

# Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Martin, Tristan, Twomey, Rosie, Medysky, Mary E., Temesi, John, Culos-Reed, S. Nicole and Millet, Guillaume Y. (2021) The Relationship between Fatigue and Actigraphy-Derived Sleep and Rest-Activity Patterns in Cancer Survivors. *Current Oncology*, 28 (2). pp. 1170-1182. ISSN 1198-0052

Published by: MDPI

URL: <https://doi.org/10.3390/curroncol28020113>  
<<https://doi.org/10.3390/curroncol28020113>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:  
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/44597/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

# **The Relationship between Fatigue and Actigraphy-Derived Sleep and Rest-Activity Patterns in Cancer Survivors**

Tristan Martin<sup>\*,#</sup>, Rosie Twomey<sup>\*,††</sup>, Mary E. Medysky<sup>\*,†</sup>, John Temesi<sup>\*,\*\*</sup>, S. Nicole Culos-Reed<sup>\*,‡,§</sup> and Guillaume Y. Millet<sup>\*,||</sup>

\*Faculty of Kinesiology, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

†School of Nursing, Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, USA

‡Department of Oncology, Cumming School of Medicine, Calgary, Canada

§Department of Psychosocial Resources, Tom Baker Cancer Centre, Alberta Health Services, Calgary, Canada

||Univ Lyon, UJM Saint-Etienne, Inter-university Laboratory of Human Movement Biology, EA 7424, F-42023, Saint-Etienne, France

# UMR-S 1075 COMETE : MOBILITES "Vieillesse, Pathologies, Santé", INSERM, Normandy University, Caen, France

\*\*Faculty of Health & Life Sciences, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom

††Ohlson Research Initiative, Arnie Charbonneau Research Institute, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

Running Head: Cancer-Related Fatigue, Rest-Activity cycle and Sleep

Corresponding Author

Guillaume Millet

Laboratoire Interuniversitaire de Biologie de la Motricité

Campus Santé Innovations – IRMIS - 10 rue de la Marandière - 42270 Saint Priest en Jarez - France

T: + 33. 477.421.894 ; guillaume.millet@univ-st-etienne.fr

Authors sincerely acknowledge the Canadian Cancer Society which funded this research (grant #704208-1).

Word count: 4222

Number of figure: 1

Number of tables: 2

## ABSTRACT

**Background** Cancer-related fatigue can continue long after curative cancer treatment. The aim of this study was to investigate sleep and rest-activity cycles in fatigued and non-fatigued cancer survivors. We hypothesized that sleep and rest-activity cycles would be more disturbed in people experiencing clinically-relevant fatigue, and that objective measures of sleep would be associated with the severity of fatigue in cancer survivors.

**Methods:** Cancer survivors ( $n=87$ ) completed a 14-day wrist actigraphy measurement for the estimation of sleep and rest-activity cycles. Fatigue was measured using the Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy-Fatigue Scale (FACIT-F). Participants were dichotomised into two groups using a previously validated score (fatigued  $n=51$  and non-fatigued  $n=36$ ). Perception of sleep was measured using the Insomnia Severity Index (ISI).

**Results:** FACIT-F score was correlated with wake after sleep onset ( $r=-0.28$ ;  $p=0.010$ ), sleep efficiency ( $r=0.26$ ;  $p=0.016$ ), sleep onset latency ( $r=-0.31$ ;  $p=0.044$ ) and ISI score ( $r=-0.56$ ;  $p<0.001$ ). The relative amplitude of the rest-activity cycles was lower in the fatigued vs. non-fatigued group ( $p=0.017$ ;  $d=0.58$ ).

**Conclusions:** After treatment for cancer, the severity of cancer-related fatigue is correlated with specific objective measures of sleep, and there is evidence of rest-activity cycle disruption in people experiencing clinically-relevant fatigue.

**Keywords:** cancer-related fatigue, actigraphy, rest-activity cycle, insomnia

## INTRODUCTION

Cancer-related fatigue (CRF) is a common and debilitating symptom experienced by cancer survivors<sup>1</sup>. It is not relieved by rest or sleep and has been described as a severe and unrelenting feeling of fatigue, or a sustained sense of exhaustion, interfering with usual functioning, and therefore it can negatively impact overall quality of life<sup>2</sup>. CRF can develop during or after cancer treatment, and for approximately one-third of people, it can persist for over five years<sup>3</sup>. The potential mechanisms underlying the onset and persistence of CRF are complex and include alterations in muscle metabolism, cytokine dysregulation, hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis disruption and circadian rhythm dysregulation<sup>4,5</sup>. Disruption of sleep-wake cycle may contribute to CRF, and CRF often co-occurs with chronic sleep disturbance as part of a multi-symptom cluster<sup>6</sup>.

Patient-reported outcome and several psychometric tools are available for screening and assessment of CRF<sup>7,8</sup>. The Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy Fatigue Scale (FACIT-F;<sup>9</sup>) is widely used for the assessment of CRF severity with a proposed cut-off point for the diagnosis of CRF<sup>10</sup>. There are no objective measures of CRF, though physiological correlates of CRF are under investigation<sup>11</sup>. The phenomenon is best understood as a subjective awareness (described more broadly in neurological illnesses as perception of fatigue)<sup>12</sup>. Although psychometric tools measuring perceptions of sleep exist, objective measures of sleep are well established. The gold standard for objective measurement of sleep is laboratory-based polysomnography.

A more practical alternative is wrist actigraphy, which has become a key assessment tool in sleep research<sup>13</sup>. Actigraphy is non-intrusive, can be used to estimate sleep in the participant's habitual sleeping environment, and permits continuous monitoring of both sleep and activity over long periods in many participants. Because some cancer survivors experience cognitive impairment after cancer treatment a more objective measure of sleep may be desirable<sup>14</sup>.

