distress

Fatigue was the most frequently reported symptom among patients (66.9%), followed by pain (62.3%), sleeping problems (60.3%), and weight loss (55.6%). Caregivers also reported fatigue-related distress most frequently (56.3%); sleeping problems (53.6%), mental distress (53.0%), and pain (47.0%) were also common. Patients were more likely than caregivers ($p < .05$) to report fatigue, pain, sleeping, weight loss, breathing, heart, moving, bowel, urinating, and skin problems. There were similarities in patient and caregiver mental distress, bodily sensations, and stomach problems ($p > .05$). Symptoms most frequently reported by both members of a dyad were fatigue (55.0%), sleeping problems (51.0%), and weight loss (43.7%).

As noted in Table 2, no differences were observed between patient and caregiver mental distress ($p = .354$); however, patients' physical symptom distress was significantly higher than caregivers' ($p < .001$). Patients reported lower overall QOL, and lower physical and functional wellbeing, but better emotional wellbeing than caregivers ($p < .05$). Similar levels of social wellbeing were observed. ($p = .118$).

Symptom Distress → QOL

Results of five APIM models are reported in Table 3. Model fit was adequate (RMSEA range: .00 to .03; CFI range: .98 to 1.00; SRMR range: .00 to .01; χ^2/df ratio range: 0.13 to 1.18). Patient and caregiver *mental distress* and *physical distress* were associated with their own lower overall QOL (actor effects; $p < .05$). Associations between distress and QOL domains (actor and partner effects) are discussed below.

Acto

Among

2.88,

Similarly,

emotional

=

0.91,

Among

(

associated

not

r

Partner Effects

Increased patient *physical distress* was associated with decreased caregiver emotional wellbeing ($B = -0.20, p = .030$). Increased caregiver *mental distress* was associated with decreased patient overall QOL ($B = -3.45, p = .019$). Increased caregiver *physical distress* was associated with decreased patient emotional wellbeing ($B = -0.32, p = .003$) but increased patient social wellbeing ($B = 0.32, p = 0.36$). No other partner effects were significant ($p < .05$).

Discussion

This study investigated mental and physical symptoms among middle-aged and older Black American cancer patients and their caregivers and the influence of symptom distress on their QOL. The overall QOL scores of Black patients and Black caregivers in this study were similar to normative data on overall QOL in the general U.S. adult population and adults with cancer (i.e., score difference of less than 5 points).²² However, on two QOL subscales, clinically meaningful differences were observed (i.e., score difference of 2 points or more). First, the mean patient social wellbeing score (21.9) was higher than the general population (19.1), reflecting a strength of social support and social connections among Black patients. Second, the caregiver emotional wellbeing mean score (16.40) was lower than the general population (19.9) and cancer-specific population (18.7), reflecting the toll that patient illness and caregiving takes on Black caregivers.

Fatigue, sleep, and pain were among the most commonly reported symptoms among Black patients and caregivers in this study. Problems with fatigue were reported by 66.9% of patients and 56.3% of caregivers. These data are similar to previously reported rates of cancer-related fatigue among other patients (59% to 100%)²³ and caregivers (18% to 76%).²⁴ In addition, sleep problems were also a concern for 60.3% of patients, similar to ranges seen in

other research.²⁵ However, sleep problems of caregivers (53.6%) were lower than reported in a review of sleep disturbances among caregivers of patients with advanced cancer (72%).²⁶

There may be several factors, in addition to cancer and caregiving, which influence efforts to assess and address sleep problems with this population. For example, broader research on sleep problems indicate Black Americans may not evaluate issues with sleep (e.g., short duration) as problematic.²⁷ Furthermore, they may use positive reframing to cope with sleep problems, which could contribute to underestimations of the potential harms of poor sleep.²⁷ Given that fatigue and sleep problems were major problems for both patients and caregivers, and that one dyad member may influence fatigue and sleep problems in the other,²⁵ addressing this issue from a dyadic (vs. individual) perspective may have added benefits.

Problems with fatigue and sleep among Black adults with cancer may also be related to pain.²⁸ In the current study, 62.3% of patients reported pain, making it the second most frequently reported symptom. This prevalence is higher than reported in a prior systematic review (55%) of patients during cancer treatment.²⁹ A significant proportion of caregivers (47%) also reported trouble with pain. Patients' pain may be due to cancer, cancer treatment, or health issues. Caregivers' pain could be a consequence of their own chronic health problems or psychological pain (though the symptom measure used in this study did not distinguish between physical and psychological pain). Black patients often receive less-optimal pain management compared to Whites.³⁰ In addition, Black Americans, in particular, may use spiritual terms to express psychological pain, highlighting the importance of incorporating spirituality into health assessments and treatment.³¹ Future studies should examine pain experiences in Black patient/caregiver dyads and interventions to promote racial equity in symptom management.

