

1 **A Scoping Review of ‘Pacing’ for Management of Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic**
2 **Fatigue Syndrome (ME/CFS): Lessons Learned for the Long COVID Pandemic**

3

4 Nilihan E.M. Sanal-Hayes¹, Marie Mclaughlin¹, Lawrence D. Hayes¹, Jacqueline L. Mair^{2,3,*},
5 Jane Ormerod⁴, David Carless¹, Natalie Hilliard⁵, Rachel Meach¹, Joanne Ingram⁶, Nicholas
6 F. Sculthorpe¹

7

8 *¹Sport and Physical Activity Research Institute, School of Health and Life Sciences,*
9 *University of the West of Scotland, Glasgow, UK*

10 *²Future Health Technologies, Singapore-ETH Centre, Campus for Research Excellence and*
11 *Technological Enterprise (CREATE), Singapore*

12 *³Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of Singapore, Singapore*

13 *⁴Long COVID Scotland, 12 Kemnay Place, Aberdeen, UK*

14 *⁵Physios for ME, Online, UK*

15 *⁶School of Education and Social Sciences, University of the West of Scotland, Glasgow, UK*

16

17

18

19

20

21 * jamair@ethz.ch

22

23

24 **This article is formatted in British English**

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **Abstract**

26 **Background:** Controversy over treatment for people with myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic
27 fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS) is a barrier to appropriate treatment. Energy management or
28 *pacing* is a prominent coping strategy for people with ME/CFS that involves regulating activity
29 to avoid post exertional malaise (PEM), the worsening of symptoms after an activity. Until
30 now, characteristics of pacing, and the effects on patients' symptoms had not been
31 systematically reviewed. This is problematic as the most common approach to pacing, pacing
32 prescription, and the pooled efficacy of pacing was unknown. Collating evidence may help
33 advise those suffering with similar symptoms, including long COVID, as practitioners would
34 be better informed on methodological approaches to adopt, pacing implementation, and
35 expected outcomes.

36 **Objectives:** In this scoping review of the literature, we aggregated type of, and outcomes of,
37 pacing in people with ME/CFS.

38 **Eligibility criteria:** Original investigations concerning pacing were considered in participants
39 with ME/CFS.

40 **Sources of evidence:** Six electronic databases (PubMed, Scholar, ScienceDirect, Scopus, Web
41 of Science and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials [CENTRAL]) were
42 searched; and websites MEPedia, Action for ME, and ME Action were also searched for grey
43 literature.

44 **Methods:** A scoping review was conducted. Review selection and characterisation was
45 performed by two independent reviewers using pretested forms.

46 **Results:** Authors reviewed 177 titles and abstracts, resulting in included 17 studies: three
47 randomised control trials (RCTs); one uncontrolled trial; one interventional case series; one

48 retrospective observational study; two prospective observational studies; four cross-sectional
49 observational studies; and five cross-sectional analytical studies. Studies included variable
50 designs, durations, and outcome measures. In terms of pacing administration, studies used
51 educational sessions and diaries for activity monitoring. Eleven studies reported benefits of
52 pacing, four studies reported no effect, and two studies reported a detrimental effect in
53 comparison to the control group.

54 **Conclusions:** Highly variable study designs and outcome measures, allied to poor to fair
55 methodological quality resulted in heterogenous findings and highlights the requirement for
56 more research examining pacing. Looking to the long COVID pandemic, future studies should
57 be RCTs utilising objectively quantified digitised pacing, over a longer duration of
58 examination, using the core outcome set for patient reported outcome measures.

59 **Key words**

60 Pacing, Myalgic Encephalomyelitis, Chronic Fatigue Syndrome, Post-Exertional Malaise

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69 **List of Abbreviations**

- 70 Activity Pacing Questionnaire (APQ)
- 71 Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI)
- 72 Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-II)
- 73 Brief Coping Orientation to Problems Experienced Scale (bCOPE)
- 74 Canadian Occupational Performance Measure (COPM)
- 75 Centers for disease control and prevention (CDC)
- 76 Chalder Fatigue Questionnaire (CFQ)
- 77 Checklist Individual Strength (CIS)
- 78 Chronic Pain Coping Inventory (CPCI)
- 79 Cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT)
- 80 Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL)
- 81 DePaul symptom questionnaire (DSQ)
- 82 EuroQol five-dimensions, five-levels questionnaire (EQ-5D-5L)
- 83 Graded exercise therapy (GET)
- 84 Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS)
- 85 Myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS)
- 86 Pain Self Efficacy Questionnaire (PSEQ)
- 87 Pain Anxiety Symptoms Scale short version (PASS-20)

- 88 Pain Numerical Rating Scale (NRS)
- 89 Patient health questionnaire (PHQ)
- 90 Ppatient reported outcome measures (PROMs)
- 91 Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro)
- 92 Perceived Stress Scale (PSS)
- 93 Post exertional malaise (PEM)
- 94 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for scoping
95 reviews (PRISMA-ScR)
- 96 Randomised control trial (RCT)
- 97 Short-Form (SF)
- 98
- 99
- 100
- 101
- 102
- 103
- 104
- 105
- 106

107

108 **1 Introduction**

109 1.1 Rationale

110 Post-viral illness occurs when individuals experience an extended period of feeling unwell
111 after a viral infection [1–3]. While post-viral illness is generally a non-specific condition with
112 a constellation of symptoms that may be experienced, fatigue is amongst the most commonly
113 reported [4–6]. For example, our recent systematic review found there was up to 94%
114 prevalence of fatigue in people following acute COVID-19 infection [3]. The increasing
115 prevalence of long COVID has generated renewed interest in symptomology and time-course
116 of post-viral fatigue, with PubMed reporting 72 articles related to “post-viral fatigue” between
117 2020 and 2022, but less than five for every year since 1990.

118 As the coronavirus pandemic developed, it became clear that a significant proportion of the
119 population experienced symptoms which persisted beyond the initial viral infection, meeting
120 the definition of a post-viral illness. Current estimates suggest one in eight people develop long
121 COVID [7] and its symptomatology has repeatedly been suggested to overlap with clinical
122 demonstrations of myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS). In a study
123 by Wong and Weitzer [8], long COVID symptoms from 21 studies were compared to a list of
124 ME/CFS symptoms. Of the 29 known ME/CFS symptoms the authors reported that 25 (86%)
125 were reported in at least one long COVID study suggesting significant similarities. Sukocheva
126 et al. [9] reported that long COVID included changes in immune, cardiovascular, metabolic,
127 gastrointestinal, nervous and autonomic systems. When observed from a pathological stance,
128 this list of symptoms are shared with, or are similar to, the symptoms patients with ME/CFS
129 describe [10]. In fact, a recent article reported 43% of people with long COVID are diagnosed
130 with ME/CFS [10], evidencing the analogous symptom loads.

131 A striking commonality between long COVID and similar conditions such as ME/CFS is the
132 worsening of symptoms including fatigue, pain, cognitive difficulties, sore throat, and/or
133 swollen lymph nodes following exertion. Termed *post exertional malaise* (PEM) [11–14],
134 lasting from hours to several days, it is arguably one of the most debilitating side effects
135 experienced by those with ME/CFS [13–15]. PEM is associated with considerably reduced
136 quality of life amongst those with ME/CFS, with reduced ability to perform activities of daily
137 living, leading to restraints on social and family life, mental health comorbidities such as
138 depression and anxiety, and devastating employment and financial consequences [16–19]. At
139 present, there is no cure or pharmacological treatments for PEM, and therefore, effective
140 symptom management strategies are required. This may be in part because the triggers of PEM
141 are poorly understood, and there is little evidence for what causes PEM, beyond anecdotal
142 evidence. The most common approach to manage PEM is to incorporate activity pacing into
143 the day-to-day lives of those with ME/CFS with the intention of reducing the frequency of
144 severity of bouts of PEM [20]. Pacing is defined as an approach where patients are encouraged
145 to be as active as possible within the limits imposed by the illness [20–22]. In practice, pacing
146 requires individuals to determine a level at which they can function but which does not lead to
147 a marked increase in fatigue and other symptoms [23,24].

148 Although long COVID is a new condition [3,11], the available evidence suggests substantial
149 overlap with the symptoms of conditions such as ME/CFS and it is therefore pragmatic to
150 consider the utility of management strategies (such as pacing) used in ME/CFS for people with
151 long COVID. In fact, a recent Delphi study recommended that management of long COVID
152 should incorporate careful pacing to avoid PEM relapse [25]. This position was enforced by a
153 multidisciplinary consensus statement considering treatment of fatigue in long COVID,
154 recommending energy conservation strategies (including pacing) for people with long COVID
155 [26]. Given the estimated >2 million individuals who have experienced long COVID in the

156 UK alone [27–29], there is an urgent need for evidence-based public health strategies. In this
157 context, it seems pragmatic to borrow from the ME/CFS literature.

158 From a historical perspective, the 2007 NICE guidelines for people with ME/CFS advised both
159 cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) and graded exercise therapy (GET) should be offered to
160 people with ME/CFS [30]. As of the 2021 update, NICE guidelines for people with ME/CFS
161 do not advise CBT or GET, and the only recommended management strategy is pacing [31].
162 In the years between changes to these guidelines, the landmark PACE trial [32] was published
163 in 2011. This large, randomised control trial (RCT; n=639) compared pacing with CBT and
164 reported GET and CBT were more effective than pacing for improving symptoms. Yet, this
165 study has come under considerable criticism from patient groups and clinicians alike [33–36].
166 This may partly explain why NICE do not advise CBT or GET as of 2021, and only recommend
167 pacing for symptom management people with ME/CFS [31]. There has been some controversy
168 over best treatment for people with ME/CFS in the literature and support groups, potentially
169 amplified by the ambiguity of evidence for pacing efficacy and how pacing should be
170 implemented. As such, before pacing can be advised for people with long COVID, it is
171 imperative previous literature concerning pacing is systematically reviewed. This is because a
172 consensus is needed within the literature for implementing pacing so practitioners treating
173 people with ME/CFS or long COVID can do so effectively. A lack of agreement in pacing
174 implementation is a barrier to adoption for both practitioners and patients. Despite a number of
175 systematic reviews concerning pharmacological interventions or cognitive behavioural therapy
176 in people with ME/CFS [33,37,38], to date, there are no systematic reviews concerning pacing.
177 Despite the widespread use of pacing, the literature base is limited and includes clinical
178 commentaries, case studies, case series, and few randomised control trials. Consequently, while
179 a comprehensive review of the effects of pacing in ME/CFS is an essential tool to guide
180 symptom management advice, the available literature means that effective pooling of data is

181 not feasible [39] and therefore, a traditional systematic review and meta-analysis, with a tightly
182 focussed research question would be premature [40]. Consequently, we elected to undertake a
183 scoping review. This approach retains the systematic approach to literature searching but aims
184 to map out the current state of the research [40]. Using the framework of Arksey and O'Malley
185 [41], a scoping review aims to use a broad set of search terms and include a wide range of study
186 designs and methods (in contrast to a systematic review [41]). This approach, has the benefit
187 of clarifying key concepts, surveying current data collection approaches, and identifying
188 critical knowledge gaps.