Poor sleep is commonly reported in cancer survivors<sup>6</sup>. The overwhelming majority of studies measuring sleep during and after cancer treatment use no objective measurement techniques<sup>15</sup>. A robust finding is that there is a discrepancy between subjective and objective measures of sleep in people with a sleep disorder<sup>16</sup>. Many people with insomnia overestimate the time taken to fall asleep and underestimate the total amount of sleep relative to objective measures<sup>16</sup>, and such discrepancies have also been reported in cancer survivors<sup>17</sup>. Many of the studies investigating CRF and sleep have only used subjective measures of sleep disruption, and a low-moderate correlation has been reported for CRF and subjective sleep quality in

survivors of breast cancer<sup>18</sup>. The relationship with objective measures has received less attention, particularly after cancer treatment when CRF may persist indefinitely for some people. In one example, increased fatigue with treatment for breast cancer was associated with disrupted circadian activity rhythms<sup>19</sup>, and overall the literature suggests that CRF may be related to sleep and rest-activity cycle disturbances<sup>20</sup>.

The relationship between perceived fatigue and sleep and rest-activity patterns in cancer survivors post-treatment has not been fully elucidated. Therefore, the primary aim of this study was to investigate objectively-estimated sleep and rest-activity cycles in fatigued and non-fatigued cancer survivors. We hypothesized that sleep would be more disturbed in people experiencing clinically-relevant CRF, and that objective measures of sleep would be associated with the severity of fatigue in cancer survivors. A secondary aim was to investigate the mismatch between subjective and objective measures of sleep in a sub-set of our participants.

## **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

This work was performed at Human Performance Laboratory, Faculty of Kinesiology, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada.

### **Participants**

Participants were recruited via the Alberta Cancer Registry (Alberta Health Services, Canada). Data extraction criteria included age ( $\geq 18$  and  $\leq 75$  years), diagnosed with any invasive cancer, and postal codes within 20 km of the University of Calgary. From the resulting extraction, equal numbers of males and females were randomly sampled and sent a confidential invitation letter from the registry (such that the research team did not know who received the invitation, but participants could then contact the research team if interested). Participants were also recruited via liaising with clinicians and/or advertising at cancer centres local to the University of Calgary. Participants were eligible if they had completed initial cancer treatment and were not scheduled to receive further treatment during the study period. Initially, 57 participants were recruited for the study (REB14-0398: FACIT-F  $> 34$ ,  $n = 36$ ; FACIT-F  $\leq 34$ ,  $n = 20$ ). One shift worker was not included in the final data analysis. The study was later extended to include an exercise program for people with clinically-relevant CRF i.e. FACIT-F  $\leq 34$ ,  $n = 31$  (HREBA.CC-16-10-10, see also Twomey et al.<sup>11</sup>) meaning that in total, 87 cancer survivors (53 females) provided written informed consent to participate and completed the study procedures. Participant characteristics are presented in Table 1. Approval for all procedures was obtained

by the Conjoint Health Research Ethics Board and the Health Research Ethics Board of Alberta Cancer Committee (REB14-0398 and HREBA.CC-16-10-10, respectively).

### **Study Design**

Participants attended two lab visits. On the initial lab visit, participants completed a health screening and a number of other procedures as part of a wider project investigating cancer-related fatigue. Participants were provided with an actigraphy system and sleep diary (see later sections) and the data collection period was two weeks. After the data collection period, participants attended the lab to return the MotionWatch 8<sup>®</sup> and sleep diary. On this lab visit, participants completed the FACIT-F scale and the Insomnia Severity Index (ISI)<sup>21</sup>.

### **Actigraphy**

The MotionWatch 8<sup>®</sup> actigraphy system (CamNtech Ltd, UK) is an unobtrusive, waterproof, wrist-worn device containing a light sensor and a tri-axial accelerometer detecting acceleration in a 0.01-8 g range. The device recorded 30-s epochs (as per manufacturer guidelines), and light intensity. The device was worn on the non-dominant wrist for a continuous two-week period to obtain aggregated measures that characterize individuals and quantify sleep in accordance with established recommendations<sup>13,22</sup>.

### **Sleep Diary**

Participants were also provided with a sleep diary to complete alongside the actigraphy measurement<sup>23</sup> to assist with editing the actigraph data for better accuracy<sup>24</sup>. Information provided by the participants (self-report) included “lights out” time (i.e., 8:30 PM), estimated sleep onset (time) and night-time awakenings (number/night).

### **Cancer-Related Fatigue**

The FACT-F is a 13-item, 5-point Likert scale. The scale has a cut off to distinguish fatigued patients from non-fatigued patients, with scores  $\leq 34$  indicating clinically relevant fatigue<sup>10</sup>. The scale has high internal consistency<sup>9</sup> and is widely used in the literature<sup>25</sup>.

### **Insomnia Severity**

Perceived severity of insomnia over the previous two weeks was measured using the ISI<sup>21</sup>. Questions address difficulty falling asleep, maintaining sleep and the frequency of early morning awakenings, as well as the degree of dissatisfaction with current sleep. The ISI has

been validated in cancer survivors<sup>26</sup>. Items are rated from 0 (none) to 4 (very severe), scores range from 0-28 ( $\geq 8$  indicates clinical insomnia) and gives maximal sensitivity and specificity for the detection of sleep difficulties<sup>27</sup>. The ISI was a late addition to the protocol and therefore only 66 participants completed this questionnaire.

### **Data Analysis**

Estimated sleep characteristics were derived from actigraphy. Actigraph data were analyzed with Motionware<sup>®</sup> version 1.1.20 software (CamNtech Ltd, UK). As recommended in the literature<sup>28</sup>, actigraph data were edited to correspond with the completed sleep diary. In cases when the actigraph data and sleep diary disagreed on the initiation of sleep, the light sensor data was used to determine the approximate “lights out” time, or when the participant first tried falling asleep. Similarly, the light data and the first large increase in activity onset were used to determine the end of the sleep window when the actigraph data and sleep diary did not correspond. This type of data editing has been performed in a previous study of older adults<sup>24</sup>. Sleep variables estimated by Motionware<sup>®</sup> included total sleep time (TST: time spent asleep at night), sleep efficiency (SE: percentage of time spent sleeping in relation to time spent in bed), sleep onset latency (SOL: amount of time taken to fall asleep), wake after sleep onset (WASO: min awake after an extended period of sleep), and fragmentation index (FI: indication of sleep quality based on the sum of the ‘Mobile time (%)’ and the ‘Immobile bouts  $\leq 1$ min (%)’ calculated by the software). A high sensitivity setting was used, with a time awake threshold of 20 counts per epoch, and sleep onset was defined as the first period with a minimum of 10 min of consecutively recorded immobile data with no more than 1 epoch of movement within that time (as validated by the manufacturer).