Mental distress among Black patients and caregivers had a negative influence on their QOL, specifically, their functional, emotional and social wellbeing. In addition, increased caregiver mental distress had a negative influence on patient overall QOL. It is important to note estimates of mental distress were similar for patients and caregivers. Given the noted disparities in access to and uptake of mental health treatment,³² Black American caregivers and patients may need additional support to overcome barriers to mental health services.

Interestingly, patient and caregiver mental distress, but not physical distress, had a negative influence on their social wellbeing. This suggests dyads were better able to navigate their own physical symptom-related barriers to social engagement than mental distress-related barriers. In a qualitative study of social support among Black Americans with cancer, Hamilton & Sandelowski³³ found that Black patients emphasized several types of social support not commonly discussed in literature, including being present (without expectations of communication), prayer, support from church members, and assistance for maintaining social roles. Among Black Americans for whom spirituality and religiosity are important factors, supporting their continued involvement in faith practices and communities, particularly when facing mental distress, may be helpful.³⁴

Physical distress was associated with several domains of wellbeing. In particular, increased physical distress among patients or caregivers was associated with poorer emotional wellbeing in the other member of the dyad, underscoring the interdependence of patients' and caregivers' wellbeing. Improving physical symptom distress of both members of the dyad may be particularly helpful for their emotional QOL early in the cancer treatment/caregiving experience when patients, caregivers, and families are adjusting to complex emotions and life changes associated with the cancer and caregiving. Unexpectedly, increased physical distress

among caregivers was associated with better patient social wellbeing. It is possible that when caregivers were experiencing increased physical distress (which could be due to health issues and/or the stress of caregiving), dyads were able to mobilize resources from their support networks to compensate for the challenges caregivers were facing. It is also possible that family members and friends had previous experience providing support for cancer caregivers' ongoing health concerns, and this support continued following the cancer diagnosis.¹³

Interventions should seek to build upon strengths and resources related to family disease management³⁵ that may also promote effective family symptom management after treatment ends. Research indicates that self-efficacy is inversely associated with symptom distress for both people with cancer and their caregivers;³⁶ familial beliefs regarding collective efficacy may also play an important role.³⁷ Future research should investigate interactions between, individual, dyad and collective family efficacy for symptom management and QOL.

Clinical Implications

Targeted approaches to alleviate caregiver symptom distress and enhance their emotional wellbeing may be needed. Clinical interventions that provide caregivers with skills to support patient symptom management³⁸ could also incorporate caregiver symptom management with the goal of addressing patient and caregiver health concerns. Tailored intervention strategies are particularly useful for increasing access and uptake where health disparities are observed.³⁹ Culturally-tailored interventions for Black patients⁴⁰ may be a useful starting place for adapting interventions for dyads or families. Widening the focus of social support to include the broader family system could maximize support from individuals serving in caregiving roles for either/both members of the recognized patient/caregiver dyad.

Study Limitations

This study included cross-sectional secondary data; thus, we are unable to report relationships between symptom distress and QOL in dyads over time or directionality. Significant estimates were primarily actor effects. Null partner effects may stem from the use of baseline data at diagnosis and treatment onset. Other partner effects could emerge over the course of the disease. There may be conceptual overlap in the measures of patient physical distress and patient physical and functional wellbeing; correlations between physical distress and these QOL dimensions are $-.73$ and $-.60$, respectively. Differences also exist in inclusion criteria for the intervention studies, which has implications for the time since diagnosis, age of patient, and symptom distress. Of note, a majority of the sample had metastatic disease, which is typically associated with greater symptom burden and/or a cancer recurrence; thus, findings may not be generalizable to samples with early stages disease and/or primary diagnoses.

Conclusions

Many Black patients and caregivers have concurrent health concerns. Findings suggest that when aiming to increase the QOL of Black adults with cancer, improving both patient and caregiver symptom management is important. Future research needs to examine symptom clustering in this population, develop measures and interventions to address their individual and dyadic symptom management, and assess the heterogeneity of Black Americans' responses to illness and caregiving through within-group research. Lastly, given the long and troubling history of unequal treatment and health outcomes in the United States associated with racism, future studies examining the potential influence of racism and discrimination on symptom management among patient and caregiver dyads is warranted.