189

190 1.2 Objectives

191 We aimed to provide an overview of existing literature concerning pacing in ME/CFS. Our
192 three specific objectives of this scoping review were to (1) conduct a systematic search of the
193 published literature concerning ME/CFS and pacing, (2) map characteristics and
194 methodologies used, and (3) provide recommendations for the advancement of the research
195 area.

196

197 **2 Methods**

198 2.1 Protocol and Registration

199 The review was conducted and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for
200 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR)
201 guidelines [42] and the five-stage framework outlined in Arksey and O'Malley [41].
202 Registration is not recommended for scoping reviews.

203

204 2.2 Eligibility criteria

205 Studies that met the following criteria were included in this review: (1) published as a full-text
206 manuscript; (2) not a review; (3) participants with ME/CFS; (4) studies employed a pacing
207 intervention or retrospective analysis of pacing or a case study of pacing. Studies utilising sub-
208 analysis of the pacing, graded activity, and cognitive behaviour therapy: a randomised
209 evaluation (PACE) trial were included as these have different outcome measures and, as this is
210 not a meta-analysis, this will not influence effect size estimates. Additionally, due to the paucity
211 of evidence, grey literature has also been included in this review.

212

213 2.3 Search Strategy

214 The search strategy consisted of a combination of free-text and MeSH terms relating to
215 ME/CFS and pacing, which were developed through an examination of published original
216 literature and review articles. Example search terms for PubMed included: ‘ME/CFS’ OR ‘ME’
217 OR ‘CFS’ OR ‘chronic fatigue syndrome’ OR ‘PEM’ OR ‘post exertional malaise’ OR ‘pene’
218 OR ‘post-exertion neurogenic exhaust’ AND ‘pacing’ OR ‘adaptive pacing’. The search was
219 performed within title/abstract. Full search terms can be found in **Appendix 1**.

220

221 2.4 Information sources

222 Six electronic databases [PubMed, Scholar, ScienceDirect, Scopus, Web of Science, and the
223 Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL)] were searched to identify
224 original research articles published from the earliest available date up until 02/02/2022.
225 Additional records were identified through reference lists of included studies. ‘Grey literature’

226 repositories including MEPedia, Action for ME, and ME Action were also searched with the
227 same terms.

228

229 2.5 Study selection and Data Items

230 Once each database search was completed and manuscripts were sourced, all studies were
231 downloaded into a single reference list (Zotero, version 6.0.23) and duplicates were removed.
232 Titles and abstracts were screened for eligibility by two reviewers independently and
233 discrepancies were resolved through discussion between reviewers. Subsequently, full text
234 papers of potentially relevant studies were retrieved and assessed for eligibility by the same
235 two reviewers independently. Any uncertainty by reviewers was discussed in consensus
236 meetings and resolved by agreement. Data extracted from each study included sample size,
237 participant characteristics, study design, trial registration details, study location, pacing
238 description (type), intervention duration, intervention adherence, outcome variables, and main
239 outcome data. Descriptions were extracted with as much detail as was provided by the authors.
240 Study quality was assessed using the Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro) scale [43,44].

241

242 2.6 Role of the funding source

243 The study sponsors had no role in study design, data collection, analysis, or interpretation, nor
244 writing the report, nor submitting the paper for publication.

245

246 **3 Results**

247 3.1 Study selection

248 After the initial database search, 281 records were identified (see Fig. 1). Once duplicates were
249 removed, 177 titles and abstracts were screened for inclusion resulting in 22 studies being
250 retrieved as full text and assessed for eligibility. Of those, five were excluded, and 17 articles
251 remained and were used in the final qualitative synthesis.

252

253 *****INSERT FIGURE 1 AROUND HERE*****

254

255 3.2 Study characteristics

256 Study characteristics are summarised in table 1. Of the 17 studies included, three were
257 randomised control trials (RCTs [32,45,46]); one was an uncontrolled trial [47]; one was a case
258 series [48]; one was a retrospective observational study [49], two were prospective
259 observational studies [50,51]; four were cross-sectional observational studies [22,52,53]; and
260 five were cross-sectional analytical studies [54–58] including sub-analysis of the PACE trial
261 [32,53,56,58]. Seven of the studies were registered trials [32,45–47,53–55]. Diagnostic criteria
262 for ME/CFS are summarised in table 2.

263

264 *****INSERT TABLE 1 AROUND HERE*****

265 *****INSERT TABLE 2 AROUND HERE*****

266

267 3.3 Types of Pacing

268 3.3.1 Pacing Interventions

269 Of the 17 studies included, five implemented their own pacing interventions and will be
270 discussed in this section. Sample sizes ranged from n=7 in an interventional case series [48] to
271 n=641 participants in the largest RCT [32]. The first of these five studies considered an
272 education session on pacing and self-management as the ‘pacing’ group, and a ‘pain physiology
273 education’ group as the control group [46]. Two studies included educational sessions provided
274 by a therapist plus activity monitoring via ActiGraph accelerometers [48] and diaries [45] at
275 baseline and follow-up. In the first of these two studies, Nijs and colleagues [48] implemented
276 a ‘self-management program’ which asked patients to estimate their current physical
277 capabilities prior to commencing an activity and then complete 25-50% less than their
278 perceived energy envelope. They[48] did not include a control group and had a sample size of
279 only n=7. Six years later, the same research group [45] conducted another pacing study which
280 utilised relaxation as a comparator group (n=12 and n=14 in the pacing and relaxation groups,
281 respectively). The pacing group underwent a pacing phase whereby participants again aimed
282 to complete 25-50% less than their perceived energy envelope, followed by a gradual increase
283 in exercise after the pacing phase (the total intervention spanned three weeks, and it is unclear
284 how much was allocated to pacing, and how much to activity increase). Therefore, it could be
285 argued that Kos et al. [45] really assessed pacing followed by a gradual exercise increase as
286 outcome measures were assessed following the graded activity phase. Another pacing
287 intervention delivered weekly educational sessions for six weeks and utilised a standardised
288 rehabilitation programme using the ‘activity pacing framework’ [47] in a single-arm, no
289 comparator group feasibility study. Finally, the PACE trial adopted an adaptive pacing therapy
290 intervention consisting of occupational therapists helping patients to plan and pace activities
291 utilising activity diaries to identify activities associated with fatigue and staying within their
292 energy envelope [32]. This study incorporated standard medical care, cognitive behavioural
293 therapy (CBT) and graded exercise therapy (GET) as comparator groups [32]. It is worth noting

294 that the pacing group and the CBT group were both ‘encouraged’ to increase physical activity
295 levels as long as participants did not exceed their energy envelope. Although not all five
296 intervention studies explicitly mentioned the “Energy Envelope Theory”, which dictates that
297 people with ME/CFS should not necessarily increase or decrease their activity levels, but
298 moderate activity and practice energy conservation [59], all intervention studies used language
299 analogous to this theory, such as participants staying within limits, within capacity, or similar.

300 The interventions included in this review were of varying durations, from a single 30-minute
301 education session [46], a 3-week (one session a week) educational programme [48], a 3-week
302 (3 x 60-90 minute sessions/week) educational programme [45], a 6-week rehabilitation
303 programme [47], to a 24-week programme [32]. Intervention follow-up durations also varied
304 across studies from immediately after [46], 1-week [48], 3-weeks [45], 3-months [47], and 1-
305 year post-intervention [32].

306

307 3.3.2 Observational studies of pacing

308 Eight studies were observational and, therefore, included no intervention. Observational study
309 sample sizes ranged from 16 in a cross-sectional interview study[22] to 1428 in a cross-
310 sectional survey[49]. One study involved a retrospective analysis of participants’ own pacing
311 strategies varying from self-guided pacing or pacing administered by a therapist compared with
312 implementation of CBT and GET [49]. Five involved a cross-sectional analysis of participants
313 own pacing strategies which varied from activity adjustment, planning and acceptance [47,52],
314 and the Energy Envelope method [55,57]. Two studies were prospective observational studies
315 investigating the Energy Envelope theory [50,51]. Four studies [53,54,56,58] included in this
316 review involved sub-analysis of results of the PACE trial [32].

317

318 3.4 Outcome measures

319 3.4.1 Quantitative health outcomes

320 ME/CFS severity and general health status were the most common outcome measures across
321 studies (16/17)[32,45–58,60]. Studies utilised different instruments, including the Short-Form
322 36 (SF-36; 8/16)[32,48,50,51,53–55,57], SF-12 (2/16)[47,60], ME symptom and illness
323 severity (2/16)[49,52], Patient health (PHQ-15; 1/16)[56], DePaul symptom questionnaire
324 (DSQ; 1/16)[55], and the Patient health questionnaire-9 (1/16)[47]. Additionally, some studies
325 used diagnostic criteria for ME/CFS as an outcome measure to determine recovery [54,56,58]
326 .

327 Pain was assessed by most included studies (11/17) [32,46–48,50–52,54,56–58,60]. Two
328 studies [56,58] included the international CDC criteria for CFS which contain five painful
329 symptoms central to a diagnosis of CFS: muscle pain and joint pain. Other methods of
330 assessment included Brief Pain Inventory (1/11)[50], Chronic Pain Coping Inventory (CPCI;
331 1/11)[46], Pain Self Efficacy Questionnaire (PSEQ; 1/11)[47], Tampa Scale for
332 Kinesiophobia–version CFS (1/11)[46], algometry (1/11)[46], Knowledge of Neurophysiology
333 of Pain Test (1/12)[46], Pain Catastrophizing Scale (1/11)[46], Pain Anxiety Symptoms Scale
334 short version (PASS-20; 1/11)[47], Pain Numerical Rating Scale (NRS; 1/11)[60].

335 Fatigue or post-exertional malaise was assessed by 11 of the 17 studies
336 [32,45,47,48,50,51,53,54,57,58,60]. Again, measurement instruments were divergent between
337 studies and included the Chalder Fatigue Questionnaire (CFQ; 4/11) [32,47,54,60], Fatigue
338 Severity Scale (2/11)[50,57], the Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Medical Questionnaire (1/11)[57],
339 and Checklist Individual Strength (CIS; 2/11)[45,48].

340 Anxiety and depression were also common outcome measures, utilised by four studies
341 (4/17)[47,50,56,60]. These were also assessed using different instruments including Hospital
342 Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS; 2/4)[56,60], Generalised Anxiety Disorder Assessment
343 (1/4[47]), Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-II; 1/4)[50], Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI;
344 1/4)[50], and Perceived Stress Scale (PSS; 1/4)[50].