The characteristics of the rest-activity cycle were analyzed with the Non-Parametric Circadian Rhythm Analysis (NPCRA) function. We considered the following parameters to characterize the rest-activity cycle: estimated peak time of activity (the time of day when the peak of the cosine function fitted to the average 24 h data occurs), relative amplitude of the rest-activity cycle (the difference between the mean activity in the estimated least and most active periods, with theoretical range of 0 to 1, where higher values indicate a rhythm with higher amplitude)<sup>29</sup>. The following parameters were also estimated from the raw MotionWatch<sup>®</sup> 8 data: mean activity for wake and sleep periods (the mean amount of movement while out of bed, and the mean amount of movement while in bed, respectively) and index of activity for wake and sleep, calculated as the percentage of activity  $> 0$  per epoch for wake and sleep periods respectively<sup>30,31</sup>.

## Statistical Methods

An *a priori* sample size estimation was performed using G\*Power 3 (v3.1.2-3.1.9)<sup>32</sup> for the relationship between FACIT-F and objectively-estimated sleep parameters. For a correlation coefficient of  $r = 0.3$  (i.e. a small effect), with  $\alpha = 0.05$  and a  $1 - \beta = 0.80$ , the sample size required was calculated as 85. All data were analyzed using IBM SPSS version 23 statistical software (IBM Corporation, Chicago, IL). Data were checked for normality using the Skewness-Kurtosis test combined with visual inspection of histograms and Q-Q plots. Data were also checked for homogeneity of variance using Levene's test. To test the hypothesis that participants experiencing clinically-relevant fatigue would have poorer sleep than those who were not, participants were dichotomised into two groups using FACIT-F  $> 34$  and  $\leq 34$  (labelled non-fatigued and fatigued, respectively) and parameters relating to sleep and the rest-activity cycle were compared using independent samples t-tests, or non-parametric Mann-Whitney tests when data were not normally distributed. Significant results were controlled multiple comparisons using the Benjamini & Hochberg false discovery rate procedure<sup>33,34</sup>. This procedure compares each individual  $p$  value to its Benjamini-Hochberg critical value,  $(i/m)Q$ , where  $i$  is the rank,  $m$  is the total number of comparisons, and  $Q$  is the chosen false discovery rate (FDR). FDR  $Q$  values usually range from 0.05 (relatively conservative) to 0.2 (liberal). Due to the exploratory nature of this study, that participants daily living cannot be controlled, the limitations of using actigraphy despite its demonstrated validity and reliability<sup>13</sup>, and the importance of not missing a potentially meaningful difference, we chose an intermediate FDR of  $Q = 0.1$ . Effect sizes for pairwise comparisons were calculated as Cohen's  $d$ <sup>35,36</sup>. Interpretation of the size of the effect was considered as  $d = 0.2$  is small,  $d = 0.5$  is medium and  $d = 0.8$  is large<sup>35</sup>. The relationships between FACIT-F score and sleep and rest-activity outcomes were examined using Pearson correlation coefficients or Spearman correlation coefficients, as appropriate. The relationship between perceptions of sleep (ISI score) and sleep outcomes were also examined using Pearson correlation coefficients or Spearman correlation coefficients. The threshold for statistical significance of Pearson and Spearman correlations coefficients was set at  $p < 0.05$ .



## RESULTS

Of the 87 participants, 51 cancer survivors had CRF (fatigued group) and 36 cancer survivors were non-fatigued according to FACIT-F scores. Participant characteristics and FACIT-F scores are presented in Table 1. Time since treatment was not correlated with FACIT-F scores ( $r = 0.136$ ;  $p = 0.283$ ). Many of the participants were highly educated (49%), white (89%), female (61%), and survivors of breast cancer (44%).

### Objective Measures of Sleep

In the fatigued group, participants had greater WASO ( $p = 0.046$ ,  $d = 0.43$ ) and SOL ( $p = 0.053$ ,  $d = 0.35$ ) using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure. No other significant differences between groups were observed (Table 2). Overall, participants took  $15 \pm 13$  min to fall asleep at night, were asleep for  $421 \pm 45$  min per night ( $7.0 \pm 0.8$  h), spent  $58 \pm 20$  min awake after initially falling asleep, had a mean SE of  $84.6 \pm 5.0\%$  and a FI of  $28.7 \pm 9.2$ . FACIT-F score was correlated with wake after sleep onset ( $r = -0.28$ ;  $p = 0.010$ ), sleep efficiency ( $r = 0.26$ ;  $p = 0.016$ ), and sleep onset latency ( $r = -0.31$ ;  $p = 0.004$ ). FACIT-F score was not correlated with total sleep time ( $r = 0.04$ ;  $p = 0.696$ ) or fragmentation index ( $r = -0.16$ ;  $p = 0.130$ ). Correlations are presented in Figure 1A-E.

### Rest-Activity Cycles

The amount of movement during the sleep period (mean sleep actigraphy and index of activity during sleep) were both higher in the fatigued vs. the non-fatigued group (Table 2). The relative amplitude of the rest-activity cycle was lower in fatigued vs. the non-fatigued group ( $p = 0.007$ ,  $d = 0.62$ ) using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure. Peak time of the rest-activity cycle occurred  $\sim 40$  min later in the fatigued than in the non-fatigued group ( $p = 0.007$ ,  $d = 0.62$ ). The fatigued group also went to bed 25 min later ( $p = 0.03$ ,  $d = 0.48$ ) and woke up 40 min later ( $p = 0.009$ ,  $d = 0.58$ ) than non-fatigued participants. The index of activity during wake period (mean wake actigraphy) was not different between groups. FACIT-F score was negatively correlated with the peak time of the rest-activity cycle ( $r = -0.32$ ;  $p = 0.002$ ), bed time ( $r = -0.26$ ;  $p = 0.014$ ), and wake-up time ( $r = -0.28$ ;  $p = 0.008$ ). FACIT-F score was also correlated with amount of movement during the sleep period (i.e. the index of activity during sleep:  $r = -0.39$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), mean sleep actigraphy ( $r = -0.39$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), relative amplitude ( $r = 0.31$ ;  $p = 0.003$ ). FACIT-F was not correlated with other rest-activity cycle parameters (Supplemental Table 1).