Data Availability Statement

Research data are not shared.

REFERENCES

1. American Cancer Society. *Cancer Facts & Figures for African Americans 2019-2021*. Retrieved from Atlanta: American Cancer Society, 2019.
2. Powe BD, Hamilton J, Hancock N, et al. Quality of life of African American cancer survivors. A review of the literature. *Cancer*. 2007;109(2 Suppl):435-445.
3. Orom H, Biddle C, Underwood W, 3rd, Homish GG, Olsson CA. Racial or ethnic and socioeconomic disparities in prostate cancer survivors' prostate-specific quality of life. *Urology*. 2018;112:132-7.
4. Poghosyan H, Stock S, Sheldon LK, Cromwell J, Cooley ME, Nerenz DR. Racial disparities in health-related quality of life after lung cancer surgery: Findings from the cancer care outcomes research and surveillance consortium. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology*. 2015;10(10):1404-12.
5. Deimling G, Phelps EK, Gilbert M, Ciaralli S. Life satisfaction among older adult, long-term cancer survivors: A comparison of Black with White survivors. *Psycho-Oncology*. 2019 Jun;28(6):1335-41.
6. Armstrong TS. Symptoms experience: a concept analysis. *Oncology Nursing Forum*. 2003; 30(4): 601-606.
7. Sugimura H, Yang P. Long-term survivorship in lung cancer: a review. *Chest*. 2006;129(4):1088-97.
8. Manning-Walsh J. Social support as a mediator between symptom distress and quality of life in women with breast cancer. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic & Neonatal Nursing*. 2005;34(4):482-93.
9. Dickey SL, Ogunsanya ME. Quality of life among Black prostate cancer survivors: an integrative review. *American Journal of Men's Health*. 2018;12(5):1648-64.
10. Johnson-Lawrence V, Zajacova A, & Sneed R. Education, race/ethnicity, and multimorbidity among adults aged 30-64 in the National Health Interview Survey. *SSM-Population Health*. 2017; 3, 366-372. doi:10.1016/j.ssmph.2017.03.007
11. Lochner KA & Cox CS. Prevalence of multiple chronic conditions among Medicare beneficiaries, United States, 2010. *Preventing Chronic Disease*. 2013;10, E61-E61. doi:10.5888/pcd10.120137
12. Streck BP, Wardell DW, LoBiondo-Wood G, Beauchamp JES. Interdependence of physical and psychological morbidity among patients with cancer and family caregivers: Review of the literature. *Psycho-Oncology*. 2020;29(6):974-89.
13. Ellis KR, Hecht H, Young TL, Oh S, Thomas S, Hoggard LS, et al. Chronic disease among African American families: A systematic scoping review. *Preventing Chronic Disease* (in press).
14. Whitfield KE, Allaire JC, Belue R, Edwards CL. Are comparisons the answer to understanding behavioral aspects of aging in racial and ethnic groups? *The Journals of Gerontology Series B, Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*. 2008;63(5):P301-P8.
15. Northouse L, Kershaw T, Mood D, Schafenacker A. Effects of a family intervention on the quality of life of women with recurrent breast cancer and their family caregivers. *Psycho-Oncology*. 2005;14(6):478-91.
16. Northouse LL, Mood DW, Schafenacker A, Montie JE, Sandler HM, Forman JD, et al. Randomized clinical trial of a family intervention for prostate cancer patients and their spouses. *Cancer*. 2007; 110(12):2809-18.