345 Outcome measures also included sleep (2/17)[50,56], assessed by The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality
346 Index (1/2)[50] and Jenkins sleep scale (1/2)[56]; and quality of life (2/17)[47,50] as assessed
347 by the EuroQol five-dimensions, five-levels (EQ-5D-5L; 1/2)[47] and The Quality-of-Life
348 Scale (1/2)[50]. Self-Efficacy was measured in four studies[47,50,56,57], assessed by the Brief
349 Coping Orientation to Problems Experienced Scale (bCOPE; 1/4)[57] and the Chronic Disease
350 Self-Efficacy measure (3/4)[47,50,56].

351

352

353

354 3.4.2 Quantitative evaluation of pacing

355 Some studies (4/17)[22,47,49,60] included assessments of the participants' experiences of
356 pacing, using the Activity Pacing Questionnaire (APQ-28; 1/4[47], APQ-38 (2/4)[22,60]), a
357 re-analysis of the 228 question survey regarding treatment (1/4) [49] originally produced by
358 the ME Association [52], and qualitative semi-structured telephone interviews regarding
359 appropriateness of courses in relation to individual patient needs (1/4)[22]. The APQ-28 and -
360 38 have been previously validated, but the 228 question survey has not. When outcome
361 measures included physical activity levels (4/17), the Canadian Occupational Performance
362 Measure (COPM) was used in two studies[45,48] and two studies used accelerometers to

363 record physical activity [48,51]. Of these two studies, Nijs [48] examined accelerometry after
364 a 3 week intervention based on the Energy Envelope Theory and Brown et al. [51] evaluated
365 the Energy Envelope Theory of pacing over 12 months.

366

367 3.4.3 Other outcomes

368 Two[50,56] of the 17 studies included structured clinical interviews for the Diagnostic and
369 Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th edition (DSM-IV) to assess psychiatric comorbidity
370 and psychiatric exclusions. One study included a disability benefits questionnaire[52], and one
371 study included employment and education questionnaire[52]. Additionally, satisfaction of
372 primary care was also used as an outcome measure (2/17)[22,52] assessed using the Chronic
373 Pain Coping Inventory (CPCI).

374

375 3.5 Efficacy of pacing interventions

376 The majority of studies (12/17)[22,45,47–53,55,57,60] highlighted improvements in at least
377 one outcome following pacing (figure 2). When the effect of pacing was assessed by ME
378 symptomology and general health outcomes, studies reported pacing to be
379 beneficial[22,47,48,50–53,55]. It is worth noting however that pacing reportedly worsened ME
380 symptoms in 14% of survey respondents, whilst improving symptoms in 44% of respondents
381 [49]. Most studies using fatigue as an outcome measure reported pacing to be efficacious
382 (7/10)[47,48,50,51,53,57,60]. However, one study reported no change in fatigue with a pacing
383 intervention (1/10)[32], and 2/10 studies[50,60] reported a worsening of fatigue with pacing.
384 Physical function was used to determine the efficacy of pacing in 11
385 studies[32,45,47,48,50,51,53,55–57,60]. Of these, the majority found pacing improved

386 physical functioning (8/10)[45,47,48,50,51,53,55,57], with 1/10 [32] studies reporting no
387 change in physical functioning, and 1/10 [56] reporting a worsening of physical functioning
388 from pre- to post-pacing. Of the seven studies[32,46–48,50,51,57] which used pain to assess
389 pacing efficacy, 4/7[47,48,50,57] reported improvements in pain and 3/7[32,48,50] reported
390 no change in pain scores with pacing. All studies reporting quality of life (1/1)[50], self-
391 efficacy (3/3)[47,50,56], sleep (2/2)[50,56], and depression and anxiety (4/4)[47,50,56,60],
392 found pacing to be efficacious for ME/CFS participants.

393

394 *****INSERT FIGURE 2 AROUND HERE*****

395

396 3.6 Participant characteristics

397 The majority of studies (10/17)[22,47,49–51,55–58,60] did not report age of the participants.
398 For those which did report age, this ranged from 32 ± 14 to 43 ± 13 years. Where studies
399 reported sex (11/17)[32,45–48,51–55,57], this was predominantly female, ranging from 75%
400 to 100% female. Only six studies[32,51,53–55,57] reported ethnicity, with cohorts
401 predominantly Caucasian (94-98%). Time since diagnosis was mostly unreported
402 (12/17)[22,45–47,49–51,55–58,60] but ranged from 32 to 96 months, with a cross-sectional
403 survey reporting 2% of the participants were diagnosed 1-2 years previously; 6% 3-4 years
404 since diagnosis; 13% 3-4 years since diagnosis; 12% 5-6 years since diagnosis; 20% 7-10 years
405 since diagnosis; 29% 11-21 years since diagnosis; 13% 21-30 years since diagnosis; and 5%
406 >30 years since diagnosis. Of the studies which reported comorbidities of the participants
407 (6/17) [22,32,47,53,54,60], the comorbidities were chronic pain, depressive disorder,
408 psychiatric disorder.

409

410 3.7 Study location

411 Of the 17 studies, 14 were from Europe[22,32,45–49,52–56,58,60], and three from North
412 America[50,51,57]. Of the 14 studies[22,32,45–49,52–56,58,60] from Europe,
413 ten[22,32,47,49,52–56,58,60] were conducted in the United Kingdom, three in
414 Belgium[45,46,48], and one was a multicentred study between the United Kingdom and
415 Norway[55].

416

417 3.8 Recruitment strategy

418 Of the 17 studies, three[50,51,57] used announcements in a newspaper and physician referrals
419 to recruit participants, two[47,60] recruited patients referred by a consultant from a National
420 Health Service (NHS) Trust following a pain diagnosis, two[49,52] concerned online
421 platforms on the web, two[56,58] recruited from secondary care clinics, and two used the
422 PACE trial databases[53,54]. Moreover, one study recruited from the hospital [55], one from
423 physiotherapist referrals [22], two from specialist clinic centres [32,61], one from waiting list
424 of rehabilitation centre [45], and one from medical files [46].

425

426 3.9 Study settings

427 Ten studies were carried out in hospital and clinic setting[22,32,45–48,55,56,58,60]. Two
428 studies were performed on online platforms [49,52]. Three studies did not report study
429 setting[50,51,57]. Two studies generated output from PACE trial databases [53,54]

430

431 3.10 Adherence and feasibility

432 All five intervention studies reported adherence rates (which they defined as number of
433 sessions attended), which ranged from 4-44% (4% [46], 8% [32], 25% [45], 29% [48], and
434 44% [47]). One study reported the median number of rehabilitation programme sessions
435 attended was five out of six possible sessions, with 58.9% [47] participants attending ≥ 5
436 sessions; 83.2% participants attending at least one educational session on activity pacing and
437 56.1% attending both activity pacing sessions.

438

439 4 Discussion

440 This scoping review summarises the existing literature, with a view to aid physicians and
441 healthcare practitioners better summarise evidence for pacing in ME/CFS and use this
442 knowledge for other post-viral fatiguing conditions. Overall, studies generally reported pacing
443 to be beneficial for people with ME/CFS. The exception to this trend is the controversial PACE
444 trial [33–36], which we will expand on in subsequent sections. We believe information
445 generated within this review can facilitate discussion of research opportunities and issues that
446 need to be addressed in future studies concerning pacing, particularly given the immediate
447 public health issue of the long COVID pandemic. As mentioned, we found some preliminary
448 evidence for improved symptoms following pacing interventions or strategies. However, we
449 wish to caution the reader that the current evidence base is extremely limited and hampered by
450 several limitations which preclude clear conclusions on the efficacy of pacing. Firstly, studies
451 were of poor to fair methodological quality (indicated by the PEDro scores), often with small
452 sample sizes, and therefore unknown power to detect change. Moreover, very few studies
453 *implemented* pacing, with most studies merely consulting on people’s views on pacing. This
454 may of course lead to multiple biases such as reporting, recruitment, survivorship,

455 confirmation, availability heuristic, to name but a few. Thus, there is a pressing need for more
456 high-quality interventions studies. Secondly, the reporting of pacing strategies used was
457 inconsistent and lacked detail, making it difficult to describe current approaches, or implement
458 them in future research or symptom management strategies. Furthermore, outcome evaluations
459 varied greatly between studies. This prevents any appropriate synthesis of research findings.
460 The lack of evidence concerning pacing is concerning given pacing is the only NICE
461 recommended management strategy for ME/CFS following the 2021 update [31]. Given the
462 analogous nature of long COVID with ME/CFS, patients and practitioners will be looking to
463 the ME/CFS literature for guidance for symptom management. There is an urgent need for high
464 quality studies (such as RCTs) investigating the effectiveness of pacing and better reporting of
465 pacing intervention strategies so that clear recommendations can be made to patients. If this
466 does not happen soon, there will be serious healthcare and economic implications for years to
467 come [62,63].

468

469 4.1 Efficacy of pacing

470 Most studies (12/17) highlighted improvements in at least one outcome measure following
471 pacing. Pacing was self-reported to be the most efficacious, safe, acceptable, and preferred
472 form of activity management for people with ME/CFS [52]. Pacing was reported to improve
473 symptoms and improve general health outcomes [22,47,49,55,60], fatigue and PEM
474 [45,47,48,50–53,57,60], physical functioning [45,47,48,50,53,55,57,60], pain [22,47,52,60],
475 quality of life [47], self-efficacy [47,50], sleep [50,52], and depression and anxiety [47,50,60].
476 These positive findings provide hope for those with ME/CFS, and other chronic fatiguing
477 conditions such as long COVID, to improve quality of life through symptom management.

478 Conversely, some studies reported no effects of pacing on ME/CFS symptoms [49], fatigue,
479 physical functioning [32], or pain scores [46,58]. Some studies even found pacing to have
480 detrimental effects in those with ME/CFS, including a worsening of symptoms in 14% of
481 survey participants recalling previous pacing experiences [49]. Furthermore, a worsening of
482 fatigue [32,56], and physical functioning from pre- to post-pacing [32,54,56,58] was reported
483 by the PACE trial and sub-analysis of the PACE trial [53,54,58]. The PACE trial [32], a large
484 RCT (n=639) comparing pacing with CBT and GET, reported GET and CBT were more
485 effective for reducing ME/CFS-related fatigue and improving physical functioning than
486 pacing. However, the methodology and conclusions from the PACE trial have been heavily
487 criticised, mainly due to the authors lowering the thresholds they used to determine
488 improvement [33–35,64]. With this in mind, Sharpe et al. [53] surveyed 75% of the participants
489 from the PACE trial 1-year post-intervention and reported pacing improved fatigue and
490 physical functioning, with effects similar to CBT and GET.

