UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

Factors Related to Cancer Patients' Willingness to Participate in an iPod-based MBSR Intervention

Tessa Blevins¹, Chelsea Siwik, M.S.¹, and Sandra E. Sephton, Ph.D.^{1,2}

¹ Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, University of Louisville;² James Graham Brown Cancer Center, University of Louisville



MINDFUL BIO LAB



Coping (B-COPE)

status revealed a significant difference between groups (p = .05). Forty two percent of those who declined the intervention were actively receiving chemotherapy, while 80% of those who completed the intervention were not receiving chemotherapy at the time. No other significant group differences emerged. Secondary analyses revealed a significant difference in mean depression scores between patients who were receiving chemotherapy and patients who were not receiving chemotherapy (p = .018).

 To expand on this work among lung cancer patients, we explored demographic, medical, psychosocial, and biological factors related to patients' willingness to participate in a mobile MBSR intervention. 		 Secondary analyses revealed a s scores between patients actively 9.19) and those who were not (N .018. 	receiv receiv 1 = 12.	/ing chemo 89, SD = 9	nce in mea otherapy (N 9.35); t(56)	n depress I = 19.09, = -2.439,	sion SD = p =
METHODS		Table 2. Measures and One-wa	ay AN	'OVA resu	ılts.		
	_		df	SS	MS	F	р
Procedure		Demographics					
 Non-small cell lung cancer (NCSLC) patients (N =65) were recruited from the Brown Concer Conter during a scheduled enpointment with the assistance of 		Age at Diagnosis	0			0.400	
collaborating physicians			2	29.68	14.84	0.189	0.828
 Once eligible patients were screened and had provided informed consent, 		Gender†	-	-	-	-	-
participants reported on demographic and medical factors and provided a		Race/Ethnicity	2	3.384	1.692	1.699	0.194
blood draw for immune assessment.		Education	-				
 Participants were provided with materials and instructions for 10 days of at home collection of saliva for cortisol assessment, actionaphy data, and 			2	0.017	0.009	1.604	0.21
psychosocial factors.		Income	2	28.949	14.474	1.349	0.268
• Upon the return of the at home data collection materials, participants were re-		Pack Years	2	545 152	272 576	0 538	0 588
introduced to the intervention.		Medical	_	0.1011.07	2121010	01000	01000
 Willing participants were provided with an iPod containing a version of MBSR with cancer-specific content and a log to track listening behavior and were 							
instructed to listen for 30 minutes per day, five days per week.		Cancer Stage†	-	-	-	-	-
		Karnofsky Rating	2	179 25	89 625	0.365	0 696
Statistical Analyses		Psychosocial		170.20	00.020	0.000	0.000
 One-way ANOVAs and Chi-square tests were performed to explore demographic medical psychosocial and biological differences between 							
patients who declined participation. agreed to participate but did not complete		Positive Affect (PANAS)	2	16.514	8.257	0.11	0.896
the intervention, and completed the intervention on continuous and		Negative Affect (PANAS)	2	337 743	168 871	2 753	0 073
categorical variables, respectively.		Concer Chasifie Distract (IEC D)	۲			2.100	0.070
 Secondary t-tests were conducted to explore factors associated with active versus inactive treatment status 		Cancer-Specific Distress (IES-K)	2	220.224	110.112	0.506	0.606

• Given the opportunity to participate in a mobile MBSR intervention, NSCLC patients with flatter diurnal cortisol slopes were more likely to

CONCLUSIONS:

These results demonstrated statistically significant differences in diurnal cortisol slopes between NSCLC patients who opted to complete an MBSR intervention and those who declined to participate. These results suggest diurnal cortisol slope has a role in willingness to participate in an MBSR intervention, possibly due to the associated status of current chemotherapy treatment and related depressive symptoms, although more research is needed to clarify this relationship.

GRANT SUPPORT:

NCI R25 grant support University of Louisville Cancer Education Program NIH/NCI (R25-CA134283).