### **Perception of Sleep Disruption**

The mean ISI score was significantly higher in the fatigued vs. non-fatigued group (Table 2). In the fatigued group, the vast majority of participants (83%,  $n = 35$ ) reported clinically-relevant sleep disruption (ISI total score  $\geq 8^{27}$ ). Of these 35 participants, 20 reported subthreshold insomnia (ISI total score 8-14), 12 reported moderate severity insomnia (ISI total score 15-21), and 3 reported severe insomnia (ISI total score 22-28). In the non-fatigued group, half of participants (50%,  $n = 12$ ) reported clinically-relevant sleep disruption (ISI total score  $\geq 8^{27}$ ). Of these 12 participants, 10 reported subthreshold insomnia (ISI total score 8-14) and 2 reported moderate severity insomnia (ISI total score 15-21).

The relationship between perceived sleep and perceived fatigue is presented in Figure 1F. The ISI total score was negatively and significantly associated with FACIT-F score ( $r = -0.56$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). That is, more severe perceived difficulties with sleep were associated with more severe ratings of fatigue. We also examined relationships between total ISI score and actigraphy-estimated sleep outcomes. Total ISI score was not correlated with TST ( $r = -0.076$ ;  $p = 0.546$ ), WASO ( $r = 0.24$ ;  $p = 0.051$ ), or FI ( $r = 0.06$ ;  $p = 0.608$ ). However, the total ISI score was significantly correlated with SE ( $r = -0.34$ ;  $p = 0.006$ ), and sleep onset latency ( $r = 0.30$ ;  $p = 0.013$ ) (Supplemental Table 2).

### **DISCUSSION**

The primary aim of this study was to investigate objectively-estimated sleep and rest-activity cycles in fatigued and non-fatigued cancer survivors. In line with our hypothesis, some actigraphy-derived markers of sleep were associated with the severity of fatigue in cancer survivors, including parameters associated with more awakening and movement during the sleep period. To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate sleep and rest-activity cycle disruption months and years after cancer treatment comparing fatigued and non-fatigued cancer survivors. A secondary aim of this study was to investigate the association between subjective and objective measures of sleep in a sub-set of our participants. We found that people with CRF perceived their sleep as worse than non-fatigued survivors, and this perception was associated with both fatigue severity and several, although not all, objective sleep parameters.

### **The relationship between fatigue and actigraphy-derived sleep and comparison to Reference Data for Sleep Duration and Quality**

CRF is a complex issue that for some people can continue for years after cancer treatment. CRF and poor sleep can occur simultaneously, but the relationship between CRF and actigraphy-

derived estimates of sleep has not been investigated after cancer treatment. The current findings show a small but significant association between fatigue assessed with FACIT-F and specific objective parameters, including wake after sleep onset, sleep efficiency and sleep onset latency. In cancer survivors, difficulties initiating sleep and the robustness/quality of the sleep episode may contribute to the perception of CRF which persists after treatment completion. This is a major concern for health-related quality of life and societal issues, including return to work and productivity at work<sup>37</sup>. Interestingly, there was no relationship between CRF and total sleep time. Existing research shows that the time devoted to sleep is similar for cancer patients and healthy controls<sup>38</sup>. Moreover, total sleep time has been shown to be similar at across various points during cancer treatment, and similar to a healthy population up to one year after treatment<sup>39</sup>.

Using dichotomized groups based on a pre-specified and validated cut off point<sup>10</sup>, we found that participants categorized as fatigued vs. non-fatigued had a marginally greater time spent awake after sleep onset and time to fall asleep. The current study did not include a control group, but recent data from the National Sleep Foundation may be used as reference data for sleep duration and quality. We identified 38 people (44%) who slept less than the recommendation for sleep duration<sup>40</sup>. These participants were approximately evenly distributed across dichotomised groups (43% of fatigued and 44% of non-fatigued, respectively). Concerning other sleep parameters, a good sleep quality was defined as WASO < 51 min, SOL < 30 min or SE > 85%<sup>41</sup>. Specifically, only 37% of fatigued people were awake at night for < 51 min, versus 50% in the non-fatigued group. There was also a small and small-medium effect for sleep efficiency and sleep onset latency, respectively. Poor quality sleep in cancer survivors has been mainly associated with high wake time at night and a long sleep onset latency, rather than less total nocturnal sleep time<sup>42</sup>. The fact that approximately double the number of participants had issues with sleep efficiency and latency in the fatigued vs. non-fatigued group suggests that difficulties with beginning/maintaining sleep (like in insomnia) relate to subjective feelings of fatigue. Specifically, for latency, 16% of the fatigued group took longer than 30 min to fall asleep (8% in the non-fatigued group) and 59% had a sleep efficiency less than 85% (versus 33% in the non-fatigued group). A low sleep efficiency is a major concern, given that a less efficient sleep has been associated with lower survival in people living with and beyond cancer<sup>43</sup>. In summary, more severe fatigue seems to be related to more difficulties to achieve a good sleep. Even though precise mechanisms are unknown, both CRF and sleep disorders share a common symptom cluster including modification of immune function, dysregulation of hypothalamic-pituitary axis and circadian rhythms, pain, and depression, that

may be the basis of a reciprocal relationship between sleep disorders and CRF<sup>5,6</sup>. Further investigation is required since cancer survivors in the present study had completed initial cancer treatment only (e.g. surgery, chemotherapy and/or radiation therapy). Some long-term adjuvant treatments, specifically hormonal therapy, may affect daytime activity and sleep quality<sup>44</sup>.

