

1 **Post-Exertional Malaise in People with Chronic Cancer-Related Fatigue**

2

3 Rosie Twomey Ph.D.¹, Samuel T. Yeung¹, James G. Wrightson Ph.D.², Guillaume Y. Millet
4 Ph.D.^{1,3}, S. Nicole Culos-Reed Ph.D.^{1,4,5}

5 ¹Faculty of Kinesiology, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada; ²Department of Clinical
6 Neurosciences, University of Calgary, Canada; ³Univ Lyon, UJM Saint-Etienne, Inter-
7 university Laboratory of Human Movement Biology, EA 7424, F-42023, Saint-Etienne,
8 France; ⁴Department of Oncology, Cumming School of Medicine, Calgary, Canada;
9 ⁵Department of Psychosocial Resources, Tom Baker Cancer Centre, Alberta Health Services,
10 Calgary, Canada

11

12 Corresponding Author:

13 Rosie Twomey, Ph.D.

14 Faculty of Kinesiology, University of Calgary, 2500 University Dr. NW, Calgary, Alberta,
15 T2N 1N4, Canada

16 T: +1 403-210-8688

17 F: +1 403-289-9117

18 Email: Rosemary.Twomey@ucalgary.ca

19 **Abstract**

20 **Context:** Cancer-related fatigue (CRF) is a distressing and persistent sense of tiredness or
21 exhaustion that interferes with usual functioning. Chronic CRF continues for months after
22 curative cancer treatment is complete. Post-exertional malaise (PEM) is a worsening of
23 symptoms after physical or mental activity, with limited investigations in people with chronic
24 CRF.

25 **Objectives:** The purpose of this study was to identify and describe self-reported incidences of
26 PEM in people with chronic CRF.

27 **Methods:** Participants ($n=18$) were eligible if they scored ≤ 34 on the Functional Assessment
28 of Chronic Illness Therapy-Fatigue scale and had a cancer-related onset of fatigue. Participants
29 completed a brief questionnaire to assess PEM over a 6-month time-frame (the DePaul
30 Symptom Questionnaire – Post-Exertional Malaise; DSQ-PEM). In addition, a maximal
31 exercise test was used to investigate self-reported symptom exacerbation (via an open-ended
32 questionnaire) after strenuous physical exertion.

33 **Results:** On the DSQ-PEM, three participants met previously defined scoring criteria, which
34 included experiencing moderate to very severe symptoms at least half of the time, worsening
35 of fatigue after minimal effort, plus a recovery duration of >24 h. Content analysis of responses
36 to open-ended questionnaires identified five people who experienced a delayed recovery and
37 symptoms of PEM after maximal exercise.

38 **Conclusion:** A subset of people with chronic CRF (up to 33% in this sample) may experience
39 PEM. Exercise specialists and health care professionals working with people with chronic CRF
40 must be aware that PEM may be an issue. Symptom exacerbation after exercise should be
41 monitored, and exercise should be tailored and adapted to limit the potential for harm.

42 **Abstract word count:** 254

43 **Keywords:** exercise oncology; maximal exercise test; cancer rehabilitation

44 **Key message:** This study provides preliminary evidence that a subset of people with chronic
45 cancer-related fatigue experience post-exertional malaise.

46 **Introduction**

47 Cancer-related fatigue (CRF) has been defined as a distressing, persistent sense of physical,
48 emotional, and/or cognitive tiredness or exhaustion that is not proportional to recent activity
49 and interferes with usual functioning [1]. The majority of people with cancer will experience
50 CRF during active treatment, but this will resolve in the weeks after treatment. However, 20-
51 30% of people will continue to experience CRF for months or years following treatment [2–4],
52 Variations in estimates of prevalence may reflect variability in how CRF is defined and
53 measured [2–4]. Many studies do not account for the time since cancer treatment or fatigue
54 onset, meaning both transient and chronic fatigue states may be included in estimates of
55 prevalence. Although estimates of prevalence can be high, in general, there is a natural history
56 of improvement over time, as shown in prospective longitudinal studies where CRF is
57 medically unexplained (i.e., not attributable to comorbidities or other factors). For example, in
58 women treated for early-stage breast cancer, a continuous fatigue state was only present in 11%
59 6-months after treatment [5]. However, in a similar study in people treated for various
60 malignancies, 22% had persistent and severe fatigue 1-year after curative cancer treatment [3].
61 Furthermore, higher fatigue at least 2-months after treatment predicted persistent fatigue 1-year
62 after treatment [3]. CRF that continues for months or years has been called chronic CRF [4] or
63 post-cancer fatigue [6]. Although there is no strict consensus on when CRF can be described
64 as chronic, we and other research groups [6,7] define chronic CRF/post-cancer fatigue as
65 clinically-relevant CRF that continues for ≥ 3 months after the completion of cancer treatment.

66
67 CRF is assessed as a patient-reported outcome, and there are psychometric tools used for both
68 routine screening [8], and the assessment of CRF severity [9]. Evidence-based guidelines for
69 the screening, assessment and treatment of CRF have been developed, including pan-Canadian
70 practice guidelines for clinical use [8,10]. In addition, there are consensus-developed
71 diagnostic criteria for CRF, as proposed for the International Statistical Classification of
72 Diseases and Related Health Problems, 10th revision (ICD-10) in 1998 [11]. The proposed
73 ICD-10 criteria specify that six or more symptoms must have been present every day or nearly
74 every day during the same two-week period over the past month, and at least one symptom
75 must be “significant fatigue.” Previous qualitative data have been interpreted as consistent with
76 various descriptors in the ICD-10 case definition of CRF, including an excessive fatigue state,
77 protracted in course, in relation to relatively limited physical activity [12]. Alongside items
78 such as “perceived need to struggle to overcome inactivity” and “difficulty completing daily
79 tasks attributed to feeling fatigued,” “post-exertional malaise (PEM) lasting several hours” is

Running Title: PEM in Chronic CRF

80 also included in the ICD-10 criteria [11]. However, PEM has not been defined in the context
81 of CRF, and is only vaguely addressed in the accompanying diagnostic interview guide, where
82 the related question is: “Did you find yourself feeling sick or unwell for several hours after you
83 had done something that took some effort?” [11].

84
85 PEM is a cardinal symptom of a separate and serious long-term illness called myalgic
86 encephalitis and/or chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS) [13]. In ME/CFS, PEM is described
87 by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) as a worsening of symptoms after
88 physical or mental activity that would not have caused a problem before illness [13]. PEM in
89 ME/CFS has also been described as a constellation of extensively disabling signs and
90 symptoms in response to exertion [14]. Historically, there has been difficulty in defining and
91 measuring PEM (see [15,16] for more information), but for the purposes of this study, PEM
92 will be used to denote concepts related to post-exertional symptom exacerbation [15].