Table 1 Patient	Dem	oaranhi	c and N	Aedical C	haract	eristics			Denial	2	0.023	0.011
	De	eclined	Agree	d/Did Not	Ag	reed/		Total	Behavioral Disengagement	2	0.039	0.02
	Part	icipation	Cor	mplete	Com	pleted		ισιαι	Mindfulness (FFMQ)	2	204.576	102.288
<u>N</u>	20	30.8%	19	29.2%	26	40.0%	67	100.0%	Optimism (LOT-R)	2	0.598	0.299
<u>Gender</u>									Fatigue (FSI)	2	509.351	254.676
Male	6	10.0%	6	10.0%	7	11.7%	19	31.7%	Anxiety (GAD-7)	2	16.303	8.151
Female	9	15.0%	13	21.7%	19	31.7%	41	68.4%	Depressive Symptoms (CES-D)	2	57.085	28.542
Race/Ethnicity									Symptom Distress (SDS)	2	20.366	10 183
White	8	17.8%	11	24.4%	15	33.3%	34	75.5%	Adjustment (MINI-MAC)	Ľ	20.000	10.100
Black or African American	3	6.7%	3	6.7%	2	4.4%	8	17.8%	Helplessness/Hopelessness	0	0.050	0.00
Hispanic or Latino	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.2%	1	2.2%	Anxious Preoccupation	2	0.059	0.03
Asian or Asian	4		0	0.00/	0	0.00/	4	0.00/		2	0.203	0.101
American Other	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.2%	Cognitive Avoidance	2	0.439	0.22
Other	0	0.078	I	∠. ∠ /0	0	0.078	I	2.270	Fatalism	2	1.192	0.596
<u>Stage</u>									Health Behavior (HPLP-II)	2	0.22	0.011
 	4	6.2%	6	9.2%	4	6.2%	14	21.6%	<u>Biological</u>			
11	1 7	1.5%	2	3.1%	4	6.2%	ן רס	10.8%	Actioraphy			
IV	7 8	10.0%	1	15.4%	7	10.9%	20 16	43.1 <i>%</i> 24.6%	, long april			
Early stage	5	7.7%	8	12.3%	8	12.3%	23	32.3%	Daytime Sedentariness	2	0.031	0.015
Late stage	15	23.1%	11	16.9%	18	27.7%	44	67.7%	Nighttime Restfulness	2	0.242	0.121
									Rest/Activity Rhythm	2	0.012	0.006
Annual Household Income									Salivary Cortisol			
< \$15,000 -				• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				-	Diurnal Cortisol Mean	2	0.634	0.317
\$49,999 \$50 000 -	11	20.8%	13	24.6%	14	26.4%	38	/1.8%	Diurnal Cortisol Slope	2	0.037	0.018
\$149,999	2	3.8%	4	7.6%	8	15.1%	14	26.5%	Immune Markers			
\$150,000- \$249,999	1	1 9%	0	0.0%	1	1 9%	2	3.8%		2	2 809	1 404
Ψ2 10,000	•	1.070	0	0.070	·	1.070		0.070		2	2.000	4.005
Active Treatment									IL12	2	3.81	1.905
<u>Status:</u> Chemo currently									IL13	2	2.212	1.106
Yes	6	10.5%	10	17.5%	5	8.8%	21	36.8%	ll17a	2	1.174	0.587
No	8	14.0%	8	14.0%	20	35.1%	36	63.1%	IL1b	2	2.593	1.297
Radiation									IL5	2	3.838	1.919
Yes	0	0.0%	2	3.4%	1	1.7%	3	5.1%	IL6	2	2.339	1.17
No	14	24.1%	_ 16	27.6%	25	43.1%	55	94.8%	11 7	2	በ 821	በ

Denial	2	0.023	0.011	0.319	0.729	
Behavioral Disengagement	2	0.039	0.02	0.799	0.455	
Mindfulness (FFMQ)	2	204.576	102.288	0.581	0.563	
Optimism (LOT-R)	2	0.598	0.299	0.016	0.984	
Fatigue (FSI)	2	509.351	254.676	0.305	0.738	
Anxiety (GAD-7)	2	16.303	8.151	0.351	0.705	
Depressive Symptoms (CES-D)	2	57.085	28.542	0.278	0.758	
Symptom Distress (SDS)	2	20.366	10.183	0.225	0.8	
Adjustment (MINI-MAC)						
Helplessness/Hopelessness	2	0.059	0.03	0.139	0.87	
Anxious Preoccupation	2	0.203	0.101	0.203	0.817	
Cognitive Avoidance	2	0.439	0.22	0.399	0.673	
Fatalism	2	1.192	0.596	1.979	0.148	
Health Behavior (HPLP-II)	2	0 22	0.011	0.06	0 942	
<u>Biological</u>	L	0.22	0.011	0.00	01012	
Actigraphy						
Davtime Sedentariness	2	0 031	0.015	0.159	0 854	
Nighttime Restfulness	2	0 242	0 121	1 006	0.373	
Rest/Activity Rhythm	2	0.012	0.006	1.358	0 267	
Salivary Cortisol		0.012	0.000	1.000	0.201	
Calivary Collison						
Diurnal Cortisol Mean	2	0.634	0.317	1.383	0.26	

3.547

1.330

2.22

0.669

0.952

1.318

1.41

1.206

0.647

0.037*

0.273

0.12

0.518

0.393

0.277

0.289

0.309

0.528

decline, whereas patients with steeper diurnal cortisol slopes were more likely to complete the intervention.