### **The relationship between fatigue and rest-activity cycles in cancer survivors**

Sleep has a reciprocal relationship with circadian rhythm disturbances in that sleep disruption might adversely affect circadian function, and disrupted circadian function can contribute to the development of sleep disorders<sup>43</sup>. The estimated cosine peak time of the rest-activity cycle occurred later in fatigued than in non-fatigued survivors in our study, which was correlated with CRF scores. Fatigued survivors also had delayed bed and wake up times. Phase delays of the rest-activity cycle have been previously observed in patients with depressive symptoms presenting low sleep quality<sup>45</sup>. More importantly, despite similar indices of daytime activity, fatigued survivors exhibited more body movement during sleep and a lower relative amplitude of the rest-activity cycle cosine estimation. Both were also associated with CRF. Lower amplitude of the rest-activity cycle has previously been observed after treatment in cancer survivors compared to control participants<sup>19</sup>. Previous results in cancer survivors have highlighted a clear dichotomy between day-time and night-time actigraphy, with high activity during wake time and low activity during night time, being associated with better quality of life<sup>46</sup>. Interestingly, Ancoli-Israel et al.<sup>39</sup> observed that characteristics of the rest-activity cycle returned to baseline one year after treatment, despite being lower than healthy controls. Although no comparison to a control population was included in the current study, our results show that fatigued participants have a lower amplitude of the rest-activity cycle than non-fatigued participant months and years after treatment. An altered rest-activity cycle may also be related to other symptoms associated with cancer such as pain and depression<sup>6</sup>. Further experiments in people with clinically-relevant CRF are needed to better understand the link between circadian rhythms disruption and persistent CRF after treatment.

### **The mismatch between subjective and objective measures of sleep**

Subjective sleep does not always correspond with actigraph data due to the presence of other symptoms or psychological and physiological factors<sup>38</sup>. However, fatigue is one of the most reported complaints of patients with insomnia<sup>47</sup>. The longer time spent awake during the night and the longer time taken to fall asleep observed in fatigued participants, corroborates the higher subjective feeling of insomnia in this study. As a self-report, the ISI was chosen since insomnia

is common in cancer survivors reporting having sleep disorders<sup>48</sup>. We found that the majority (83%) of fatigued participants in the present study reported significant sleep disruption (ISI total score  $\geq 8$ ), whereas this was reduced to 50% in the non-fatigued group. Dirksen et al.<sup>49</sup> showed that cancer survivors with the highest level of fatigue reported higher scores on the ISI, which was in accordance with the present study, suggesting that CRF may be linked to the perception of sleep disturbance in cancer populations. ISI scores in our study were lower (less self-reported insomnia) than in previous studies in cancer survivors where ISI was used to assess insomnia after treatment<sup>50</sup>, however these studies focused on cancer survivors with clinical insomnia.

Based on the results of the present study, interventions for CRF after cancer treatment should target both the perception of sleep and the improvement of objectively-measured sleep. Two interventions which may have promise for treating sleep disturbance are exercise<sup>20</sup> and cognitive behavioral therapy<sup>51</sup>.

### **Limitations**

There are several limitations of the current study. As previously highlighted, these results are based on a sample of predominantly white, female, survivors of breast cancer and therefore may not be representative of a more diverse population or generalizable to specific tumour groups. Dichotomization of the FACIT-F score, although using a validated cut-off<sup>10</sup> may have resulted in misclassification of some individuals. We did not ask participants about the perception of their sleep quality and quantity prior to their cancer diagnosis because the recall period would have been  $> 12$  months for most. Therefore, it was not possible to comment on whether sleep and rest-activity cycle disruption was cancer-related. Future longitudinal studies should aim to investigate the relationship between fatigue and sleep during the period between diagnosis and treatment, and at time-points encompassing treatment and recovery. Actigraphy has some key limitations that have been discussed previously<sup>13</sup>, such as the underestimation of SOL and overestimation of SE. It cannot be considered as a substitute for clinical interviews or overnight polysomnography and information about the modification of sleep architecture between people with and without CRF must also be measured in future studies. There is also a risk of bias due to lack of compliancy in participants completing the sleep diary (which was used to edit the actigraph data to improve accuracy). The limitation of paper diaries is that aspects of compliance (such as the recall period) cannot be monitored by the experimenter in real time, and participants may not remember to complete the diary every day<sup>52</sup>. However, this limitation

was minimized by using the light sensor data to indicate sleep and wake onset when the sleep diary and actigraph data were otherwise incongruent<sup>52</sup>.

## **Conclusion**

This is the first study to show that after treatment for cancer, the severity of CRF is correlated with specific objective measures of sleep including sleep onset latency, wake time at night and sleep efficiency, but not total sleep duration. The subjective perception of difficulties with sleep was worse in people with clinically-relevant CRF. In addition, the severity of CRF is correlated to the amount of movement during the sleep period, and we observed evidence of disrupted rest-activity cycles in people experiencing CRF. Future studies should focus on the potential benefits of interventions that influence both objective and subjective measure of sleep in people with CRF after cancer treatment, particularly exercise. These findings have direct consequences on the rehabilitation process, even months and years after cancer treatment.

## **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

No competing interests

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Authors sincerely acknowledge all participants for their involvement in this study.

This research is funded by the Canadian Cancer Society (grant #704208-1). Canadian cancer society has no a role in study design, collection, analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; and in the decision to submit the article for publication.