93
94 The chronic nature of CRF in some cancer survivors has led to a comparison with ME/CFS
95 [12]. Exercise appears to exert a moderate effect on fatigue in people with CFS in the short
96 term [17]. However, following a reanalysis of an influential study [18,19] and subsequent
97 controversy [20,21], the CDC no longer recommends graded exercise (progressive aerobic
98 activity) as a recommended therapy in ME/CFS [14]. However, in people living with and
99 beyond cancer, exercise (including moderate-vigorous exercise) is considered a safe and
100 effective intervention to counteract the adverse physical and psychological effects of cancer
101 and its treatment [22,23], including CRF (e.g. [24]). Considering inadequate reporting of
102 adverse reactions to exercise in previous studies of ME/CFS [17,25], and the lack of data on
103 PEM in people with chronic CRF, caution may be warranted. PEM is inadequately documented
104 in the literature on chronic CRF and requires further investigation considering the potential
105 implications for exercise prescription. The purpose of this study was to identify and describe
106 self-reported incidences of PEM in a group of people with chronic CRF. Despite the inclusion
107 of “PEM lasting several hours” in the proposed ICD-10 criteria for CRF [6], to our knowledge,
108 this is the first attempt to measure PEM in people with chronic CRF.

109

110 **Methods**

111 *Participants*

112 Participants were recruited as part of an ongoing prospective randomized controlled trial
113 (ClinicalTrials.gov, NCT03049384 and [26]). The purpose of the RCT is to investigate the

114 effect of a tailored versus traditional 12-week exercise intervention on fatigue severity in
115 people with chronic CRF after cancer treatment. Participants were eligible if they were aged
116 18-75 years and had completed curative-intent cancer treatment (≥ 3 months and ≤ 5 years from
117 enrolment), self-identified as feeling fatigued/tired, and self-identified that the fatigue/tiredness
118 developed at any point during the course of the disease (e.g. during the treatment phase) and
119 had not resolved. Furthermore, participants were eligible if they scored ≤ 34 [27] on the
120 Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy Fatigue Scale (FACIT-F) [28]. The FACIT-
121 F is widely recommended for the assessment of CRF severity [9], has a cut-off point (≤ 34) that
122 correctly identifies over 90% of 'ICD-10 positive' cases, and has been recommended for the
123 diagnosis of CRF [27]. Based on these eligibility criteria, all participants in the larger study
124 were considered to have chronic CRF. Participants were excluded if they had a contraindication
125 to experimental procedures and/or exercise. Additional inclusion and exclusion criteria have
126 been reported previously, and include exclusion for sleep apnea or anemia [26]. A medical
127 history was taken to account for conditions that may explain/contribute to fatigue. No
128 participants in the present study had a diagnosis of hypothyroidism or were experiencing a
129 major depressive episode. Written informed consent for all study procedures was obtained.
130 This study was approved by the Health Research Ethics Board of Alberta Cancer Committee
131 (HREBA.CC-16-10-10) and was performed according to the Declaration of Helsinki.

132

133 *Laboratory Visit*

134 Full details of the wider project have been reported elsewhere [26]. The data for this sub-study
135 were collected during and after an initial visit to the laboratory, previously described as Lab
136 Visit #1 [26]. Participants completed a Physical Activity Readiness Questionnaire for Everyone
137 (PAR-Q+) and were also screened for arrhythmia and hypertension, determined during resting
138 electrocardiography and blood pressure measurements, respectively. Continuation with the
139 study was conditional on the screening process, and physician approval was sought at this stage
140 where required. Otherwise, participants were cleared for participation by a Certified Exercise
141 Physiologist (Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology). Details of the maximal exercise test
142 protocol have been reported in detail elsewhere [26]. Data collected during the test and used
143 for the main study (e.g. peak oxygen uptake, heart rate, rating of perceived exertion (RPE) and
144 blood lactate) is reported for the purpose of characterizing the test and describing the sub-study
145 participants. Borg's RPE scale (6-20) [29] was administered according to published
146 instructions [30].

147

Running Title: PEM in Chronic CRF

148 *Measurement of Post-Exertional Malaise*

149 Before the exercise test, participants completed a brief questionnaire to assess PEM over a 6-
150 month time-frame (the DePaul Symptom Questionnaire – Post-Exertional Malaise; DSQ-PEM)
151 [31,32]. The first five items (Table 2) were recommended by the National Institutes of
152 Health/Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Common Data Elements (CDE) PEM
153 working group [33] and five supplementary items (including symptom duration, see Table 2)
154 were designed to operationalize the CDE recommendations [23] further. To gain a
155 comprehensive understanding of the participant experience, an open-ended questionnaire was
156 provided (hard copy or via email, participant preference), and participants were instructed to
157 complete this 96 h after the exercise test. This accounted for the potential for prolonged adverse
158 responses as reported in people with ME/CFS [34–36], while also limiting the requirement for
159 recall. The open-ended questionnaire was designed based on a review of the literature on PEM
160 in ME/CFS (e.g. [12,15,34,37]) and is available online (<https://osf.io/nygq5/>).

161

162 *Data Analysis*

163 For the DSQ-PEM, items 1-5 were scored according to Cotler *et al.* [31], i.e., a frequency score
164 of ≥ 2 (i.e., “about half the time” or more frequently) in combination with a severity score of
165 ≥ 2 (i.e. “moderate” severity or more severe) was considered relevant. Items 6-10 are considered
166 supplementary but were also scored according to Cotler *et al.* [31].

167 The open-ended questionnaires were analyzed with qualitative content analysis [38]. The
168 written responses were de-identified, and two authors independently read all responses several
169 times in order to become familiarized with the data. Responses were assigned codes according
170 to a classification scheme that was developed using (i) the questions on the open-ended
171 questionnaire/knowledge about PEM (e.g. experience of worsening of fatigue) and (ii)
172 recurrent responses that arose from the data (e.g. the need to nap). Responses were then coded
173 independently, and an agreement was reached on all items. Coded responses were then counted
174 and summarized descriptively.

175

176 **Results**

177 Of 18 participants (14 female), two did not complete the DSQ-PEM (missing data), and another
178 completed the exercise test but did not complete the open-ended questionnaire (due to food
179 poisoning). Participant characteristics and parameters related to the maximal exercise test are
180 presented in Table 1.

181 **Table 1.** Participant Characteristics and the Maximal Exercise Test. Participant characteristics
 182 by group. Group A, participants not meeting objective criteria for the DSQ-PEM and not
 183 describing PEM in the open-ended questionnaire; Group B, participants meeting objective
 184 criteria for the DSQ-PEM and/or describing PEM in the open-ended questionnaire.