491

492 4.2 Lessons for pacing implementation

493 All pacing intervention studies (5/5) implemented educational or coaching sessions. These
494 educational components were generally poorly reported in terms of the specific content and
495 how and where they had been developed, with unclear pedagogical approaches. Consequently,
496 even where interventions reported reduction in PEM or improved symptoms, it would be
497 impossible to transfer that research into practice, future studies, or clinical guidance, given the
498 ambiguity of reporting. Sessions typically contained themes of pacing such as activity
499 adjustment (decrease, break-up, and reschedule activities based on energy levels), activity
500 consistency (maintaining a consistently low level of activity to prevent PEM), activity planning
501 (planning activities and rest around available energy levels), and activity progression (slowly

502 progressing activity once maintaining a steady baseline) [32,45–48]. We feel it is pertinent to
503 note here that although activity progression has been incorporated as a pacing strategy in these
504 included studies, some view activity progression as a form of GET. The NICE definition of
505 GET is “first establishing an individual's baseline of achievable exercise or physical activity,
506 then making fixed incremental increases in the time spent being physically active” [31]. Thus,
507 this form of pacing can also be considered a type of ‘long-term GET’ in which physical activity
508 progression is performed over weeks or months with fixed incremental increases in time spent
509 being physically.

510 Intervention studies attempted to create behaviour change, through educational programmes
511 to modify physical activity, and plan behaviours. However, none of these studies detailed
512 integrating any evidence-based theories of behaviour change [65] or reported using any
513 frameworks to support behaviour change objectives. This is unfortunate since there is good
514 evidence that theory-driven behaviour change interventions result in greater intervention
515 effects [66]. Indeed, there is a large body of work regarding methods of behaviour change
516 covering public health messaging, education, and intervention design, which has largely been
517 ignored by the pacing literature. Interventions relied on subjective pacing (5/5 studies), with
518 strategies including keeping an activity diary (3/5 studies) to identify links between activity
519 and fatigue [32,45,47]. Given the high prevalence of ‘brain fog’ within ME/CFS [67–70],
520 recall may be extremely difficult and there is significant potential for under-reporting. Other
521 strategies included simply asking participants to estimate energy levels available for daily
522 activities (2/5 studies [45,48]). Again, this is subjective and relies on participants’ ability to
523 recall previous consequences of the activity. Other methods of activity tracking and
524 measuring energy availability, such as wearable technology [71–75] could provide a more
525 objective measure of adherence and pacing strategy fidelity in future studies. Despite
526 technology such as accelerometers being widely accessible since well-before the earliest

527 interventional study included in this review (which was published in 2009²
528), none of the interventional studies utilised objective activity tracking to track pacing and
529 provide feedback to participants. One study considered accelerometry alongside an activity
530 diary [48]. However, accelerometry was considered the outcome variable, to assess change in
531 activity levels from pre- to post-intervention and was not part of the intervention itself (which
532 was one pacing coaching sessions per week for 3 weeks). Moreover, most research-grade
533 accelerometers cannot be used as part of the intervention since they have no ability to provide
534 continuous feedback and must be retrieved by the research team in order to access any data.
535 Consequently, their use is mostly limited to outcome assessments only. As pacing comprises a
536 limit to physical activity to prevent push-crash cycles, it is an astonishing observation from this
537 scoping review that only two studies objectively measured physical activity to quantify changes
538 to activity as a result of pacing [48,51]. If the aim of pacing is to reduce physical activity, or
539 reduce variations in physical activity (i.e., push-crash cycles), only two studies have objectively
540 quantified the effect pacing had on physical activity, so it is unclear whether pacing was
541 successfully implemented in any of the other studies.

542

543 By exploring the pacing strategies previously used, in both intervention studies and more
544 exploratory studies, we can identify and recommend approaches to improve symptoms of
545 ME/CFS. These approaches can be categorised as follows: activity planning, activity
546 consistency, activity progression, activity adjustment and staying within the Energy Envelope
547 [47,50,57,60]. Activity planning was identified as a particularly effective therapeutic strategy,
548 resulting in improvement of mean scores of all symptoms included in the APQ-28, reducing
549 current pain, improvement of physical fatigue, mental fatigue, self-efficacy, quality of life, and
550 mental and physical functioning [47]. Activity planning aligns with the self-regulatory
551 behaviour change technique ‘Action Planning’ [76] which is commonly used to increase

552 physical activity behaviour. In the case of ME/CFS, activity planning is successfully used to
553 minimise rather than increase physical activity bouts to prevent expending too much energy
554 and avoid PEM. Activity consistency, meaning undertaking similar amounts of activity each
555 day, was also associated with reduced levels of depression, exercise avoidance, and higher
556 levels of physical function [60]. Activity progression was associated with higher levels of
557 current pain. Activity adjustment associated with depression and avoidance, and lower levels
558 of physical function [60]. Staying within the Energy Envelope was reported to reduce PEM
559 severity [50,57], improve physical functioning [50,57] and ME/CFS symptom scores [50], and
560 more hours engaged in activity than individuals with lower available energy [50]. These results
561 suggest that effective pacing strategies would include activity planning, consistency, and
562 energy management techniques while avoiding progression. This data is, of course, limited by
563 the small number of mostly low-quality studies and should be interpreted with some caution.
564 Nevertheless, these are considerations that repeatedly appear in the literature and, as such,
565 warrant deeper investigation. In addition, and as outlined earlier, most studies are relatively
566 old, and we urgently need better insight into how modern technologies, particularly
567 longitudinal activity tracking and contemporaneous heart-rate feedback, might improve (or
568 otherwise) adaptive pacing. Such longitudinal tracking would also enable activities and other
569 behaviours (sleep, diet, stress) to be linked to bouts of PEM. Linking would enable a deeper
570 insight into potential PEM triggers and mitigations that might be possible.

571

572 4.3 The PACE Trial

573 We feel it would be remiss of us to not specifically address the PACE trial within this
574 manuscript, as five of the 17 included studies resulted from the PACE trial [32,53,54,56,58].
575 There has been considerable discussion around the PACE trial, which has been particularly

576 divisive and controversial [34–36,56,64,77,78]. In the PACE trial, GET and CBT were deemed
577 superior to pacing by the authors. Despite its size and funding, the PACE trial has received
578 several published criticisms and rebuttals. Notably, NICE's most recent ME/CFS guideline
579 update removed GET and CBT as suggested treatment options, which hitherto had been
580 underpinned by the PACE findings. While we will not restate the criticisms and rebuttals here,
581 what is not in doubt, is that the PACE trial has dominated discussions of pacing, representing
582 almost a third of all the studies in this review. However, the trial results were published over a
583 decade ago, with the study protocol devised almost two decades ago [79]. The intervening time
584 has seen a revolution in the development of mobile and wearable technology and an ability to
585 remotely track activity and provide real-time feedback in a way which was not available at that
586 time. Furthermore, there has been no substantive research since the PACE trial that has
587 attempted such work. Indeed, possibly driven by the reported lack of effect of pacing in the
588 PACE trial, this review has demonstrated the dearth of progress and innovation in pacing
589 research since its publication. Therefore, regardless of its findings or criticisms, the pacing
590 implementation in the PACE trial is dated, and there is an urgent need for more technologically
591 informed approaches to pacing research.

592

593 4.4 Limitations of the current evidence

594 The first limitation to the literature included in this scoping review is that not all studies
595 followed the minimum data set (MDS) of patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) agreed
596 upon by the British Association of CFS/ME Professionals (BACME) (fatigue, sleep quality,
597 self-efficacy, pain/discomfort, anxiety/depression, mobility, activities of daily living, self-care,
598 and illness severity) [80,81]. All but one study included in this review measured illness
599 severity, most studies included fatigue and pain/discomfort, and some studies included

600 assessments of anxiety/depression. There was a lack of quantitative assessment of sleep quality,
601 self-efficacy, mobility, activities of daily living, and self-care. Therefore, studies did not
602 consistently capture the diverse nature of the symptoms experienced, with crucial domains
603 missing from the analyses. The MDS of PROMs were established in 2012 [80,81] and
604 therefore, for studies published out prior to 2012, these are not applicable [32,46,48,50,51].
605 However, for the 12 studies carried out after this time, the MDS should have been considered
606 elucidate the effects of pacing on ME/CFS. Importantly, despite PEM being a central
607 characteristic of ME/CFS, only two studies included PEM as an outcome measure [52,57]. This
608 may be because of the difficulty of accurately measuring fluctuating symptoms, as PEM occurs
609 multiple times over a period of months, and therefore pre- to post- studies and cross-sectional
610 designs cannot adequately capture PEM incidence. Therefore, it is likely studies opted for
611 measuring general fatigue instead. More appropriate longitudinal study designs are required to
612 track PEM over time to capture a more representative picture of PEM patterns. Secondly,
613 reporting of participant characteristics was inadequate, but in the studies that did describe
614 participants, characteristics were congruent with the epidemiological literature and reporting
615 of ME/CFS populations (i.e., 60-65% female) [82]. Therefore, in this respect, studies included
616 herein were representative samples. However, the lack of reporting of participant
617 characteristics limits inferences we can draw concerning any population-related effects (i.e.
618 whether older, or male, or European, or people referred by a national health service would be
619 more or less likely to respond positively to pacing). Thirdly, comparison groups (where
620 included) were not ideal, with CBT or GET sometimes used as comparators to pacing [32], and
621 often no true control group included. Penultimately, there is a distinct lack of high-quality
622 RCTs (as mentioned throughout this manuscript). Finally, in reference to the previous section,
623 inferences from the literature are dated and do not reflect the technological capabilities of 2023.

624

625 4.5 Recommendations for advancement of the investigative area

626 It is clear from the studies included in this scoping review for the last decade or more, progress
627 and innovation in pacing research have been limited. This is unfortunate for several reasons.
628 People with ME/CFS or long COVID are, of course, invested in their recovery. From our
629 patient and public involvement (PPI) group engagement, it is clear many are ahead of the
630 research and are using wearable technology to track steps, heart rate, and, in some cases, heart
631 rate variability to improve their own pacing practice. While the lack of progress in the research
632 means this is an understandable response by patients, it is also problematic. Without
633 underpinning research, patients may make decisions based on an individual report of trial-and-
634 error approaches given the lack of evidence-based guidance.

635 A more technologically-informed pacing approach could be implemented by integrating
636 wearable trackers [74,75,86,87] to provide participants with live updates on their activity and
637 could be integrated with research-informed messaging aimed at supporting behaviour change,
638 as has been trialled in other research areas [88–91]. However, more work is needed to evaluate
639 how to incorporate wearable activity trackers and which metrics are most helpful.

640 A more technologically-informed approach could also be beneficial for longitudinal symptom
641 tracking, particularly useful given the highly variable symptom loads of ME/CFS and episodic
642 nature of PEM. This would overcome reliance on assessments at a single point in time (as the
643 studies within this review conducted). Similarly, mobile health (mHealth) approaches also
644 allow questionnaires to be digitised to make it easier for participants to complete if they find
645 holding a pen or reading small font problematic [92]. Reminders and notifications can also be
646 helpful for patients completing tasks [74,93–95]. This approach has the added advantage of
647 allowing contemporaneous data collection rather than relying on pre- to post-intervention
648 designs limited by recall bias. Future work must try to leverage these approaches, as unless we

649 collect large data sets on symptoms and behaviours (i.e. activity, diet, sleep, and pharmacology)
650 in people with conditions like ME/CFS we will not be able to leverage emerging technologies
651 such as AI and machine learning to improve the support and care for people with these
652 debilitating conditions. The key areas for research outline in the NICE guidelines (2021 update)
653 speaks to this, with specific mention of improved self-monitoring strategies, sleep strategies,
654 and dietary strategies, all of which can be measured using mHealth approaches, in a scalable
655 and labour-inexpensive way.