17. Northouse LL, Mood DW, Schafenacker A, Kalemkerian G, Zalupski M, LoRusso P, et al. Randomized clinical trial of a brief and extensive dyadic intervention for advanced cancer patients and their family caregivers. *Psycho-Oncology*. 2013;22(3):555-63.
18. SEER*Explorer: An interactive website for SEER cancer statistics [Internet]. Surveillance Research Program, National Cancer Institute. [Cited 2020 Sep 14]. Available from <https://seer.cancer.gov/explorer/>.
19. Cella DF, Tulsky DS, Gray G, Sarafian B, Linn E, Bonomi A, et al. The Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy scale: development and validation of the general measure. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 1993;11(3):570-9.
20. Kenny DA, Kashy DA, Cook WL. *Dyadic data analysis*. New York: Guilford Press; 2006.
21. West, SG, Taylor AB, Wu W. Model fit and model selection in structural equation modeling. *Handbook of Structural Equation Modeling*. 1: 209-231.
22. Brucker PS, Yost K, Cashy J, Webster K, & Cella D. General Population and Cancer Patient Norms for the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-General (FACT-G). *Evaluation and the Health Professions*. 2005;28(2), 192-211. doi:10.1177/0163278705275341
23. Weis J. Cancer-related fatigue: prevalence, assessment and treatment strategies. *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics & Outcomes Research*. 2011;11(4):441-6. doi:10.1586/erp.11.44
24. Wang T, Molassiotis A, Chung BPM, Tan J-Y. Unmet care needs of advanced cancer patients and their informal caregivers: a systematic review. *BMC Palliative Care*. 2018;17(1):96.
25. Chen Q, Terhorst L, Lowery-Allison A, et al. Sleep problems in advanced cancer patients and their caregivers: Who is disturbing whom? *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*. 2020;43(4):614-622.
26. Maltby KF, Sanderson CR, Lobb EA, Phillips JL. Sleep disturbances in caregivers of patients with advanced cancer: A systematic review. *Palliative & Supportive Care*. 2017;15(1):125-40. doi:10.1017/s1478951516001024
27. Adenekan B, Pandey A, McKenzie S, et al. Sleep in America: Role of racial/ethnic differences. *Sleep Medicine Reviews*. 2013;17(4):255-262.
28. Yeager KA, Quest TE, Vena C, Sterk CE. Living with symptoms: a qualitative study of Black adults with advanced cancer living in poverty. *Pain Management Nursing*. 2018;19(1):34-45.
29. van den Beuken-van Everdingen MHJ, Hochstenbach LMJ, Joosten EAJ, Tjan-Heijnen VCG, Janssen DJA. Update on Prevalence of Pain in Patients With Cancer: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 2016;51(6):1070-90.e9. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2015.12.340>
30. Anderson KO, Green CR, Payne R. Racial and ethnic disparities in pain: causes and consequences of unequal care. *The Journal of Pain*. 2009;10(12):1187-204.
31. Boyd-Franklin N. Incorporating spirituality and religion into the treatment of African American clients. *The Counseling Psychologist*. 2010;38(7):976-1000.
32. Alegría M, Alvarez K, Ishikawa RZ, DiMarzio K, McPeck S. Removing obstacles to eliminating racial and ethnic disparities in behavioral health care. *Health Affairs*. 2016;35(6):991-9.
33. Hamilton J, Sandelowski M. Types of social support in African Americans with cancer. *Oncology Nursing Forum*. 2004;31(4):792-800.

34. Chatters LM, Taylor RJ, Woodward AT, Nicklett EJ. Social support from church and family members and depressive symptoms among older African Americans. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*. 2015;23(6):559-567.
35. Grey M, Schulman-Green D, Knafl K, et al. A revised self-and family management framework. *Nursing outlook*. 2015;63(2):162-170.
36. Ellis KR, Janevic MR, Kershaw T, Caldwell CH, Janz NK, Northouse L. The influence of dyadic symptom distress on threat appraisals and self-efficacy in advanced cancer and caregiving. *Supportive Care in Cancer*. 2017;25(1):185-94.
37. Bandura A, Caprara GV, Barbaranelli C, Regalia C, Scabini E. Impact of family efficacy beliefs on quality of family functioning and satisfaction with family life. *Applied Psychology*. 2011;60(3):421-48.
38. White LL, Cohen MZ, Berger AM, Kupzyk KA, Bierman PJ, editors. Self-efficacy for management of symptoms and symptom distress in adults with cancer: an integrative review. *Oncology Nursing Forum*; 2019.
39. Barrera Jr M, Castro FG, Strycker LA, Toobert DJ. Cultural adaptations of behavioral health interventions: A progress report. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2013;81(2):196.
40. Ashing KT, George M. Exploring the efficacy of a paraprofessional delivered telephonic psychoeducational intervention on emotional wellbeing in African American breast cancer survivors. *Supportive Care in Cancer*. 2020; 28(2):1163-1171.

List of Table and Figure Legends

1.

Figure 1. Hypothesized Model Examining Actor and Partner Influences of Symptom Distress on Quality of Life

The hypotheses (H2, H3) relevant to each path in the model have been noted. Independent effects (i.e. actor effects) are represented by solid lines. Interdependent effects (i.e. partner effects) are represented by dashed lines. Correlations are represented by curved double-headed arrows. PT=Patient; CG=Caregiver.