	All participants (n = 18)	Group A (n = 12)	Group B: PEM (n = 6)
Age, mean ± SD	51 ± 15	47 ± 16	60 ± 7
Sex			
Male, n (%)	4 (22.2)	2 (16.7)	2 (33.3)
Female, n (%)	14 (77.8)	10 (83.3)	4 (66.7)
Height (cm), mean ± SD	169 ± 10	170 ± 10	166 ± 11
Body Mass (kg), mean ± SD	80.0 ± 17.1	76.8 ± 13.4	86.3 ± 22.9
Fatigue Score (FACIT-F), mean ± SD	23 ± 8	25 ± 7	19 ± 8
Months Since Treatment*, mean ± SD	22 ± 14	25 ± 16	17 ± 10
Cancer Type			
Breast, n (%)	9 (50)	5 (41.7)	4 (33.3)
Hodgkin's Lymphoma, n (%)	2 (11.1)	2 (16.7)	-
Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma, n (%)	3 (16.7)	2 (16.7)	1 (16.7)
Prostate, n (%)	1 (5.6)	-	1 (16.7)
Myelodysplastic Syndrome (Leukaemia), n (%)	1 (5.6)	1 (8.3)	-
Thyroid, n (%)	1 (5.6)	1 (8.3)	-
Oligodendroglioma, n (%)	1 (5.6)	1 (8.3)	-
Cancer Stage			
I	5 (28)	2 (17)	3 (50)
II	5 (28)	3 (25)	2 (33)
III	4 (22)	4 (33)	-
IV	2 (11)	2 (17)	-
Unknown	2 (11)	1 (8)	1 (17)
Treatment Received			
Surgery, n (%)	13 (72.2)	8 (66.7)	5 (83.3)
Chemotherapy, n (%)	11 (61.1)	8 (66.7)	3 (33.3)
Radiation Therapy, n (%)	11 (61.1)	7 (58.3)	4 (66.7)
Hormonal Therapy (completed), n (%)	2 (22.2)	5 (41.7)	3 (50)
Hormonal Therapy (ongoing), n (%)	6 (33.3)	5 (41.7)	1 (16.7)
Stem Cell Transplant, n (%)	3 (11.2)	2 (16.7)	1 (16.7)
Maximal Exercise Test			
Peak Oxygen Uptake (L·min ⁻¹)	1.78 ± 0.43	1.78 ± 0.41	1.76 ± 0.52
Peak Oxygen Uptake (mL·kg ⁻¹ ·min ⁻¹)	22.6 ± 4.8	23.6 ± 5.1	20.5 ± 3.4
End-Exercise Rating of Perceived Exertion (6-20), median [IQR]	19 [17-19]	18 [17-19]	18 [16-20]
Maximal Heart Rate (bpm)	157 ± 18	162 ± 21	152 ± 10
Percentage of Age Predicted Maximal Heart Rate (%)	92 ± 8	92 ± 10	92 ± 5
End-Exercise Blood Lactate (mmol/L)	7.2 ± 2.4	7.0 ± 2.8	7.5 ± 1.2
Exercise Time (min)	9.9 ± 1.6	9.8 ± 1.5	10.1 ± 2.0
Peak Power Output (W)	119 ± 33	122 ± 34	114 ± 32

185 Months since treatment completion was calculated as the time between the most recent (i.e. last) surgery,
 186 chemotherapy treatment, radiation treatment or stem cell transplant (as relevant) and the date of the lab visit. The
 187 most recent treatment was also the final scheduled cancer treatment (with the exception of hormonal therapy).

188 *DSQ-PEM*

189 In this sample of people with chronic CRF, 50% of respondents indicated that they experienced
 190 at least one of the first 5 items (see Table 2) at least half time at a moderate or greater severity.
 191 A sub-set of participants (4/16) indicated that they feel worse after activities for >24 h, and
 192 5/16 indicated that they do not exercise because exercise makes their symptoms worse. In order
 193 to apply previously defined criteria to help identify participants for whom PEM could be an
 194 issue, all scoring steps recommended by Cotler *et al* [31] were used to identify people who
 195 scored ≥ 2 for frequency and severity for any item from 1-5, plus answered “Yes” to item 7 or
 196 8, plus gave a response of >14 h for item 9. Three people in this sample (19%) met these criteria
 197 (and all three answered ≥ 2 for frequency and severity on all items from 1-5, answered yes for
 198 both items 7 and 8, and gave a response of >24 h for item 9).

199

200 **Table 2.** DSQ-PEM responses.

DSQ-PEM Item	Response	n (%)
1. Dead, heavy feeling after starting to exercise	Frequency ≥ 2 and Severity ≥ 2 *	5 (31)
2. Next day soreness or fatigue after non-strenuous, everyday activities	Frequency ≥ 2 and Severity ≥ 2 *	7 (39)
3. Mentally tired after the slightest effort	Frequency ≥ 2 and Severity ≥ 2 *	6 (33)
4. Minimum exercise makes you physically tired	Frequency ≥ 2 and Severity ≥ 2 *	7 (39)
5. Physically drained or sick after mild activity	Frequency ≥ 2 and Severity ≥ 2 *	5 (31)
Frequency ≥ 2 and Severity ≥ 2 for <i>at least 1</i> of the above items		9 (50)
Frequency ≥ 2 and Severity ≥ 2 for <i>all</i> of the above items		4 (22)
6. If you were to become exhausted after actively participating in extracurricular activities, sports, or outings with friends, would you recover within an hour or two after the activity ended?	No	8 (44)
7. Do you experience a worsening of your fatigue/energy related illness after engaging in minimal physical effort?	Yes	7 (39)
8. Do you experience a worsening of your fatigue/energy related illness after engaging in mental effort?	Yes	12 (67)
9. If you feel worse after activities, how long does this last?	>24 h	4 (22)
10. If you do not exercise, is it because exercise makes your symptoms worse?	Yes	5 (31)

201

202 *Frequency = “how often you have had this symptom” and a score of ≥ 2 (2-4) ranges from “about half the time”
 203 to “all of the time.” Severity = “how much has this symptom bothered you,” and a score ≥ 2 (2-4) ranges from
 204 “moderate” to “very severe.”