## References

- 1 Prue G, Rankin J, Allen J, Gracey J, Cramp F. Cancer-related fatigue: A critical appraisal. *Eur J Cancer* 2006; **42**: 846–863.
- 2 Berger AM, Mooney K, Alvarez-Perez A, Breitbart WS, Carpenter KM, Cella D *et al.* Cancer-Related Fatigue, Version 2.2015. *J Natl Compr Cancer Netw* 2015; **13**: 1012–1039.
- 3 Jones JM, Olson K, Catton P *et al.* Cancer-related fatigue and associated disability in post-treatment cancer survivors. *J Cancer Surviv Res Pract* 2016; **10**: 51–61.
- 4 O’Higgins CM, Brady B, O’Connor B, Walsh D, Reilly RB. The pathophysiology of cancer-related fatigue: current controversies. *Support Care Cancer Off J Multinatl Assoc Support Care Cancer* 2018; **26**: 3353–3364.
- 5 Ryan JL, Carroll JK, Ryan EP, Mustian KM, Fiscella K, Morrow GR. Mechanisms of cancer-related fatigue. *The Oncologist* 2007; **12 Suppl 1**: 22–34.
- 6 Roscoe JA, Kaufman ME, Matteson-Rusby SE, Palesh OG, Ryan JL, Kohli S *et al.* Cancer-related fatigue and sleep disorders. *The Oncologist* 2007; **12**: 35–42.
- 7 Howell D, Keshavarz H, Broadfield L, Hack T, Hamel M, Harth T, J *et al.*, on behalf of the Cancer Journey Advisory Group of the Canadian Partnership Against Cancer. A Pan Canadian Practice Guideline for Screening, Assessment, and Management of Cancer-Related Fatigue in Adults Version 2-2015, Toronto: Canadian Partnership Against Cancer (Cancer Journey Advisory Group) and the Canadian Association of Psychosocial Oncology, April 2015. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7939/R33R6N>.
- 8 Minton O, Stone P. A systematic review of the scales used for the measurement of cancer-related fatigue (CRF). *Ann Oncol* 2008; **20**: 17–25.
- 9 Yellen SB, Cella DF, Webster K, Blendowski C, Kaplan E. Measuring fatigue and other anemia-related symptoms with the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy (FACT) measurement system. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1997; **13**: 63–74.
- 10 Van Belle S, Paridaens R, Evers G *et al.* Comparison of proposed diagnostic criteria with FACT-F and VAS for cancer-related fatigue: proposal for use as a screening tool. *Support Care Cancer Off J Multinatl Assoc Support Care Cancer* 2005; **13**: 246–254.
- 11 Twomey R, Martin T, Temesi J, Culos-Reed SN, Millet GY. Tailored exercise interventions to reduce fatigue in cancer survivors: study protocol of a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Cancer* 2018; **18**: 757.
- 12 Kluger BM, Krupp LB, Enoka RM. Fatigue and fatigability in neurologic illnesses: proposal for a unified taxonomy. *Neurology* 2013; **80**: 409–416.
- 13 Sadeh A. The role and validity of actigraphy in sleep medicine: an update. *Sleep Med Rev* 2011; **15**: 259–267.
- 14 Pendergrass JC, Targum SD, Harrison JE. Cognitive Impairment Associated with Cancer. *Innov Clin Neurosci* 2018; **15**: 36–44.



- 15 Otte JL, Carpenter JS, Manchanda S *et al.* Systematic review of sleep disorders in cancer patients: can the prevalence of sleep disorders be ascertained? *Cancer Med* 2015; **4**: 183–200.
- 16 Harvey AG, Tang N. (Mis)Perception of Sleep in Insomnia: A puzzle and a resolution. *Psychol Bull* 2012; **138**: 77–101.
- 17 Reinsel RA, Starr TD, O’Sullivan B, Passik SD, Kavey NB. Polysomnographic Study of Sleep in Survivors of Breast Cancer. *J Clin Sleep Med JCSM Off Publ Am Acad Sleep Med* 2015; **11**: 1361–1370.
- 18 Banthia R, Malcarne VL, Ko CM, Varni JW, Sadler GR. Fatigued Breast Cancer Survivors: The Role of Sleep Quality, Depressed Mood, Stage, and Age. *Psychol Health* 2009; **24**: 965–980.
- 19 Liu L, Rissling M, Neikrug A *et al.* Fatigue and Circadian Activity Rhythms in Breast Cancer Patients Before and After Chemotherapy: A Controlled Study. *Fatigue Abingdon Eng Print* 2013; **1**: 12–26.
- 20 Medysky ME, Temesi J, Culos-Reed SN, Millet GY. Exercise, sleep and cancer-related fatigue: Are they related? *Neurophysiol Clin Clin Neurophysiol* 2017; **47**: 111–122.
- 21 Bastien CH, Vallières A, Morin CM. Validation of the Insomnia Severity Index as an outcome measure for insomnia research. *Sleep Med* 2001; **2**: 297–307.
- 22 van Someren EJ. Improving actigraphic sleep estimates in insomnia and dementia: how many nights? *J Sleep Res* 2007; **16**: 269–275.
- 23 Morgenthaler TI, Lee-Chiong T, Alessi C *et al.* Practice parameters for the clinical evaluation and treatment of circadian rhythm sleep disorders. An American Academy of Sleep Medicine report. *Sleep* 2007; **30**: 1445–1459.
- 24 Landry GJ, Best JR, Liu-Ambrose T. Measuring sleep quality in older adults: a comparison using subjective and objective methods. *Front Aging Neurosci* 2015; **7**. doi:10.3389/fnagi.2015.00166.
- 25 Andersen C, Rørth M, Ejlersen B *et al.* The effects of a six-week supervised multimodal exercise intervention during chemotherapy on cancer-related fatigue. *Eur J Oncol Nurs Off J Eur Oncol Nurs Soc* 2013; **17**: 331–339.
- 26 Savard M-H, Savard J, Simard S, Ivers H. Empirical validation of the Insomnia Severity Index in cancer patients. *Psychooncology* 2005; **14**: 429–441.
- 27 Morin CM, Belleville G, Bélanger L, Ivers H. The Insomnia Severity Index: Psychometric Indicators to Detect Insomnia Cases and Evaluate Treatment Response. *Sleep* 2011; **34**: 601–608.
- 28 Lockley SW, Skene DJ, Arendt J. Comparison between subjective and actigraphic measurement of sleep and sleep rhythms. *J Sleep Res* 1999; **8**: 175–183.