2.

Table 1.

Symptom prevalence in this descriptive analysis combines reports of “some trouble” or “any trouble” with the symptom to determine overall prevalence of symptom (at any level of distress).

3.

Table 2.

PT=Patient; CG=Caregiver; QOL=Quality of Life. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. Mental distress scores: minimum possible: 0; maximum possible: 2. Physical distress scores: minimum possible: 0; maximum possible: 24. Minimal possible scores for overall QOL and subscale is 0. Maximum possible scores as follows: overall QOL – 108; physical wellbeing – 28; social wellbeing – 28; emotional wellbeing – 24; functional wellbeing – 28.

4.

Table 3.

Unstandardized coefficients are presented. PT=Patient; CG=Caregiver. All actor effects for main study variables are shown; only significant ($p < .05$) partner effects shown. Boldface type indicate p -values $< .05$.

5.

Appendix A.

Flow diagram of pooled analytic sample from parent RCTs.

Table 1.
Sociodemographic and Health Characteristics of Participants

	Patients N=151	Caregivers N=151	p-value
Age (years)			
Mean (SD)	59.1 (9.9)	51.5 (14.9)	<.001
Range	40-85	18-80	-
40 years or older, % (n)	100 (151)	80.1 (121)	
Female, % (n)	57.6 (87)	66.9 (101)	.202
Black American race, % (n)	100 (151)	100 (151)	-
Hispanic, % (n)	0.0 (0)	0.7 (1)	-
Highest level of education in years			<.001
Mean (SD)	13.5 (2.8)	13.7 (2.8)	
Range	4-22	7-22	
Income, % (n)			<.001
Less than \$5,000	13.7 (19)	11.8 (15)	
\$5,000-\$15,000	19.4 (27)	13.4 (17)	
\$15,001-\$30,000	19.4 (27)	19.7 (25)	
\$30,001-\$50,000	20.1 (28)	16.5 (21)	
\$50,001-\$75,000	13.7 (19)	22.0 (28)	
More than \$75,000	13.7 (19)	16.5 (21)	
Patient cancer type, % (n)			-
Breast	41.1 (62)	-	
Prostate	33.1 (50)	-	
Colorectal	13.9 (21)	-	
Lung	11.9 (18)	-	
Patient currently in treatment, % (n)	92.7 (139)	-	
Patient with advanced disease, % (n)	76.2 (115)	-	
Patient with metastatic disease, % (n)	74.2 (112)	-	
Patient with cancer recurrence, % (n)	45.0 (68)	-	
Caregiver relationship to patient, % (n)			-
Spouse/Partner	-	73.5 (108)	
Daughter	-	10.2 (15)	
Son	-	6.8 (10)	
Other relative	-	4.8 (7)	
Friend	-	4.1 (6)	
Sibling	-	0.7 (1)	
Caregiver living with patient	-	70.9 (107)	
Symptom Prevalence ^a , % (n)			
Fatigue	66.9 (101)	56.3 (85)	<.001
Pain	62.3 (94)	47.0 (71)	.013
Sleeping Problems	60.3 (91)	53.6 (81)	.031
Weight Loss	55.6 (84)	45.0 (68)	<.001

Mental Distress	50.0 (75)	53.0 (80)	.699
Bodily Sensations	48.3 (73)	40.4 (61)	.008
Heart Problems	43.0 (65)	27.2 (41)	.004
Breathing Problems	43.7 (66)	15.9 (24)	<.001
Moving Difficulties	42.0 (63)	34.7 (52)	.019
Stomach Problems	41.6 (62)	37.3 (56)	.210
Bowel Problems	41.3 (62)	33.1 (50)	.004
Urinating Problems	28.0 (42)	9.3 (14)	<.001
Skin Problems	22.5 (34)	17.3 (26)	.008

Symptom reported by both dyad members, % (n)

Fatigue	55.0 (83)		-
Sleeping Problems	51.0 (77)		
Weight Loss	43.7 (66)		
Bodily Sensations	38.4 (58)		
Stomach Problems	33.8 (51)		
Moving Difficulties	31.8 (48)		
Mental Distress	31.1 (47)		
Bowel Problems	30.5 (46)		
Pain	28.5 (43)		
Skin Problems	17.2 (26)		
Heart Problems	13.2 (20)		
Breathing Problems	10.6 (16)		
Urinating Problems	4.0 (6)		