 Further, patients actively receiving chemotherapy during study enrollment were more likely to decline the intervention and were significantly more depressed than those who were not receiving chemotherapy.

• Interestingly, no other factor tested differentiated intervention group status.

• These results suggest diurnal cortisol profiles may play a role in patients' willingness to participate in mobile MBI's, particularly during chemotherapy when greater depressive symptoms were reported. • Dysregulated cortisol profiles are reflective of poor neuroendocrine function⁶, have been strongly linked to depression⁷, and are prognostic of shorter survival in lung cancer⁸.

• Thus, it seems diurnal cortisol profiles may be more strongly related to psychosocial behavior, including willingness to engage in supplementary interventions than indicators of physical or psychological health individually.

 Although chemotherapy poses significant physical and psychological challenges for the patient, these data suggest patients may be too burdened during active treatment to engage in supplementary stressreduction interventions, even when the intervention is mobile.

• Future research should test the benefits of MBI's with respect to diurnal cortisol slope regulation as well as other physical and psychological symptom alleviation, including depression, among patients who are both receiving and not receiving chemotherapy.

RE	FER	EN	CES

Shigaki, C. L., Glass, B., & Schopp, L. H. (2006). Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction in Medical Settings. Journal of Clinical Psychology
<i>in Medical Settings,13</i> (3), 209-216. doi:10.1007/s10880-006-9033-8
Lengacher C. A. Reich R. R. Ramesar, S. Alinat C. B. Moscoso, M. Cousin, J. Park, J. Y. (2017). Feasibility of the mobile

ess reduction for breast cancer (mMBSR(BC)) program for symptom improvement among breast cancer survivors. *Psycho-Oncology*,27(2), 524-531. doi:10.1002/pon.4491

Emmerik, A. A., Berings, F., & Lancee, J. (2017). Efficacy of a Mindfulness-Based Mobile Application: A Randomized Waiting-List Controlled Trial. *Mindfulness*, 9(1), 187-198. doi:10.1007/s12671-017-0761-7 4. Ledesma, D., & Kumano, H. (2009). Mindfulness-based stress reduction and cancer: A meta-analysis. *Psycho-Oncology, 18*(6), 571-579. doi:10.1002/pon.1400 Würtzen, H., Dalton, S. O., Andersen, K. K., Elsass, P., Flyger, H. L., Sumbundu, A., & Johansen, C. (2012). Who participates in a randomized trial of mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) after breast cancer? A study of factors associated with enrollment among Danish breast cancer patients. *Psycho-Oncology*,22(5), 1180-1185. doi:10.1002/pon.3094 Hellhammer, D. H., Wüst, S., & Kudielka, B. M. (2009). Salivary cortisol as a biomarker in stress research. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 34(2), 163-171 Ising, M., Horstmann, S., Kloiber, S., Lucae, S., Binder, E. B., Kern, N., ... & Holsboer, F. (2007). Combined dexamethasone/corticotropin releasing hormone test predicts treatment response in major depression-a potential biomarker?. Biological psychiatry, 62(1), 47-54. Sephton, S. E., Lush, E., Dedert, E. A., Floyd, A. R., Rebholz, W. N., Dhabhar, F. S., ... & Salmon, P. (2013). Diurnal cortisol rhythm as a predictor of lung cancer survival. Brain, behavior, and immunity, 30, S163-S170.

CONTACT

Sandra E. Sephton Mindfulness and Biobehavioral Health Research Laboratory sephton@louisville.edu (502) 852-1166

 NCI R25 grant support University of Louisville Cancer Education Program NIH/NCI (R25- CA134283)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

• Grant Funding - Kentucky Lung Cancer Research Grant GB140436

*= significant at p<.05 \uparrow = dichotomous variable, tested with χ^2