- 29 Bonmati-Carrion MA, Middleton B, Revell VL, Skene DJ, Rol MA, Madrid JA. Validation of an innovative method, based on tilt sensing, for the assessment of activity and body position. *Chronobiol Int* 2015; **32**: 701–710.
- 30 Afonso P, Brissos S, Figueira ML, Paiva T. Schizophrenia patients with predominantly positive symptoms have more disturbed sleep–wake cycles measured by actigraphy. *Psychiatry Res* 2011; **189**: 62–66.
- 31 Martin T, Moussay S, Bulla I *et al.* Exploration of Circadian Rhythms in Patients with Bilateral Vestibular Loss. *PLoS One* 2016; **11**: e0155067.
- 32 Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang A-G, Buchner A. G\*Power 3: a flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behav Res Methods* 2007; **39**: 175–191.
- 33 Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling The False Discovery Rate - A Practical And Powerful Approach To Multiple Testing. *J R Stat Soc Ser B* 1995; **57**: 289–300.
- 34 Lee S, Lee DK. What is the proper way to apply the multiple comparison test? *Korean J Anesthesiol* 2018; **71**: 353–360.
- 35 Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 2nd ed. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.
- 36 Lakens D. Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: a practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Front Psychol* 2013; **4**: 863.
- 37 Islam T, Dahlui M, Majid H *et al.* Factors associated with return to work of breast cancer survivors: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health* 2014; **14**: S8.
- 38 Berger AM. Update on the state of the science: sleep-wake disturbances in adult patients with cancer. *Oncol Nurs Forum* 2009; **36**: E165-177.
- 39 Ancoli-Israel S, Liu L, Rissling M *et al.* Sleep, fatigue, depression, and circadian activity rhythms in women with breast cancer before and after treatment: a 1-year longitudinal study. *Support Care Cancer* 2014; **22**: 2535–2545.
- 40 Hirshkowitz M, Whiton K, Albert SM *et al.* National Sleep Foundation’s sleep time duration recommendations: methodology and results summary. *Sleep Health J Natl Sleep Found* 2015; **1**: 40–43.
- 41 Ohayon M, Wickwire EM, Hirshkowitz M *et al.* National Sleep Foundation’s sleep quality recommendations: first report. *Sleep Health* 2017; **3**: 6–19.
- 42 Natale V, Innominato PF, Boreggiani M *et al.* The difference between in bed and out of bed activity as a behavioral marker of cancer patients: A comparative actigraphic study. *Chronobiol Int* 2015; **32**: 925–933.
- 43 Palesh O, Aldridge-Gerry A, Zeitzer JM *et al.* Actigraphy-Measured Sleep Disruption as a Predictor of Survival among Women with Advanced Breast Cancer. *Sleep* 2014; **37**: 837–842.

- 44 Costa AR, Fontes F, Pereira S, Gonçalves M, Azevedo A, Lunet N. Impact of breast cancer treatments on sleep disturbances – A systematic review. *The Breast* 2014; **23**: 697–709.
- 45 Winkler D, Pjrek E, Praschak-Rieder N *et al.* Actigraphy in Patients with Seasonal Affective Disorder and Healthy Control Subjects Treated with Light Therapy. *Biol Psychiatry* 2005; **58**: 331–336.
- 46 Mormont M-C, Waterhouse J, Bleuzen P *et al.* Marked 24-h rest/activity rhythms are associated with better quality of life, better response, and longer survival in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer and good performance status. *Clin Cancer Res* 2000; **6**: 3038–3045.
- 47 Davis MP, Khoshknabi D, Walsh D, Lagman R, Platt A. Insomnia in patients with advanced cancer. *Am J Hosp Palliat Care* 2014; **31**: 365–373.
- 48 Fleming L, Randell K, Stewart E, Espie CA, Morrison DS, Lawless C *et al.* Insomnia in breast cancer: a prospective observational study. *Sleep* 2018. doi:10.1093/sleep/zsy245.
- 49 Dirksen SR, Belyea MJ, Epstein DR. Fatigue-Based Subgroups of Breast Cancer Survivors With Insomnia: *Cancer Nurs* 2009; **32**: 404–411.
- 50 Ritterband LM, Bailey ET, Thorndike FP, Lord HR, Farrell-Carnahan L, Baum LD. Initial evaluation of an Internet intervention to improve the sleep of cancer survivors with insomnia. *Psychooncology* 2012; **21**: 695–705.
- 51 Matthews E, Carter P, Page M, Dean G, Berger A. Sleep-Wake Disturbance: A Systematic Review of Evidence-Based Interventions for Management in Patients With Cancer. *Clin J Oncol Nurs* 2018; **22**: 37–52.
- 52 Jungquist CR, Pender JJ, Klingman KJ, Mund J. Validation of Capturing Sleep Diary Data via a Wrist-Worn Device. *Sleep Disord* 2015; **2015**: 758937.

**Table I** Participant Characteristics

		<b>All</b>	<b>Fatigued</b>	<b>Non-Fatigued</b>
<i>N</i>		<b>87</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Age (years)</b>		55.8 ± 10.2	54.2 ± 8.9	58.2 ± 11.6
<b>Months Since Treatment</b>		33.4 ± 28.7	40.1 ± 28.9	29.9 ± 27.1
<b>Sex</b>	Female	53 [61]	32 [63]	21 [58]
	Male	34 [39]	19 [37]	15 [42]
<b>Ethnicity (self-identified)<sup>a</sup></b>	White	76 [89]	43 [88]	33 [98]
	Middle Eastern	1 [1]	0 [0]	1 [3]
	Asian	5 [6]	4 [8]	1 [3]
	Black	1 [1]	1 [2]	0 [0]
	First Nations	2 [2]	1 [2]	1 [3]
<b>Marital Status<sup>a</sup></b>	Married/Common Law	64 [75]	34 [69]	30 [83]
	Divorced	12 [14]	6 [12]	6 [17]
	Single	7 [8]	7 [14]	0 [0]
	Widowed	2 [2]	2 [4]	0 [0]
<b>Education<sup>a</sup></b>	University	42 [49]	25 [51]	17 [48]
	College	26 [31]	16 [33]	10 [28]
	Secondary School	14 [17]	5 [10]	9 [25]
	Other	3 [4]	3 [6]	0 [0]
<b>Employment Status</b>	Part-Time	14 [17]	6 [12]	8 [22]
	Full-Time	34 [40]	23 [47]	11 [31]
	Retired	20 [24]	6 [12]	14 [39]
	Unemployed	7 [8]	5 [10]	2 [6]
	Disability/Leave	10 [12]	9 [18]	1 [3]
<b>Cancer Type</b>	Breast	38 [44]	22 [43]	16 [44]
	Prostate	15 [17]	4 [8]	11 [31]
	Head & Neck	8 [9]	6 [12]	2 [6]
	Colorectal	7 [8]	5 [10]	2 [6]
	Hematologic	1 [1]	1 [2]	0 [0]
	Other	18 [21]	13 [26]	5 [14]
<b>FACIT-F Score</b>		33 ± 10	26 ± 6	43 ± 6