205

206

207 *Open-Ended Questionnaire*

208 There were 12 codes used for the content analysis: (1) worsening of fatigue; (2)
209 duration/recovery time; (3) change in routine; (4) reduced daily activities; (5) muscle soreness;
210 (6) weakness (7) joint pain; (8) mood; (9) memory/concentration; (10) need to nap or lie down;
211 (11) flu-like symptoms; (12) positive comments on exercise/the test. A narrative synthesis of
212 codes with illustrative quotes is provided below. Overall, we identified five participants (29%
213 of this sample) who described PEM on the open-ended questionnaire. Specifically, these
214 participants indicated that they experienced worsening of fatigue, plus had to change routine
215 or reduce daily activities, plus had to nap or lie down, plus experienced ≥ 3 other symptoms
216 (including muscle soreness, weakness, joint pain, mood disturbance, memory/concentration or
217 flu-like symptoms), plus had a delayed recovery of >2 days.

218

219 Of 17 participants, 13 reported a worsening of fatigue after the exercise test. Responses ranged
220 from mild, e.g. *“Felt a little more tired the day after the lab visit”* to more severe, e.g. *“I was*
221 *thoroughly exhausted.”* Of the 13 participants who experienced worsening of fatigue, seven
222 participants had to reduce their daily activities, and six had to change their routines or plans as
223 a result of how they felt after the exercise test. This ranged from relatively mild: *“The only*
224 *change was lying down in the morning, which is unusual for me. Typically, I get through the*
225 *morning and rest in some way after lunch.”* To more severe *“The next day I stayed in bed most*
226 *of the day and evening. Unable to walk the dog for two days. On the third day, I cancelled a*
227 *‘coffee date’ with a friend.”* In an item that arose from the data, six people noted that they need
228 to nap or lie down later on the same day of the test and/or in the following days, e.g. *“I lay*
229 *down all 4 afternoons for a rest. I don't usually do that”*. Interestingly, in response to a question
230 on the need to change plans or reduce activities, one participant answered, *“No. I anticipated*
231 *the fatigue”*, indicating that they expected increased fatigue (specifically, the day after the
232 exercise test) and had planned accordingly. Also of note, is one participant who did not need
233 to change their routine because their routine is already reduced/disrupted by the fluctuation and
234 unpredictable nature of their fatigue: *“I don't usually plan anything because I don't know how*
235 *I'm going to feel especially next day, [I] only plan day to day.”*

236

237 It was difficult to obtain clear information on how long it took for participants fatigue to return
238 to ‘usual’ or ‘normal,’ partly because some people were unsure about their ‘usual’ or ‘normal,’
239 e.g. in the case of someone who only felt more tired later on the day of the test, they also
240 commented: *“I don't know what is abnormal for me, as things are variable.”* Another

241 confounder was that three participants were unsure whether to attribute increased fatigue to the
242 test, or to other activities that were perceived as strenuous that occurred within the data
243 collection period, specifically, e.g. “*more activities with family,*” and “*more stairs than usual.*”
244 Nevertheless, of the 12 people who indicated worse fatigue, two participants only experienced
245 this on the day of the test, seven returned to typical levels within 1-3 days, e.g. “*Back to normal*
246 *after the two days had passed.*” and four were unsure if they had recovered by 96 h (when the
247 questionnaire was completed), e.g. “*Each evening, I seemed to be so tired that I couldn’t do*
248 *my normal activities (research on family history). I didn’t have the energy or ability to*
249 *concentrate. I don’t know if I have recovered that yet because I have very little energy left by*
250 *evening.*”

251
252 Of 17 participants, 11 experienced muscle soreness after the test, localized to the legs and
253 mainly attributed to cycling in all but one participant, e.g. “*The pain was just mild muscle pain*
254 *that a person feels after working muscles more than usual.*” Four people experienced joint pain,
255 and five people referred to weakness. In one person, this was prolonged: “*The weakness was*
256 *extreme and lasted in its worst state for days 3 and 4.*” Seven people experienced changes in
257 mood, and seven people had worse memory/concentration, e.g. “*First day, I had significant*
258 *problems with my short-term memory and concentration.*” It is also noteworthy that one of the
259 participants who did not report worsening of memory and concentration compared to ‘normal’
260 stated that they “*never feel normal,*” referring to ongoing issues with memory and
261 concentration since cancer treatment. Five people experienced flu-like symptoms (e.g. “*chills,*
262 *cold, body wet, and very sore*” and “*I felt generalized aching throughout my body, like the*
263 *flu.*”). Finally, in the additional comments, four participants self-reported feeling better after
264 exercise in general, e.g. “*Usually feel better after exercise*” or after the test, e.g. “*I think in the*
265 *afternoon I felt invigorated and then the next two days quite a bit more tired,*” and two people
266 commented on the test itself, e.g. “*I felt very supported and safe throughout the test.*”

267

268 *Overlap Between the DSQ-PEM and Open-Ended Questionnaire*

269 In this sample, up to 33% of participants were identified as potentially experiencing PEM (i.e.
270 met the previously defined criteria for the DSQ-PEM and/or described PEM in the open-ended
271 questionnaire, Table 1). Two of the five participants who described PEM in their responses to
272 the open-ended questionnaire also met the DSQ-PEM criteria. Of the remaining three
273 participants, one did not complete the DSQ-PEM (missing data); a second met all DSQ-PEM
274 criteria except they answered “No” to items 7 and 8 which refer to minimal effort; and the third

Running Title: PEM in Chronic CRF

275 indicated “next day soreness or fatigue after non-strenuous, everyday activities” of a moderate
276 severity about half the time and “minimum exercise makes you physically tired” at 2 (“severe”
277 but only “a little of the time”), plus “yes” to items 7 and 10 (experience a worsening of fatigue
278 after engaging in minimal physical effort, and do not exercise because it makes their symptoms
279 worse). Although these latter two participants did not meet all scoring criteria for the DSQ-
280 PEM, PEM does seem to be an issue above a certain intensity (i.e., above minimal), possibly
281 explaining why the open-ended questionnaire identified these participants when the DSQ-PEM
282 did not. Finally, the DSQ-PEM identified one participant who was not identified from the open-
283 ended questionnaire. This participant did report increased fatigue for 2-3 days after the exercise
284 test but also noted, “*I like exercise. I like feeling strong. Like I am working toward health*”.
285 However, considering our experience of their later participation in the RCT, it is our clinical
286 judgement that PEM was an issue for them (which also prevented returning to work).

287

288 **Discussion**

289 The purpose of this study was to investigate self-reported incidences of PEM in people with
290 chronic CRF. Our results provide preliminary evidence that a subset (up to 33% in this sample,
291 a possible 6/18 participants) of people with chronic CRF experience symptoms of PEM. These
292 findings must be replicated/extended in larger and more diverse samples of people with chronic
293 CRF. Nevertheless, this finding has potential implications for exercise professionals working
294 with people experiencing chronic CRF. We recommend that CRF is monitored throughout an
295 exercise program (including asking people about their symptoms between individual exercise
296 sessions, and after increases in, e.g. exercise intensity - with an awareness that symptom onset
297 may vary and may be delayed) and that trials involving people with chronic CRF report this
298 patient-level data to facilitate the understanding of PEM in this context, and therefore help
299 mitigate the potential for harm.