656

657 4.6 The potential for existing pacing research to address the long COVID pandemic

658 There is now an urgent public health need to address long COVID, with over 200 million
659 sufferers worldwide [27]. Given the analogous symptomology between ME/CFS and long
660 COVID, and the lack of promising treatment and management strategies in ME/CFS, pacing
661 remains the only strategy for managing long COVID symptoms. This is concerning as the
662 quality of evidence to support pacing is lacking. Given long COVID has reached pandemic
663 proportions, scalable solutions will be required. In this context, we propose that technology
664 should be harnessed to a) deliver, but also b) evaluate, pacing. We recently reported on a just-
665 in-time adaptive intervention to *increase* physical activity during the pandemic [75]. However,
666 this method could be adapted to *decrease* or maintain physical activity levels (i.e., pacing) in
667 long COVID. This method has the advantage of scalability and remote data collection, reducing
668 resource commitments and participant burden, essential for addressing a condition with so
669 many sufferers.

670

671 **4 Conclusion**

672 This review highlights the need for more studies concerning pacing in chronic fatiguing
673 conditions. Future studies would benefit from examining pacing's effect on symptomology and
674 PEM with objectively quantified pacing, over a longer duration of examination, using the
675 MDS. It is essential this is conducted as an RCT, given that in the case of long COVID,
676 participants may improve their health over time, and it is necessary to determine whether
677 pacing exerts an additional effect over time elapsing. Future studies would benefit from
678 digitising pacing to support individuals with varying symptom severity and personalise
679 support. This would improve accessibility and reduce selection bias, in addition to improving
680 scalability of interventions. Finally, clinicians and practitioners should be cognisant of the
681 strength of evidence reported in this review and should exert caution when promoting pacing
682 in their patients, given the varying methods utilised herein.

683

684 **Declarations**

685 **Ethical approval and content to participate**

686 This manuscript did not involve human participants, data, or tissues, so did not require ethical
687 approval.

688 **Consent for publication**

689 This paper does not contain any individual person's data in any form.

690 **Availability of data and materials**

691 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding
692 author on reasonable request.

693 **Competing interests**

694 We report no financial and non-financial competing interests.

695 **Funding**

696 This work was supported by grants from the National Institute for Health and Care Research
697 (COV-LT2-0010) and the funder had no role in the conceptualisation, design, data collection,
698 analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

699 **Authors' contributions**

700 Authors' contributions are given according to the CRediT taxonomy as follows:
701 Conceptualization, N.E.M.S-H., M.M., L.D.H, and N.F.S.; methodology, N.E.M.S-H., M.M.,
702 L.D.H., and N.F.S.; software, N.E.M.S-H., M.M., L.D.H., and N.F.S.B.; validation, N.E.M.S-
703 H., M.M., L.D.H, and N.F.S.; formal analysis, N.E.M.S-H., M.M., L.D.H., and N.F.S.;
704 investigation, N.E.M.S-H., M.M., L.D.H., and N.F.S.; resources, L.D.H., J.O., D.C., N.H.,
705 J.L.M., and N.F.S.; data curation, N.E.M.S.-H., M.M., L.D.H., and N.F.S.; writing—original
706 draft preparation, N.E.M.S.-H., M.M., L.D.H., and N.F.S.; writing—review and editing,
707 N.E.M.S-H., M.M., L.D.H., J.O., D.C., N.H., R.M., J.L.M., J.I., and N.F.S.; visualisation,
708 N.E.M.S-H. and M.M., supervision, N.F.S; project administration, N.E.M.S-H., M.M., L.D.H.,
709 and N.F.S.; funding acquisition, L.D.H., J.O., D.C., N.H., J.L.M., J.I., and N.F.S. All authors
710 have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

711 **Acknowledgements**

712 We have no acknowledgements to make.

713

714 **5 References**

- 715 1. McMurray JC, May JW, Cunningham MW, Jones OY. Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in
716 Children (MIS-C), a Post-viral Myocarditis and Systemic Vasculitis-A Critical Review of Its
717 Pathogenesis and Treatment. *Front Pediatr.* 2020;8:626182.
- 718 2. Perrin R, Riste L, Hann M, Walther A, Mukherjee A, Heald A. Into the looking glass: Post-viral
719 syndrome post COVID-19. *MEDICAL HYPOTHESES.* 2020;144.
- 720 3. Hayes LD, Ingram J, Sculthorpe NF. More Than 100 Persistent Symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 (Long
721 COVID): A Scoping Review. *Frontiers in Medicine.* 2021;8.
- 722 4. Jenkins R. Post-viral fatigue syndrome. *Epidemiology: lessons from the past. Br Med Bull.*
723 1991;47:952–65.
- 724 5. Sandler CX, Wyller VBB, Moss-Morris R, Buchwald D, Crawley E, Hautvast J, et al. Long COVID and
725 Post-infective Fatigue Syndrome: A Review. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 2021;8:ofab440.
- 726 6. Carod-Artal FJ. [Post-COVID-19 syndrome: epidemiology, diagnostic criteria and pathogenic
727 mechanisms involved]. *Rev Neurol.* 2021;72:384–96.
- 728 7. Ballering AV, van Zon SKR, Olde Hartman TC, Rosmalen JGM, Lifelines Corona Research Initiative.
729 Persistence of somatic symptoms after COVID-19 in the Netherlands: an observational cohort study.
730 *Lancet.* 2022;400:452–61.
- 731 8. Wong TL, Weitzer DJ. Long COVID and Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome
732 (ME/CFS)-A Systemic Review and Comparison of Clinical Presentation and Symptomatology.
733 *Medicina (Kaunas).* 2021;57:418.
- 734 9. Sukocheva OA, Maksoud R, Beeraka NM, Madhunapantula SV, Sinelnikov M, Nikolenko VN, et al.
735 Analysis of post COVID-19 condition and its overlap with myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue
736 syndrome. *Journal of Advanced Research [Internet].* 2021 [cited 2022 Aug 17]; Available from:
737 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2090123221002320>
- 738 10. Bonilla H, Quach TC, Tiwari A, Bonilla AE, Miglis M, Yang P, et al. Myalgic
739 Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (ME/CFS) is common in post-acute sequelae of SARS-
740 CoV-2 infection (PASC): Results from a post-COVID-19 multidisciplinary clinic [Internet]. *medRxiv;*
741 2022 [cited 2022 Aug 22]. p. 2022.08.03.22278363. Available from:
742 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.08.03.22278363v1>
- 743 11. Twomey R, DeMars J, Franklin K, Culos-Reed SN, Weatherald J, Wrightson JG. Chronic Fatigue
744 and Postexertional Malaise in People Living With Long COVID: An Observational Study. *Phys Ther.*
745 2022;102:pzac005.
- 746 12. Barhorst EE, Boruch AE, Cook DB, Lindheimer JB. Pain-Related Post-Exertional Malaise in Myalgic
747 Encephalomyelitis / Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (ME/CFS) and Fibromyalgia: A Systematic Review and
748 Three-Level Meta-Analysis. *Pain Med.* 2022;23:1144–57.
- 749 13. Goudsmit EM. The psychological aspects and management of chronic fatigue syndrome
750 [Internet] [Thesis]. Brunel University, School of Social Sciences; 1996 [cited 2022 Jan 20]. Available
751 from: <http://bura.brunel.ac.uk/handle/2438/4283>
- 752 14. Stussman B, Williams A, Snow J, Gavin A, Scott R, Nath A, et al. Characterization of Post-
753 exertional Malaise in Patients With Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. *Front*
754 *Neurol.* 2020;11:1025.

- 755 15. Holtzman CS, Bhatia KP, Cotler J, La J. Assessment of Post-Exertional Malaise (PEM) in Patients
756 with Myalgic Encephalomyelitis (ME) and Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (CFS): A Patient-Driven Survey.
757 Diagnostics (Basel, Switzerland) [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2022 Aug 17];9. Available from:
758 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30832336/>
- 759 16. Fukuda K, Straus SE, Hickie I, Sharpe MC, Dobbins JG, Komaroff A. The chronic fatigue syndrome:
760 a comprehensive approach to its definition and study. International Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Study
761 Group. *Ann Intern Med*. 1994;121:953–9.
- 762 17. Carruthers BM, van de Sande MI, De Meirleir KL, Klimas NG, Broderick G, Mitchell T, et al.
763 Myalgic encephalomyelitis: International Consensus Criteria. *J Intern Med*. 2011;270:327–38.
- 764 18. Carruthers JD, Lowe NJ, Menter MA, Gibson J, Eadie N, Botox Glabellar Lines II Study Group.
765 Double-blind, placebo-controlled study of the safety and efficacy of botulinum toxin type A for
766 patients with glabellar lines. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2003;112:1089–98.
- 767 19. Jason LA, Jordan K, Miike T, Bell DS, Lapp C, Torres-Harding S, et al. A Pediatric Case Definition for
768 Myalgic Encephalomyelitis and Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. *Journal of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome*.
769 2006;13:1–44.
- 770 20. Goudsmit EM, Nijs J, Jason LA, Wallman KE. Pacing as a strategy to improve energy management
771 in myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome: a consensus document. *Disability and*
772 *Rehabilitation*. 2012;34:1140–7.
- 773 21. Antcliff D, Keenan A-M, Keeley P, Woby S, McGowan L. Engaging stakeholders to refine an
774 activity pacing framework for chronic pain/fatigue: A nominal group technique. *Musculoskeletal*
775 *Care*. 2019;17:354–62.
- 776 22. Antcliff D, Keeley P, Campbell M, Woby S, McGowan L. Exploring patients' opinions of activity
777 pacing and a new activity pacing questionnaire for chronic pain and/or fatigue: a qualitative study.
778 *Physiotherapy*. 2016;102:300–7.
- 779 23. Yoshiuchi K, Cook DB, Ohashi K, Kumano H, Kuboki T, Yamamoto Y, et al. A real-time assessment
780 of the effect of exercise in chronic fatigue syndrome. *Physiol Behav*. 2007;92:963–8.
- 781 24. Davenport TE, Stevens SR, Baroni K, Van Ness M, Snell CR. Diagnostic accuracy of symptoms
782 characterising chronic fatigue syndrome. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2011;33:1768–75.
- 783 25. M N, C R, A F, S T, L J, N M, et al. Recommendations for the recognition, diagnosis, and
784 management of long COVID: a Delphi study. *The British journal of general practice : the journal of*
785 *the Royal College of General Practitioners* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2023 Mar 23];71. Available from:
786 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34607799/>
- 787 26. Je H, Wn N, J W, A A, Jm B, Tk F, et al. Multidisciplinary collaborative consensus guidance
788 statement on the assessment and treatment of fatigue in postacute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2
789 infection (PASC) patients. *PM & R : the journal of injury, function, and rehabilitation* [Internet]. 2021
790 [cited 2023 Mar 23];13. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34346558/>
- 791 27. Chen C, Hauptert SR, Zimmermann L, Shi X, Fritsche LG, Mukherjee B. Global Prevalence of Post
792 COVID-19 Condition or Long COVID: A Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review. *J Infect Dis*.
793 2022;jiac136.