<sup>a</sup>Demographic data about ethnicity, marital status and education were not provided for two fatigued participants. Data are presented as mean ± SD for continuous data or count [percentage] for categorical data. Some values may not sum to 100% due to rounding. Other cancer types included bladder, testicular, endometrial, lymphoma, kidney, lymphoma, papillary, esophageal, thyroid, seminoma, choriocarcinoma, pancreatic, brain, cervical

**Table II** Sleep and Rest-Activity Cycle Parameters for Fatigued and Non-Fatigued Cancer survivors.

Outcome	Fatigued (n=51)		Non-Fatigued (n=36)		p [q]	Effect Size
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
<b>Sleep (Actigraphy)</b>						
Total Sleep Time (min)	422.6	44.9	417.9	46.3	0.632 [0.100]	0.10
Sleep Efficiency (%)	84.1	4.7	85.3	5.3	0.285 [0.071]	0.23
Sleep Onset Latency (min) <sup>np</sup>	17.3	13.1	12.9	11.9	0.053 <sup>a</sup> [0.064]	0.35
Wake After Sleep Onset (min)	61.2	22.4	52.9	15.7	0.046 <sup>a</sup> [0.057]	0.43
Fragmentation Index	29.5	9.4	27.5	8.9	0.305 [0.086]	0.23
<b>Perceptions of Sleep</b>						
Insomnia Severity Index	12.7	5.6	8.0	5.6	0.020 <sup>a</sup> [0.043]	0.84
<b>Rest-Activity Cycle</b>						
Relative amplitude <sup>np</sup>	0.88	0.07	0.91	0.05	0.017 <sup>a</sup> [0.029]	0.58
Bed times	23h21	0h57	22h55	00h48	0.033 <sup>a</sup> [0.05]	0.48
Wake up times	7h40	01h07	6h59	01h11	0.009 <sup>a</sup> [0.021]	0.58
Peak Time (hh:mm)	14h40	01h14	14h00	00h53	0.007 <sup>a</sup> [0.007]	0.62
Mean Sleep Actigraphy (MW8 counts) <sup>np</sup>	15.6	6.9	12.8	6.5	0.018 <sup>a</sup> [0.036]	0.42
Mean Wake Actigraphy (MW8 counts)	101.3	33.6	109.6	37.0	0.289 [0.079]	0.23
Index of Activity during Wake (%)	68.9	9.3	70.8	10.0	0.364 [0.093]	0.20
Index of Activity during Sleep (%)	14.3	3.8	12.8	3.7	0.008 <sup>*</sup> [0.014]	0.60

<sup>a</sup> indicates p values which are significant using Benjamini-Hochberg procedure with a false discovery rate of Q =

0.1. <sup>np</sup> indicates non parametric Mann-Whitney test



**Figure 1** Correlations between actigraphy-derived sleep parameters and Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy – Fatigue (FACIT-F) score (panels A to E), and correlation between the Insomnia Severity Index score and FACIT-F (panel F). A lower FACIT-F score indicates higher fatigue severity.

Supplemental Table 1 : Correlation between sleep and rest-activity cycle parameters, Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy-Fatigue Scale (FACIT-F)

	FACIT-F		
	Pearson	Sig.	N
TST	0,042	0,696	87
WASO	-,275	0,010	87
SE	,258 <sup>b</sup>	0,016	87
SOL <sup>np</sup>	-,305 <sup>b</sup>	0,004	87
FI	-0,164	0,130	87
Index activity wake %	0,040	0,712	87
Index activity sleep %	-,385 <sup>a</sup>	0,000	87
Mean wake Actigraphy	0,092	0,396	87
Mean Sleep Actigraphy <sup>np</sup>	-,392 <sup>a</sup>	0,001	87
Amplitude (RA) <sup>np</sup>	,313 <sup>a</sup>	0,003	87
Peak time	-,323 <sup>a</sup>	0,002	87
IS (stability)	0,168	0,120	87
IV (variability)	0,015	0,889	87
Bed time	-,263 <sup>b</sup>	0,014	87
Wake-up time	-,282 <sup>a</sup>	0,008	87

<sup>a</sup> Correlation is significant at 0,01 level (bilateral).

<sup>b</sup> Correlation is significant at 0,05 level (bilateral).

<sup>np</sup> indicate non parametric spearman correlation test

Supplemental Table 2: Correlation between sleep estimated parameters and Insomnia Severity Index (ISI).

	ISI		
	Pearson	Sig.	N
FACIT-F	-,560 <sup>a</sup>	0,000	66
TST	-0,076	0,546	66
WASO	0,242	0,051	66
SE	-,336 <sup>a</sup>	0,006	66
SOL <sup>np</sup>	,303 <sup>a</sup>	0,013	66
FI	0,064	0,608	66

- <sup>a</sup> Correlation is significant at 0,01 level (bilateral).  
<sup>b</sup> Correlation is significant at 0,05 level (bilateral).  
<sup>np</sup> indicate non parametric spearman correlation test