300

301 Content analysis of open-ended questionnaires delivered 96 h after a maximal exercise test
302 provided evidence of a constellation of symptoms, change in routine/plans, and duration of
303 recovery in people experiencing chronic CRF. Although many participants experienced a
304 worsening of fatigue, based on each participant’s profile of responses, and with particular
305 consideration of the severity of symptoms and duration of their recovery, we identified five
306 people whose descriptions were consistent with PEM. Despite qualitative comparisons
307 between chronic CRF and ME/CFS [12,39] and the inclusion of “PEM lasting several hours”
308 in the proposed ICD-10 criteria for CRF [11], to our knowledge, this is the first post-exercise

309 symptom characterization reported in people experiencing chronic CRF. A number of previous
310 studies have used maximal exercise tests to investigate the effects of physical exertion on
311 ME/CFS symptoms (e.g. [34–36]). For example, prolonged adverse responses to maximal
312 exercise tests are common in women with CFS (96% took >2 days to recover) and largely
313 absent in a sedentary control group (where 87% indicated full recovery within 24 h and 100%
314 by 2 days) [34]. Although a maximal exercise test may be more strenuous than a typical
315 exercise session performed in line with the updated international exercise guidelines for cancer
316 survivors [23], the DSQ-PEM asks questions relating to minimal physical effort and non-
317 strenuous, everyday activities. Thus, we do not know what level of exertion provokes PEM in
318 people with chronic CRF. In people with ME/CFS, low-intensity walking [40], moderate-
319 intensity continuous training and high-intensity interval training exacerbate fatigue [41].

320

321 The current study was conceived due to the need to reduce exercise intensity and carefully
322 monitor symptom exacerbation in some participants with chronic CRF in an ongoing exercise
323 trial [26]. In that trial, three participants described overwhelming exhaustion between exercise
324 sessions; therefore, little to no progression in exercise intensity or duration was made. These
325 anecdotal descriptions are in line with recent qualitative data from Penner *et al.* [42], where
326 fatigue was described not only as a chronic experience of imbalance but as involving “energy
327 crashes” that forced participants to “radically reshape their day-to-day lives.” In ME/CFS, one
328 approach that is recommended as part of a tailored and multicomponent intervention is activity
329 pacing. Activity pacing is a self-management strategy that encourages the individual to be as
330 active as possible but to rest or switch activities in response to internal cues, in order to avoid
331 marked exacerbations of symptoms (for a review, see [43]). One study added activity pacing
332 as part of a multicomponent intervention (including graded exercise therapy) in chronic CRF,
333 and 32% of participants had a clinically-significant improvement in fatigue [6]. Activity pacing
334 may be beneficial for individuals with chronic CRF, not only in relation to exercise but for the
335 management of day-to-day activities.

336

337 In this study, 33% of participants indicated that they became “mentally tired after the slightest
338 effort” (DSQ-PEM, Table 2). This is in line with previous findings, and cognitive symptoms
339 reported in people with chronic CRF may be indistinguishable from those reported in people
340 with ME/CFS [39,44]. Furthermore, after the exercise test, some symptom exacerbation was
341 cognitive in nature, i.e. impaired concentration or short-term memory. This is also in line with
342 previous research in ME/CFS (e.g.[35,45]). Considering that not only physical, but also

Running Title: PEM in Chronic CRF

343 cognitive exertion can result in PEM in people with ME/CFS [16,35], it is possible that this
344 could also be the case in a subset of people with chronic CRF.

345

346 Although commentary about individuals in this study is anecdotal, it is important to
347 communicate about individual profiles to minimize the potential for harm. Clearly, nuance is
348 required in the interpretation of these two PEM measurements. Our goal is increased awareness
349 of PEM as a potential issue within the wider context of “exercise is medicine” in oncology
350 [46]. If exercise is medicine in chronic CRF, side-effects at a given exercise dose must be
351 carefully detailed. This will enable exercise professionals to provide the best exercise
352 prescription in people with PEM, one that can be achieved within a pacing strategy that
353 focusses on balancing rest and activity to achieve daily tasks, maintaining physical function,
354 and avoiding symptom exacerbation. The new exercise guidelines for cancer survivors [23]
355 acknowledge that some proportion of cancer survivors may not be able to tolerate the
356 recommendations (particularly because dose reductions may have been poorly reported in
357 previous trials). The results of this study reinforce the need to monitor tolerance and symptom
358 exacerbation, especially in those with chronic CRF. Without appropriate safeguards (e.g.
359 monitoring of fatigue throughout the exercise intervention), it is not known if people with PEM
360 continue with little symptom exacerbation (e.g. due to low effort, or individualization and
361 regular communication with an exercise professional), continue despite symptom exacerbation
362 (and experience “energy crashes” [42] that may significantly impact daily activities), or drop
363 out. It has been recently highlighted that the reporting of exercise interventions and specifically
364 the “precise reporting of exercise treatment adherence (tolerability)” [47] must be improved.
365 We add that these reports must include the worsening of symptoms, including fatigue.
366 However, it should be emphasized that, for the majority of people with chronic CRF, exercise
367 is likely to be beneficial for multiple and interacting components of physical and mental health.
368 With support, most participants can reach physical activity guidelines (e.g. 30 minutes of
369 aerobic activity at RPE 12, three times per week [23]) with no adverse consequences. Higher
370 intensities/longer durations can be appropriate for people with chronic CRF who do not
371 experience any adverse responses, particularly if the goal is to maximize physiological
372 adaptations.