- 794 28. Office for National Statistics. Prevalence of ongoing symptoms following coronavirus (COVID-19)
795 infection in the UK [Internet]. [cited 2022 Sep 22]. Available from:
796 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/prevalenceofongoingsymptomsfollowingcoronaviruscovid19infectionintheuk/7july2022>
797
- 798 29. Office for National Statistics. Prevalence of ongoing symptoms following coronavirus (COVID-19)
799 infection in the UK [Internet]. [cited 2022 Apr 1]. Available from:
800 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/prevalenceofongoingsymptomsfollowingcoronaviruscovid19infectionintheuk/3march2022>
801 22
802
- 803 30. Baker R, Shaw EJ. Diagnosis and management of chronic fatigue syndrome or myalgic
804 encephalomyelitis (or encephalopathy): summary of NICE guidance. *BMJ*. 2007;335:446–8.
- 805 31. NICE. Overview | Myalgic encephalomyelitis (or encephalopathy)/chronic fatigue syndrome:
806 diagnosis and management | Guidance | NICE [Internet]. NICE; [cited 2022 Aug 22]. Available from:
807 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng206>
- 808 32. White P, Goldsmith K, Johnson A, Potts L, Walwyn R, DeCesare J, et al. Comparison of adaptive
809 pacing therapy, cognitive behaviour therapy, graded exercise therapy, and specialist medical care for
810 chronic fatigue syndrome (PACE): a randomised trial. *The Lancet*. 2011;377:823–36.
- 811 33. Vink M. PACE trial authors continue to ignore their own null effect. *Journal of health psychology*.
812 2017;22:1134-1140.
- 813 34. Petrie K, Weinman J. The PACE trial: it's time to broaden perceptions and move on. *Journal of*
814 *health psychology*. 2017;22:1198-1200.
- 815 35. Stouten B. PACE-GATE: an alternative view on a study with a poor trial protocol. *Journal of health*
816 *psychology*. 2017;22:1192-1197.
- 817 36. Agardy S. Chronic fatigue syndrome patients have no reason to accept the PACE trial results:
818 response to Keith J Petrie and John Weinman. *Journal of health psychology*. 2017;22:1206-1208.
- 819 37. Kim D-Y, Lee J-S, Park S-Y, Kim S-J, Son C-G. Systematic review of randomized controlled trials for
820 chronic fatigue syndrome/myalgic encephalomyelitis (CFS/ME). *Journal of Translational Medicine*.
821 2020;18:7.
- 822 38. Twisk FNM, Maes M. A review on cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) and graded exercise therapy
823 (GET) in myalgic encephalomyelitis (ME) / chronic fatigue syndrome (CFS): CBT/GET is not only
824 ineffective and not evidence-based, but also potentially harmful for many patients with ME/CFS.
825 *Neuro Endocrinol Lett*. 2009;30:284–99.
- 826 39. Mays N, Roberts E, Popay J. Synthesising research evidence. In: Fulop N, Allen P, Clarke A, Black
827 N, editors. *Studying the organisation and delivery of health services: research methods* [Internet].
828 London: Routledge; 2001 [cited 2020 Apr 14]. p. 188–220. Available from:
829 <https://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/id/eprint/15408/>
- 830 40. Munn Z, Peters MDJ, Stern C, Tufanaru C, McArthur A, Aromataris E. Systematic review or
831 scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review
832 approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2018;18:143.

- 833 41. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International*
834 *Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2005;8:19–32.
- 835 42. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping
836 Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018;169:467–73.
- 837 43. de Morton NA. The PEDro scale is a valid measure of the methodological quality of clinical trials:
838 a demographic study. *Aust J Physiother*. 2009;55:129–33.
- 839 44. Maher CG, Sherrington C, Herbert RD, Moseley AM, Elkins M. Reliability of the PEDro scale for
840 rating quality of randomized controlled trials. *Phys Ther*. 2003;83:713–21.
- 841 45. Kos D, van Eupen I, Meirte J, Van Cauwenbergh D, Moorkens G, Meeus M, et al. Activity Pacing
842 Self-Management in Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Am J Occup Ther*.
843 2015;69:6905290020.
- 844 46. Meeus M, Nijs J, Van Oosterwijck J, Van Alsenoy V, Truijen S. Pain Physiology Education Improves
845 Pain Beliefs in Patients With Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Compared With Pacing and Self-
846 Management Education: A Double-Blind Randomized Controlled Trial. *Archives of Physical Medicine*
847 *and Rehabilitation*. 2010;91:1153–9.
- 848 47. Antcliff D, Keenan A-M, Keeley P, Woby S, McGowan L. Testing a newly developed activity pacing
849 framework for chronic pain/fatigue: a feasibility study. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11:e045398.
- 850 48. Nijs J, van Eupen I, Vandecauter J, Augustinus E, Bleyen G, Moorkens G, et al. Can pacing self-
851 management alter physical behavior and symptom severity in chronic fatigue syndrome? A case
852 series. *J Rehabil Res Dev*. 2009;46:985–96.
- 853 49. Geraghty K, Hann M, Kurtev S. Myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome patients'
854 reports of symptom changes following cognitive behavioural therapy, graded exercise therapy and
855 pacing treatments: Analysis of a primary survey compared with secondary surveys. *J Health Psychol*.
856 2019;24:1318–33.
- 857 50. Jason L, Muldowney K, Torres-Harding S. The Energy Envelope Theory and myalgic
858 encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome. *AAOHN J*. 2008;56:189–95.
- 859 51. Brown M, Khorana N, Jason LA. The Role of Changes in Activity as a Function of Perceived
860 Available and Expended Energy in Non-Pharmacological Treatment Outcomes for ME/CFS. *Journal of*
861 *clinical psychology*. 2011;67:253.
- 862 52. Association ME. ME/CFS illness management survey results:“No decisions about me without
863 me.” Part 1: Results and in-depth analysis of the 2012 ME association patient survey examining the
864 acceptability, efficacy and safety of cognitive behavioural therapy, graded exercise therapy and
865 pacing, as interventions used as management strategies for ME/CFS. 2015.
- 866 53. Sharpe M, Goldsmith KA, Johnson AL, Chalder T, Walker J, White PD. Rehabilitative treatments
867 for chronic fatigue syndrome: long-term follow-up from the PACE trial. *The Lancet Psychiatry*.
868 2015;2:1067–74.
- 869 54. White PD, Goldsmith K, Johnson AL, Chalder T, Sharpe M. Recovery from chronic fatigue
870 syndrome after treatments given in the PACE trial. *Psychol Med*. 2013;43:2227–35.

- 871 55. O’connor K, Sunnquist M, Nicholson L, Jason LA, Newton JL, Strand EB. Energy envelope
872 maintenance among patients with myalgic encephalomyelitis and chronic fatigue syndrome:
873 Implications of limited energy reserves. *Chronic Illn.* 2019;15:51–60.
- 874 56. Dougall D, Johnson A, Goldsmith K, Sharpe M, Angus B, Chalder T, et al. Adverse events and
875 deterioration reported by participants in the PACE trial of therapies for chronic fatigue syndrome.
876 *Journal of Psychosomatic Research.* 2014;77:20–6.
- 877 57. Brown AA, Evans MA, Jason LA. Examining the energy envelope and associated symptom
878 patterns in chronic fatigue syndrome: does coping matter? *Chronic Illn.* 2013;9:302–11.
- 879 58. Bourke JH, Johnson AL, Sharpe M, Chalder T, White PD. Pain in chronic fatigue syndrome:
880 response to rehabilitative treatments in the PACE trial. *Psychol Med.* 2014;44:1545–52.
- 881 59. Jason LA, Brown M, Brown A, Evans M, Flores S, Grant-Holler E, et al. Energy
882 Conservation/Envelope Theory Interventions to Help Patients with Myalgic
883 Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. *Fatigue.* 2013;1:27–42.
- 884 60. Antcliff D, Campbell M, Woby S, Keeley P. Activity Pacing is Associated With Better and Worse
885 Symptoms for Patients With Long-term Conditions. *Clin J Pain.* 2017;33:205–14.
- 886 61. Nijs T, Klein Y, Mousavi S, Ahsan A, Nowakowska S, Constable E, et al. The Different Faces of 4’-
887 Pyrimidinyl-Functionalized 4,2’:6’,4"-Terpyridin es: Metal-Organic Assemblies from Solution and on
888 Au(111) and Cu(111) Surface Platforms. *JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY.*
889 2018;140:2933–9.
- 890 62. Cutler DM, Summers LH. The COVID-19 Pandemic and the \$16 Trillion Virus. *JAMA.*
891 2020;324:1495–6.
- 892 63. Cutler DM. The Costs of Long COVID. *JAMA Health Forum.* 2022;3:e221809–e221809.
- 893 64. Geraghty K. ‘PACE-Gate’: when clinical trial evidence meets open data access. *Journal of health*
894 *psychology.* 2017;22:1106-1112.
- 895 65. Davis R, Campbell R, Hildon Z, Hobbs L, Michie S. Theories of behaviour and behaviour change
896 across the social and behavioural sciences: a scoping review. *Health Psychology Review.* 2015;9:323–
897 44.
- 898 66. Prestwich A, Sniehotta FF, Whittington C, Dombrowski SU, Rogers L, Michie S. Does theory
899 influence the effectiveness of health behavior interventions? Meta-analysis. *Health Psychol.*
900 2014;33:465–74.
- 901 67. Balinas C, Eaton-Fitch N, Maksoud R, Staines D, Marshall-Gradisnik S. Impact of Life Stressors on
902 Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Symptoms: An Australian Longitudinal Study.
903 *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021;18:10614.
- 904 68. McGregor NR, Armstrong CW, Lewis DP, Gooley PR. Post-Exertional Malaise Is Associated with
905 Hypermetabolism, Hypoacetylation and Purine Metabolism Deregulation in ME/CFS Cases.
906 *Diagnostics.* 2019;9:70.
- 907 69. Nacul LC, Lacerda EM, Campion P, Pheby D, Drachler M de L, Leite JC, et al. The functional status
908 and well being of people with myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome and their carers.
909 *BMC Public Health.* 2011;11:402.