Table 2.
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables

	Mental Distress		Physical Distress		Overall QOL		Physical Wellbeing		Social Wellbeing		Emotional Wellbeing		Functional Wellbeing	
	PT	CG	PT	CG	PT	CG	PT	CG	PT	CG	PT	CG	PT	CG
Mean	.54	.60	6.73	3.25	77.75	81.89	20.23	24.17	21.91	21.03	17.69	16.40	17.93	20.29
SD	.58	.61	4.31	3.00	16.96	15.21	7.16	4.33	5.48	5.40	4.42	4.64	6.88	5.90
Paired-Sample T-Test	<i>p</i> =.354		<i>p</i> <.001		<i>p</i> =.007		<i>p</i> <.001		<i>p</i> =.118		<i>p</i> =.004		<i>p</i> <.001	
Correlations														
PT Mental Distress	1													
CG Mental Distress	.30***	1												
PT Physical Distress	.33***	.26**	1											
CG Physical Distress	.20*	.40***	.16*	1										
PT Overall QOL	-.53***	-.34***	-.65***	-.17*	1									
CG Overall QOL	-.13	-.43***	-.28***	-.39***	.33***	1								
PT Physical Wellbeing	-.33***	-.27**	-.73***	-.11	.79***	.34***	1							
CG Physical Wellbeing	-.12	-.28***	-.18*	-.49***	.23**	.65***	.24**	1						
PT Social Wellbeing	-.27**	-.18*	-.12	.00	.54***	.12	.14	.11	1					
CG Social Wellbeing	-.03	-.22*	-.12	-.11	.22**	.73***	.19*	.24**	.19*	1				
PT Emotional Wellbeing	-.44***	-.20*	-.23**	-.21**	.55***	.16	.30***	.09	.10	.10	1			
CG Emotional Wellbeing	-.20*	-.43***	-.29***	-.29***	.35***	.72***	.32***	.39***	.08	.28**	.28**	1		
PT Functional Wellbeing	-.48***	-.28**	-.60***	-.16	.86***	.26**	.61***	.17*	.33***	.12	.33***	.28***	1	
CG Functional Wellbeing	-.06	-.35***	-.27**	-.32***	.20*	.87***	.27**	.42***	-.02	.56***	.03	.53***	.22**	1

Table 3.
APIM Associations Between Symptom Distress and Quality of Life

	B	SE	<i>p</i>
Overall Quality Of Life (QOL)			
Actor			
PT Mental Distress → PT QOL	-9.75	1.60	<.001
PT Physical Distress → PT QOL	-1.86	0.23	<.001
CG Mental Distress → CG QOL	-6.68	1.78	<.001
CG Physical Distress → CG QOL	-1.13	0.38	.003
Partner			
CG Mental Distress → PT QOL	-3.45	1.48	.019
Physical Wellbeing (PWB)			
Actor			
PT Mental Distress → PT PWB	-1.08	0.67	.107
PT Physical Distress → PT PWB	-0.91	0.10	<.001
CG Mental Distress → CG PWB	-0.52	0.55	.343
CG Physical Distress → CG PWB	-0.52	0.12	<.001
Emotional Wellbeing (SWB)			
Actor			
PT Mental Distress → PT EWB	-2.88	0.56	<.001
PT Physical Distress → PT EWB	-0.19	0.08	.018
CG Mental Distress → CG EWB	-2.50	0.59	<.001
CG Physical Distress → CG EWB	-0.19	0.13	.139
Partner			
PT Physical Distress → CG EWB	-0.20	0.09	.030
CG Physical Distress → PT EWB	-0.32	0.20	.003
Social Wellbeing (SWB)			
Actor			
PT Mental Distress → PT SWB	-1.91	0.78	.015
PT Physical Distress → PT SWB	-0.08	0.11	.481
CG Mental Distress → CG SWB	-1.63	0.72	.024
CG Physical Distress → CG SWB	-0.08	0.15	.615
Partner			
CG Physical Distress → PT SWB	0.32	0.15	.036
Functional Wellbeing (FWB)			
Actor			
PT Mental Distress → PT FWB	-3.90	0.81	<.001
PT Physical Distress → PT FWB	-0.68	0.12	<.001
CG Mental Distress → CG FWB	-2.04	0.73	.006
CG Physical Distress → CG FWB	-0.35	0.16	.026