373

374 *Study Limitations and Future Directions*

375 In Table 1, descriptive differences are provided for participants not meeting objective criteria
376 for the DSQ-PEM and not describing PEM in the open-ended questionnaire (Group A, $n = 12$);
377 and participants meeting objective criteria for the DSQ-PEM and/or describing PEM in the
378 open-ended questionnaire (Group B, $n = 6$). Although of interest, the small sample size in
379 Group B precludes in-depth interpretation. Although of interest, the small sample size in Group
380 B precludes in-depth interpretation. Future research should follow-up on the potential effects
381 of age, fatigue severity, time since treatment, and the type or combination of treatment received
382 on PEM. We note that for one individual categorized to Group B (Table 1), the recall period of
383 the DSQ-PEM (6 months) overlapped with the completion of adjuvant therapy (4 months prior
384 to data collection) and this may have influenced their responses. In line with studies in ME/CFS
385 [35,41,48], future studies on PEM in people with chronic CRF should record symptoms at
386 several time points (e.g. 24, 48 and 72 h post-exercise) to better capture the symptom trajectory.
387 This study did not include a control group or data for the responses of healthy/sedentary adults
388 because this was outside the scope of our research question. However, in a previous study,
389 100% of controls recovered within 2 days of a maximal exercise test, 87% experienced an
390 increased sense of wellbeing relative to the test, and none experienced issues such as weakness,
391 impaired memory/concentration or mood disturbance [34]. The DSQ-PEM is not validated for
392 use in people with CRF. However, it has been used in people with multiple sclerosis and post-
393 polio syndrome (other clinical conditions where chronic fatigue can be an issue) [31]. As stated
394 previously, the DSQ-PEM was not used as a method to support a diagnosis of ME/CFS study,
395 especially considering the diagnostic complexity of ME/CFS [49]). Here, it is used as a tool to
396 help identify people experiencing symptoms of PEM, and any further speculation on whether
397 participants would meet any given diagnostic criteria for ME/CFS if assessed by an expert
398 clinician is out of our scope of practice. Because we were unable to obtain a copy of the open-
399 ended questionnaire used previously [34], an open-ended questionnaire was designed
400 (<https://osf.io/349ky/>) based on a review of the literature on PEM in ME/CFS. Another
401 limitation is that maximal incremental exercise is not a typical exercise intensity prescribed
402 within an intervention, and provides no information about the intensity of physical effort
403 (below maximal) that could result in PEM. Furthermore, although the FACIT-F has been
404 recommended to support a diagnosis of CRF [50], there is no consensus on what “diagnosis”
405 means in this context. The proposed ICD-10 criteria were not accepted, and few studies have
406 implemented them [51], and current guidelines have differing recommendations for screening
407 and assessment [8,52], and we recognize a lack of consensus for the identification of someone
408 with clinically-relevant CRF. Further, we acknowledge that the inclusion/exclusion criteria for

Running Title: PEM in Chronic CRF

409 this study were not equivalent to the extensive investigations/assessments that inform a
410 diagnosis of ME/CFS

411

412 In this preliminary study, up to 33% of people appeared to experience PEM, but all participants
413 self-selected themselves into an RCT that explicitly involved a 12-week exercise intervention.
414 It is reasonable to suggest that the sample in the RCT, and therefore this sub-study, may not
415 represent the prevalence of PEM in people with chronic CRF, because people who experience
416 PEM may be less likely to enrol in an exercise trial. Future studies should estimate the
417 prevalence of PEM in people with chronic CRF. In addition, future studies should include semi-
418 structured qualitative interviews to elucidate the cancer-specific symptoms and impact of PEM.
419 This preliminary study included people with chronic CRF, identified using a cancer-related
420 symptom onset, and presence of CRF at least 3 months and within 5 years (22 ± 14 months)
421 after curative-intent cancer treatment. Because CRF is more prevalent during cancer treatment
422 [53], future work must address the potential of PEM after exercise in interventions delivered
423 during treatment. One study pre-emptively reduced the exercise prescription to encourage
424 attendance when treatment side effects (including fatigue) were anticipated to peak during a
425 chemotherapy cycle [54], but to our knowledge, there has been no post-exertional symptom
426 characterization during cancer treatment.

427

428 **Conclusion**

429 This study provides preliminary evidence that a subset of people with chronic CRF experience
430 PEM. We recommend that exercise professionals not only monitor fatigue throughout an
431 exercise program (i.e. asking participants how they felt in between individual sessions - with
432 an awareness that symptom onset may vary and may be delayed) but also report this data if the
433 exercise program is part of a clinical trial. In conclusion, the field of exercise oncology must
434 be aware that adverse responses to exercise may be an issue for a subset of people with chronic
435 CRF, and exercise interventions should be designed and adapted to mitigate symptom
436 exacerbation and limit the potential for harm.

437

438 **Disclosure/Conflict of Interest**

439 This research was supported by the Canadian Cancer Society (grant #704208-1). The authors
440 have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

441 **REFERENCES**

- 442 1. Berger AM, Mooney K, Alvarez-Perez A, Breitbart WS, Carpenter KM, Cella D, et al.
443 Cancer-related fatigue, version 2.2015. *Journal of the National Comprehensive Cancer*
444 *Network*. 2015;13: 1012–39.
- 445 2. Jones JM, Olson K, Catton P, Catton CN, Fleshner NE, Krzyzanowska MK, et al.
446 Cancer-related fatigue and associated disability in post-treatment cancer survivors.
447 *Journal of Cancer Survivorship*. 2016;10: 51–61. doi:10.1007/s11764-015-0450-2
- 448 3. Goedendorp MM, Gielissen MFM, Verhagen CAHHVM, Bleijenberg G. Development
449 of Fatigue in Cancer Survivors: A Prospective Follow-Up Study From Diagnosis Into
450 the Year After Treatment. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 2013;45: 213–
451 222. doi:10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2012.02.009
- 452 4. Abrahams HJG, Gielissen MFM, Schmits IC, Verhagen CAHHVM, Rovers MM,
453 Knoop H. Risk factors, prevalence, and course of severe fatigue after breast cancer
454 treatment: a meta-analysis involving 12 327 breast cancer survivors. *Annals of*
455 *Oncology*. 2016;27: 965–974. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdw099
- 456 5. Goldstein D, Bennett BK, Webber K, Boyle F, de Souza PL, Wilcken NRC, et al.
457 Cancer-Related Fatigue in Women With Breast Cancer: Outcomes of a 5-Year
458 Prospective Cohort Study. *JCO*. 2012;30: 1805–1812. doi:10.1200/JCO.2011.34.6148
- 459 6. Sandler CX, Goldstein D, Horsfield S, Bennett BK, Friedlander M, Bastick PA, et al.
460 Randomized evaluation of cognitive-behavioral therapy and graded exercise therapy for
461 post-cancer fatigue. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2017;54: 74–84.
462 doi:10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2017.03.015
- 463 7. Bruggeman-Everts FZ, Wolvers MDJ, Schoot R van de, Vollenbroek-Hutten MMR, Lee
464 MLV der. Effectiveness of Two Web-Based Interventions for Chronic Cancer-Related
465 Fatigue Compared to an Active Control Condition: Results of the “Fitter na kanker”
466 Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2017;19: e336.
467 doi:10.2196/jmir.7180
- 468 8. Howell D, Keller-Olaman S, Oliver TK, Hack TF, Broadfield L, Biggs K, et al. A pan-
469 Canadian practice guideline and algorithm: screening, assessment, and supportive care
470 of adults with cancer-related fatigue. *Current Oncology*. 2013;20: 233.
- 471 9. Minton O, Stone P. A systematic review of the scales used for the measurement of
472 cancer-related fatigue (CRF). *Annals of Oncology*. 2008;20: 17–25.
473 doi:10.1093/annonc/mdn537
- 474 10. Pearson EJM, Morris ME, McKinstry CE. Cancer-related fatigue: appraising evidence-
475 based guidelines for screening, assessment and management. *Supportive Care in*
476 *Cancer*. 2016;24: 3935–3942. doi:10.1007/s00520-016-3228-9
- 477 11. Cella D, Peterman A, Passik S, Jacobsen P, Breitbart W. Progress toward guidelines for
478 the management of fatigue. *Oncology*. 1998;12: 369–77.
- 479 12. Bennett B, Goldstein D, Friedlander M, Hickie I, Lloyd A. The experience of cancer-
480 related fatigue and chronic fatigue syndrome: a qualitative and comparative study.