- 910 70. Us D, A V, V F, G S, E M, P L-C, et al. Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome
911 (ME/CFS): An Overview. *Journal of clinical medicine* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Aug 17];10.
912 Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34682909/>
- 913 71. Düking P, Giessing L, Frenkel MO, Koehler K, Holmberg H-C, Sperlich B. Wrist-Worn Wearables
914 for Monitoring Heart Rate and Energy Expenditure While Sitting or Performing Light-to-Vigorous
915 Physical Activity: Validation Study. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2020;8:e16716.
- 916 72. Falter M, Budts W, Goetschalckx K, Cornelissen V, Buys R. Accuracy of Apple Watch
917 Measurements for Heart Rate and Energy Expenditure in Patients With Cardiovascular Disease:
918 Cross-Sectional Study. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2019;7:e11889.
- 919 73. Fuller D, Colwell E, Low J, Orychock K, Tobin MA, Simango B, et al. Reliability and Validity of
920 Commercially Available Wearable Devices for Measuring Steps, Energy Expenditure, and Heart Rate:
921 Systematic Review. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2020;8:e18694.
- 922 74. Mair JL, Hayes LD, Campbell AK, Sculthorpe N. Should We Use Activity Tracker Data From
923 Smartphones and Wearables to Understand Population Physical Activity Patterns? *Journal for the*
924 *Measurement of Physical Behaviour*. 2022;1:1–5.
- 925 75. Mair JL, Hayes LD, Campbell AK, Buchan DS, Easton C, Sculthorpe N. A Personalized Smartphone-
926 Delivered Just-in-time Adaptive Intervention (JitaBug) to Increase Physical Activity in Older Adults:
927 Mixed Methods Feasibility Study. *JMIR Formative Research*. 2022;6:e34662.
- 928 76. Michie S, Richardson M, Johnston M, Abraham C, Francis J, Hardeman W, et al. The behavior
929 change technique taxonomy (v1) of 93 hierarchically clustered techniques: building an international
930 consensus for the reporting of behavior change interventions. *Ann Behav Med*. 2013;46:81–95.
- 931 77. Feehan SM. The PACE trial in chronic fatigue syndrome. *The Lancet*. 2011;377:1831–2.
- 932 78. Giakoumakis J. The PACE trial in chronic fatigue syndrome. *The Lancet*. 2011;377:1831.
- 933 79. White PD, Sharpe MC, Chalder T, DeCesare JC, Walwyn R, PACE trial group. Protocol for the PACE
934 trial: a randomised controlled trial of adaptive pacing, cognitive behaviour therapy, and graded
935 exercise, as supplements to standardised specialist medical care versus standardised specialist
936 medical care alone for patients with the chronic fatigue syndrome/myalgic encephalomyelitis or
937 encephalopathy. *BMC Neurol*. 2007;7:6.
- 938 80. Reuben DB, Tinetti ME. Goal-oriented patient care--an alternative health outcomes paradigm. *N*
939 *Engl J Med*. 2012;366:777–9.
- 940 81. Roberts D. Chronic fatigue syndrome and quality of life. *PROM*. 2018;9:253–62.
- 941 82. Valdez AR, Hancock EE, Adebayo S, Kiernicki DJ, Proskauer D, Attewell JR, et al. Estimating
942 Prevalence, Demographics, and Costs of ME/CFS Using Large Scale Medical Claims Data and Machine
943 Learning. *Frontiers in Pediatrics* [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2022 Oct 21];6. Available from:
944 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fped.2018.00412>
- 945 83. Munblit D, Nicholson T, Akrami A, Apfelbacher C, Chen J, De Groote W, et al. A core outcome set
946 for post-COVID-19 condition in adults for use in clinical practice and research: an international
947 Delphi consensus study. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2022;10:715–24.

- 948 84. Pithon MM. Importance of the control group in scientific research. *Dental Press J Orthod.*
949 2013;18:13–4.
- 950 85. Banerjee A, Chitnis UB, Jadhav SL, Bhawalkar JS, Chaudhury S. Hypothesis testing, type I and type
951 II errors. *Ind Psychiatry J.* 2009;18:127–31.
- 952 86. Greiwe J, Nyenhuis SM. Wearable Technology and How This Can Be Implemented into Clinical
953 Practice. *Curr Allergy Asthma Rep.* 2020;20:36.
- 954 87. Sun S, Folarin AA, Ranjan Y, Rashid Z, Conde P, Stewart C, et al. Using Smartphones and Wearable
955 Devices to Monitor Behavioral Changes During COVID-19. *J Med Internet Res.* 2020;22:e19992.
- 956 88. Hardeman W, Houghton J, Lane K, Jones A, Naughton F. A systematic review of just-in-time
957 adaptive interventions (JITAs) to promote physical activity. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2019;16:31.
- 958 89. Perski O, Hébert ET, Naughton F, Hekler EB, Brown J, Businelle MS. Technology-mediated just-in-
959 time adaptive interventions (JITAs) to reduce harmful substance use: a systematic review. *Addiction.*
960 2022;117:1220–41.
- 961 90. Aslam Ahmed S, van Luenen S, Aslam S, van Bodegom D, Chavannes NH. A systematic review on
962 the use of mHealth to increase physical activity in older people. *Clinical eHealth.* 2020;3:31–9.
- 963 91. Valenzuela T, Okubo Y, Woodbury A, Lord SR, Delbaere K. Adherence to Technology-Based
964 Exercise Programs in Older Adults: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Geriatric Physical Therapy.*
965 2018;41:49–61.
- 966 92. Bowling A. Mode of questionnaire administration can have serious effects on data quality.
967 *Journal of Public Health.* 2005;27:281–91.
- 968 93. Burns SP, Terblanche M, Perea J, Lillard H, DeLaPena C, Grinage N, et al. mHealth Intervention
969 Applications for Adults Living With the Effects of Stroke: A Scoping Review. *Archives of Rehabilitation
970 Research and Clinical Translation.* 2021;3:100095.
- 971 94. Vandelanotte C, Müller AM, Short CE, Hingle M, Nathan N, Williams SL, et al. Past, Present, and
972 Future of eHealth and mHealth Research to Improve Physical Activity and Dietary Behaviors. *J Nutr
973 Educ Behav.* 2016;48:219-228.e1.
- 974 95. Ludwig K, Arthur R, Sculthorpe N, Fountain H, Buchan DS. Text Messaging Interventions for
975 Improvement in Physical Activity and Sedentary Behavior in Youth: Systematic Review. *JMIR
976 mHealth and uHealth.* 2018;6:e10799.

977

978

979

980

FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1 Schematic flow diagram describing exclusions of potential studies and final number of studies. RCT = randomized control trial. CT = controlled trial. UCT = uncontrolled trial.

Fig. 2 Bubble plot displaying number of studies reporting each domain (x-axis) and the percentage of studies reporting improvement with pacing (y-axis), including a coloured scale of improvement from 0-100%. PEM = post-exertional malaise, 6MWT = 6-minute walk time, CFS = chronic fatigue syndrome, DSQ = DePaul Symptom Questionnaire, PA = Physical Activity, HRQOL = Health-related quality of life, COPM = The Canadian Occupational Performance Measure.

TABLE LEGENDS

Table 1. Description of included studies and data sets. RCT = randomised control trial; UCT = uncontrolled trial.

Table 2. Diagnostic criteria used in included studies to define ME/CFS (if reported).

Table 1. Description of included studies and data sets. RCT = randomised control trial; UCT = uncontrolled trial.

Intervention Trials											
Ref.	Type of pacing and duration of intervention (if relevant)	Study design (RCT, observational cohort, etc.)	Trial registered or not	Participants (<i>n</i> , age, gender, ethnicity, time since diagnosis)	Comorbidities	Location	Recruitment setting and study setting	Adherence	Outcome measures	Results (improvement or not, baseline to post-pacing intervention)	PEDro Score
Antcliff et al. 2021	Six-week rehabilitation programme using the activity pacing framework (6 x 3.5 hours sessions). Programme	Single-arm, repeated measures study, a non-randomised feasibility study	Registered at ClinicalTrials.gov: NCT03497585	n=107 Predominantly female (86%). Mean age 55.25±12.83	Lower back pain (73.8%), CFS/ME (11.2%), 61.3% of participants reported two or more conditions of chronic pain	Northern England, UK	One National Health Service (NHS) pain service	The median number of rehabilitation programme sessions attended of total 6 sessions was five (58.9% participants)	APQ-28 CFQ EQ-5D-5L GAD-7 NRS PASS-20 PHQ-9	Pacing improved mean scores of all symptoms	5

	<p>included understanding of e.g. graded exercise, relaxation and goal setting etc. Pacing was instructed in one session but not informed or standardised by any particular guide or framework.</p>				<p>and/or fatigue. 11.2% participants with CFS/ME, 83% reported ME/CFS as main condition, and 92% at least one comorbidity of LBP (64%), chronic widespread pain (55%), fibromyalgia (64%) or another condition (27%).</p>			<p>attended ≥5 sessions); 83.2% participants attended at least one activity pacing session and 56.1% attended both activity pacing sessions. 100% of participants attended at least one activity pacing specific session and 54 (83.1%) participants</p>	<p>PSEQ SF-12</p>		
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------	--	--

								ts attended both activity pacing sessions.			
[45]	Coached activity pacing self-management. Three individual therapy sessions of 60-90 min/wk for three consecutive weeks of either “activity pacing self-management” or “Relaxation therapy”	RCT with ‘relaxation’ as control	Registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT01512342)	n=33 (n = 16 in the experimental group, n = 17 in the control group) 41 ± 11 years All female Ethnicity and time since diagnosis not reported.	Not reported	Belgium	Waiting list for multidisciplinary rehabilitation and informed about the study through email University Hospital	25% drop-out in the experimental group, 18% in the control group	CFS Symptom list CIS COPM SF-36	Pacing improved COPM performance (33% of group) Pacing improved satisfaction (42% of group) Pacing improved CIS.	6
[46]	One pacing and self-	RCT with one pain physiolog	Registered at Universit	n=48	Not reported	Belgium	Medical files available at	5% dropouts	NPQ PCI	Pain physiology	9

	management education one-to-one session for 30 minutes.	education one-to-one session as control for 30 minutes	y Hospital Brussels	38±11 years Male = 8 (16.7%) Ethnicity and time since diagnosis not reported			university-based chronic fatigue clinic		PCS (Dutch) PPT TSK	education session group improved knowledge of neurophysiology of pain compared to pacing group. Pain physiology education session group improved Pain catastrophizing scale compared to pacing group	
[48]	Pacing self-management. Five different visits at 1-week intervals. Wore accelerometer for 24 hours for a week.	Case series	Not a registered trial	n= 7 43 ± 13 years All female Median illness duration	Not reported	Belgium	University-based chronic fatigue centre University Hospital	22% dropouts	CFS CFS-APQ CFS Symptom list CIS COPM	Pacing improved CFS Pacing improved COPM Pacing improved VAS	6

				of 96 ± 44 months					SF-36 VAS	Pacing did not improve SF-36 Pacing did not improve CFS Pacing did not improve CIS	
[32]	One year (52 weeks) of activity pacing therapy (APT)	RCT with graded exercise therapy (GET) and cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT), or specialised medical care (SMC) as comparators	Registered (PACE http://isrctn.org , number ISRCTN54285094.)	n = 641 (recruited [figure 1]), n=630 (analysed [figure 1]), n=607 (reported in table 3) 39 ± 12 years 76% women 94% white	Co-morbid psychiatric condition (47%) Depressive disorder (33%)	UK	outpatients attending six specialist chronic fatigue syndrome clinics	8% dropouts	CFQ CGI HADS JSS London criteria for ME SF-36 WSAS	Pacing did not improve fatigue, but CBT and GET did. Pacing did not improve physical function, but CBT and GET did. Pacing did not improve physical function, but CBT and GET did.	6