- 481 Journal of Pain and Symptom Management. 2007;34: 126–135.
482 doi:10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2006.10.014
- 483 13. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic
484 Fatigue Syndrome (ME/CFS) | Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome.
485 2018 [cited 19 Nov 2018]. Available: <https://www.cdc.gov/me-cfs/index.html>
- 486 14. Davenport TE, Stevens SR, Vanness JM, Stevens J, Snell CR. Checking our blind spots:
487 Current status of research evidence summaries in ME/CFS. *British Journal of Sports*
488 *Medicine*. 17 Jul 2018: bjsports-2018-099553. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2018-099553
- 489 15. Chu L, Valencia IJ, Garvert DW, Montoya JG. Deconstructing post-exertional malaise
490 in myalgic encephalomyelitis/ chronic fatigue syndrome: a patient-centered, cross-
491 sectional survey. *PloS one*. 2018;13: e0197811. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0197811
- 492 16. Holtzman CS, Bhatia S, Cotler J, Jason LA. Assessment of post-exertional malaise
493 (PEM) in patients with myalgic encephalomyelitis (ME) and chronic fatigue syndrome
494 (CFS): a patient-driven survey. *Diagnostics (Basel)*. 2019;9.
495 doi:10.3390/diagnostics9010026
- 496 17. Larun L, Brurberg KG, Odgaard-Jensen J, Price JR. Exercise therapy for chronic fatigue
497 syndrome. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019;10: CD003200.
498 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD003200.pub8
- 499 18. White PD, Goldsmith KA, Johnson AL, Potts L, Walwyn R, DeCesare JC, et al.
500 Comparison of adaptive pacing therapy, cognitive behaviour therapy, graded exercise
501 therapy, and specialist medical care for chronic fatigue syndrome (PACE): a randomised
502 trial. *The Lancet*. 2011;377: 823–836. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60096-2
- 503 19. Wilshire CE, Kindlon T, Courtney R, Matthees A, Tuller D, Geraghty K, et al.
504 Rethinking the treatment of chronic fatigue syndrome—a reanalysis and evaluation of
505 findings from a recent major trial of graded exercise and CBT. *BMC Psychology*.
506 2018;6: 6. doi:10.1186/s40359-018-0218-3
- 507 20. Sharpe M, Goldsmith K, Chalder T. The PACE trial of treatments for chronic fatigue
508 syndrome: a response to WILSHIRE et al. *BMC Psychology*. 2019;7: 15.
509 doi:10.1186/s40359-019-0288-x
- 510 21. Wilshire CE, Kindlon T. Response: Sharpe, Goldsmith and Chalder fail to restore
511 confidence in the PACE trial findings. *BMC Psychology*. 2019;7: 19.
512 doi:10.1186/s40359-019-0296-x
- 513 22. Cormie P, Atkinson M, Bucci L, Cust A, Eakin E, Hayes S, et al. Clinical Oncology
514 Society of Australia position statement on exercise in cancer care. *The Medical Journal*
515 *of Australia*. 2018;209: 184–187.
- 516 23. Campbell KL, Winters-Stone KM, Wiskemann J, May AM, Schwartz AL, Courneya
517 KS, et al. Exercise Guidelines for Cancer Survivors: Consensus Statement from
518 International Multidisciplinary Roundtable. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2019;51: 2375–2390.
519 doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000002116

- 520 24. Oberoi S, Robinson PD, Cataudella D, Culos-Reed SN, Davis H, Duong N, et al.
521 Physical activity reduces fatigue in patients with cancer and hematopoietic stem cell
522 transplant recipients: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials.
523 *Critical Reviews in Oncology/Hematology*. 2018;122: 52–59.
524 doi:10.1016/j.critrevonc.2017.12.011
- 525 25. Vink M, Vink-Niese A. Graded exercise therapy for myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic
526 fatigue syndrome is not effective and unsafe. Re-analysis of a Cochrane review. *Health*
527 *Psychology Open*. 2018;5: 205510291880518. doi:10.1177/2055102918805187
- 528 26. Twomey R, Martin T, Temesi J, Culos-Reed SN, Millet GY. Tailored exercise
529 interventions to reduce fatigue in cancer survivors: study protocol of a randomized
530 controlled trial. *BMC Cancer*. 2018;18: 757. doi:10.1186/s12885-018-4668-z
- 531 27. van Belle S, Paridaens R, Evers G, Kerger J, Bron D, Foubert J, et al. Comparison of
532 proposed diagnostic criteria with FACT-F and VAS for cancer-related fatigue: proposal
533 for use as a screening tool. *Supportive Care in Cancer*. 2005;13: 246–254.
534 doi:10.1007/s00520-004-0734-y
- 535 28. Yellen SB, Cella DF, Webster K, Blendowski C, Kaplan E. Measuring fatigue and other
536 anemia-related symptoms with the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy (FACT)
537 measurement system. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 1997;13: 63–74.
- 538 29. Borg G. An introduction to Borg’s RPE-scale. Ithaca, NY: Movement Publications;
539 1985.
- 540 30. Borg G. Borg’s perceived exertion and pain scales. Leeds: Human Kinetics; 1998.
- 541 31. Cotler J, Holtzman C, Dudun C, Jason L. A brief questionnaire to assess post-exertional
542 malaise. *Diagnostics*. 2018;8: 66. doi:10.3390/diagnostics8030066
- 543 32. Jason LA, Evans MA, Porter N, Brown M, Brown AA, Hunnell J, et al. The
544 development of a revised Canadian myalgic encephalomyelitis chronic fatigue
545 syndrome case definition. 2010.
- 546 33. NINDS Common Data Elements (CDE) Group Post-Exertional Malaise Subgroup
547 Summary. Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. 2017 [(accessed on
548 29 October, 2019)]. Available online:
549 [https://www.commondataelements.ninds.nih.gov/sites/nindscde/files/Doc/MECFS/PEM](https://www.commondataelements.ninds.nih.gov/sites/nindscde/files/Doc/MECFS/PEM_Subgroup_Summary.pdf)
550 [_Subgroup_Summary.pdf](https://www.commondataelements.ninds.nih.gov/sites/nindscde/files/Doc/MECFS/PEM_Subgroup_Summary.pdf). 2017.
- 551 34. VanNess JM, Stevens SR, Bateman L, Stiles TL, Snell CR. Postexertional malaise in
552 women with chronic fatigue syndrome. *Journal of Women’s Health*. 2010;19: 239–244.
553 doi:10.1089/jwh.2009.1507
- 554 35. Keech A, Sandler CX, Vollmer-Conna U, Cvejic E, Lloyd AR, Barry BK. Capturing the
555 post-exertional exacerbation of fatigue following physical and cognitive challenge in
556 patients with chronic fatigue syndrome. *J Psychosom Res*. 2015;79: 537–549.
557 doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2015.08.008

- 558 36. Bazelmans E, Bleijenberg G, Voeten MJM, van der Meer JWM, Folgering H. Impact of
559 a maximal exercise test on symptoms and activity in chronic fatigue syndrome. *J*
560 *Psychosom Res.* 2005;59: 201–208. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2005.04.003
- 561 37. Lindheimer JB, Meyer JD, Stegner AJ, Dougherty RJ, Van Riper SM, Shields M, et al.
562 Symptom variability following acute exercise in myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic
563 fatigue syndrome: a perspective on measuring post-exertion malaise. *Fatigue:*
564 *Biomedicine, Health & Behavior.* 2017;5: 69–88. doi:10.1080/21641846.2017.1321166
- 565 38. Hsieh H-F, Shannon SE. Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative*
566 *Health Research.* 2005;15: 1277–1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687
- 567 39. Bennett BK, Goldstein D, Chen M, Davenport TA, Vollmer-Conna U, Scott EM, et al.
568 Characterization of fatigue states in medicine and psychiatry by structured interview.
569 *Psychosom Med.* 2014;76: 379–388. doi:10.1097/psy.0000000000000061
- 570 40. Nijs J, Almond F, De Becker P, Truijen S, Paul L. Can exercise limits prevent post-
571 exertional malaise in chronic fatigue syndrome? An uncontrolled clinical trial. *Clin*
572 *Rehabil.* 2008;22: 426–435. doi:10.1177/0269215507084410
- 573 41. Sandler CX, Lloyd AR, Barry BK. Fatigue exacerbation by interval or continuous
574 exercise in chronic fatigue syndrome. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2016;48: 1875–1885.
575 doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000983
- 576 42. Penner CK, Zimmerman C, Kaptchuck T, Conboy L. Towards a Holistic Framework of
577 Cancer Related Fatigue: Qualitative Data on the Experience of Embodiment in Breast
578 Cancer Survivors. *PsyArXiv*; 2019 Apr. doi:10.31234/osf.io/eg7ur
- 579 43. Goudsmit EM, Nijs J, Jason LA, Wallman KE. Pacing as a strategy to improve energy
580 management in myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome: a consensus
581 document. *Disability and Rehabilitation.* 2012;34: 1140–1147.
582 doi:10.3109/09638288.2011.635746
- 583 44. Bennett B, Goldstein D, Friedlander M, Hickie I, Lloyd A. The experience of cancer-
584 related fatigue and chronic fatigue syndrome: a qualitative and comparative study.
585 *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management.* 2007;34: 126–135.
586 doi:10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2006.10.014
- 587 45. VanNess JM, Stevens SR, Bateman L, Stiles TL, Snell CR. Postexertional malaise in
588 women with chronic fatigue syndrome. *J Womens Health (Larchmt).* 2010;19: 239–244.
589 doi:10.1089/jwh.2009.1507
- 590 46. Schmitz KH, Campbell AM, Stuiver MM, Pinto BM, Schwartz AL, Morris GS, et al.
591 Exercise is medicine in oncology: Engaging clinicians to help patients move through
592 cancer. *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians.* 0. doi:10.3322/caac.21579
- 593 47. Nilsen TS, Scott JM, Michalski M, Capaci C, Thomas S, Herndon JE, et al. Novel
594 Methods for Reporting of Exercise Dose and Adherence: An Exploratory Analysis. *Med*
595 *Sci Sports Exerc.* 2018;50: 1134–1141. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001545

- 596 48. Yoshiuchi K, Cook DB, Ohashi K, Kumano H, Kuboki T, Yamamoto Y, et al. A real-
597 time assessment of the effect of exercise in chronic fatigue syndrome. *Physiol Behav.*
598 2007;92: 963–968. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2007.07.001
- 599 49. Brurberg KG, Fønhus MS, Larun L, Flottorp S, Malterud K. Case definitions for chronic
600 fatigue syndrome/myalgic encephalomyelitis (CFS/ME): a systematic review. *BMJ*
601 *Open.* 2014;4. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003973
- 602 50. Van Belle S, Paridaens R, Evers G, Kerger J, Bron D, Foubert J, et al. Comparison of
603 proposed diagnostic criteria with FACT-F and VAS for cancer-related fatigue: proposal
604 for use as a screening tool. *Support Care Cancer.* 2005;13: 246–254.
605 doi:10.1007/s00520-004-0734-y
- 606 51. Donovan KA, McGinty HL, Jacobsen PB. A systematic review of research using the
607 diagnostic criteria for cancer-related fatigue. *Psycho-Oncology.* 2013;22: 737–744.
608 doi:10.1002/pon.3085
- 609 52. Bower JE, Bak K, Berger A, Breitbart W, Escalante CP, Ganz PA, et al. Screening,
610 assessment, and management of fatigue in adult survivors of cancer: an American
611 Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline adaptation. *J Clin Oncol.*
612 2014;32: 1840–1850. doi:10.1200/JCO.2013.53.4495
- 613 53. Henry DH, Viswanathan HN, Elkin EP, Traina S, Wade S, Cella D. Symptoms and
614 treatment burden associated with cancer treatment: results from a cross-sectional
615 national survey in the U.S. *Support Care Cancer.* 2008;16: 791–801.
616 doi:10.1007/s00520-007-0380-2
- 617 54. Kirkham, Amy A; Bland, Kelcey A; Zucker, David S; Bovard, Joshua; Shenkier,
618 Tamara; McKenzie, Donald C; Davis, Margot K; Gelmon, Karen A; Campbell, Kristin
619 L. “Chemotherapy-periodized” Exercise to Accommodate for Cyclical Variation in
620 Fatigue. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise.* [cited 29 Oct 2019].
621 doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000002151

622