				Duration of illness 32 (16- 66) months							
Observational Studies											

Antcliff et al. 2016	No intervention, but assessment of perceptions of pacing. Phone interview after received postal study and APQ-38 questionnaire.	Cross-sectional observational	Not a registered trial	n=16 Adult patients, and were aged ≥ 18 years Duration of illness (all ≥ 3 months' duration) No mention of sex or ethnicity of patients	Chronic low back pain, chronic widespread pain, fibromyalgia	North West England, UK	Physiotherapy out-patients department in NHS Trust Physiotherapy out-patients	Not reported	APQ-38 CPCI PARQ	Most participants who implemented pacing reported it was beneficial.	3
----------------------	---	-------------------------------	------------------------	--	--	------------------------	--	--------------	--------------------------------	--	---

Antcliff et al. 2017	No intervention, but assessment of perceptions of pacing	Cross-sectional observational	Not a registered trial	n=257 Adult patients Age, sex, and ethnicity are not reported.	Chronic low back pain, chronic widespread pain, fibromyalgia and CFS/ME.	UK	Physiotherapy out-patients department in NHS Trust Postal questionnaires and physiotherapy at hospital	83% enrolled were included in final analyses.	APQ-38 APQ-26 CFQ HADS NRS PASS-20 SF-12	Activity adjustment was associated with higher levels of current pain, depression and avoidance, and lower levels of physical function Activity consistency was associated with lower levels of physical fatigue, depression and avoidance and higher levels of physical function Activity progression	4
----------------------	--	-------------------------------	------------------------	--	--	----	---	---	--	--	---

										was associated with higher levels of current pain Activity planning was significantly associated with lower levels of physical fatigue, and activity acceptance was associated with higher levels of current pain and avoidance	
BacME Association 2015	No intervention, but assessment of perceptions of pacing	Cross-sectional observational	Not a registered trial	n=1428 (CBT=493; GET=233; pacing=226) 78% female	Not reported	UK	Online platform (ME Association website) launched May 2012 Open to anyone	N/A	Appropriateness of treatment experience Common ME symptoms	Pacing was reported to be the most effective, safe, acceptable and preferred form of activity management	3

				<p>Time since diagnosis: 1-2 years 2%; 3-4 years 6%; 3-4 years 13%; 5-6 years 12%; 7-10 years 20%; 11-21 years 29%; 21-30 years 13%; >30 years 5%</p> <p>Age and ethnicity not reported</p>			with ME, CFS or post-viral fatigue syndrome		<p>severity (several)</p> <p>Disability benefits</p> <p>Employment and education</p> <p>Illness severity</p> <p>PEM</p>		
Brown et al. 2013	No intervention, but assessment of energy envelope	Cross-sectional observational	Not a registered trial	<p>n= 91</p> <p>83% female</p> <p>87% white</p>	Not reported	Chicago metropolitan area, USA	Newspaper and physician referrals, and support groups 46% were referred by	20% dropout	<p>bCOPE</p> <p>EEQ</p> <p>PEM from CFSMQ</p> <p>SF-36</p>	Cluster 1 (individuals highly outside the energy envelope) experienced high levels of PEM severity and impaired physical	3

						<p>physicians, 34% through media advertisements, and 20% from “other sources”</p> <p>Setting unclear</p>			<p>function</p> <p>Cluster 2 (those better staying within their energy envelope) experienced higher levels of physical functioning, and lower PEM severity</p> <p>Cluster 3 (symptomatic and mildly overextended) was comprised of individuals who were the least outside of their energy envelope, but were impaired on physical function, and had high levels of PEM</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Brown et al. 2011	<p>One year of 13, 45 min sessions of CBT with GET, anaerobic activity, cognitive coping skills, and relaxation bi-weekly</p> <p>Treatments were collapsed in this paper</p> <p>Analysis concerned participants within and outside their energy envelope</p>	Prospective observational	Not a registered trial	<p>n=44</p> <p>82% female</p> <p>91% white</p> <p>At least 18 years of age</p>	Not reported	Chicago, USA	<p>Physician referrals, media advertisements, and ME/CFS support groups</p> <p>Setting unclear</p>	61% dropout	<p>Actigraph</p> <p>CFS</p> <p>EEQ</p> <p>FSS</p> <p>SF-36</p>	<p>Pacing improved physical function and fatigue compared to those outside their energy envelope</p>	3
-------------------	--	---------------------------	------------------------	--	--------------	--------------	--	-------------	--	--	---

Geraghty et al. 2019	No intervention, but assessment of perceptions of pacing and other treatments. Online survey open for 4 months.	Cross-sectional observational compared to BacME Association (2015) survey	Not a registered trial	n=1428 compared to n=16,665. Average illness duration 4.4 years Most respondents were female (79%)	Not reported	UK	Online platform advertised nationally and open for 4 months	N/A	Appropriateness of treatment experience Common ME symptoms severity (several) Disability benefits Employment and education Illness severity PEM (same as BacME Association [2015] survey)	Pacing improved symptoms (44% of respondents), or worsened symptoms (14% of respondents)	2
----------------------	---	---	------------------------	--	--------------	----	---	-----	---	--	---

Jason et al. 2008	No intervention, but assessment of energy envelope	Prospective observational	Not a registered trial	n=110 At least 18 years old Physically capable of attending scheduled sessions. Sex and ethnicity not reported.	Not reported	Chicago, USA	Newspaper and physician referrals, and support groups 46% were referred by physicians, 34% through media advertisements, and 20% from “other sources” Setting unclear	3.5% drop out	BAI BDI-II BPI CFS DSM-IV FSS GSE PSS PSQI SF-36 QOLS	Pacing was associated with less PEM incidence, less depression, less anxiety, less fatigue, better sleep, better quality of life, better physical functioning and vitality, less difficulties with work or daily activities. Pacing was associated with less frequency of exercise avoidance, and less fatigue impairing daily activities	3
-------------------	--	---------------------------	------------------------	--	--------------	--------------	---	---------------	---	--	---

[55]	No intervention, but assessment of energy envelope	Cross-sectional observational	Registered (institutional review board approval #LREC 1 – 08/H0906/5).	n=181 83% female 98% Caucasian Age and Time since diagnosis not reported	Not reported	UK and Norway	Hospital setting	Not reported	DSQ EEQ SF-36	Pacing was associated with better physical function scores, total symptom scores, and engaged in more hours of activity	4
Sub-Analysis of PACE											
Bourke et al. 2014	PACE Trial re-analysis so APT Duration of 52 weeks.	RCT with GET, CBT, and SMC as comparators	Registered (PACE http://isrctn.org , number ISRCTN54285094.)	n=641 Around 90% at least caucasian Mean age 39 years Mostly female 76%	Depressive disorder 34%	UK	Patients from secondary-care specialist CFS clinic	Drop out 5%	ACR CDC criteria Oxford criteria for CFS	CBT and GET improved pain more than APT and SMC	7

Dougall et al. 2014	PACE Trial re-analysis so APT Follow-up interviews were conducted 12, 24, and 52 weeks after randomisation.	RCT with GET, CBT, and SMC as comparators	Registered (PACE http://isrctn.org , number ISRCTN54285094.)	n=641 Sex, age and ethnicity not reported.	Not reported	UK	Patients from six secondary care clinics with a diagnosis of CFS	Not reported	AES CBRQ CDC criteria CFS DSM-IV PHQ-15 HADS JSS London criteria for ME Oxford criteria for CFS SF-36 SEMCD	Pacing worsened physical function (25% of group) more than SMC (18%), GET (11%) and CBT (9%) No other between-group differences	4
[53]	PACE Trial re-	2 year follow-up of RCT	Registered (PACE http://isrctn.org)	n=481 (75%) participants	Psychiatric disorder (46%)	UK	PACE trial database	75% of participants from	CFQ PCGI	Pacing improved fatigue and	7

	analysis so APT 12, 24, and 52 week, and long-term follow-up measures.	with GET, CBT, and SMC as comparators	n.org, number ISRCTN5 4285094.)	ts from the PACE trial 39 ± 12 years 76% female 94% white Duration of illness 32 (16-66) months	Depressive disorder (32%)			the PACE Trial responded Adherence N/A	SF-36 WSAS	physical function similar to CBT and GET at follow-up	
White et al. 2013	PACE Trial re-analysis so APT. 52 weeks follow-up after randomisation.	RCT with GET, CBT, and SMC as comparators	Registered (PACE http://isrctn.org , number ISRCTN5 4285094.)	n= 640 39 ± 12 years 76% female 94% white Duration of illness 32 (16-	Co-morbid psychiatric condition (47%) Depressive disorder (33%)	UK	PACE trial database	0.2% drop-out	CDC criteria CFQ CGI London ME criteria Oxford criteria for CFS	Pacing participants were less likely to recover (8%) than the CBT group (22%), or GET group (22%) Pacing participants were as recover (as	6

				66) months					SF-36	the SMC group (7%)	
--	--	--	--	---------------	--	--	--	--	-------	-----------------------	--

APT = Adaptive Pacing Therapy. BMI = Body mass index. CBRQ=Cognitive Behavioural Responses Questionnaire. CBRQ-SF = Cognitive Behavioural Responses Questionnaire symptom focussing sub-scale. CBT = Cognitive Behaviour Therapy. CFQ = Chandler fatigue questionnaire. CIS = Checklist individual strength questionnaire for fatigue. DSQ = DePaul Symptom Questionnaire. EDAq: Avoidance resting score on Symptom Interpretation questionnaire. FSS = Fatigue severity scale. GAD = Generalised anxiety disorder. GET = Graded Exercise Therapy. HADS A = Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale anxiety score. JSS = Jenkins sleep scale. 6MWT= Six metres walked in six minutes. PASS-20= Escape and avoidance subscale of the Pain Anxiety Symptoms Scale-20. SF-36 = 36-Item Short Form Health Survey questionnaire. UK = United Kingdom. USA = United States of America. WSAS = Work and Social Adjustment Scale.

Table 2. Diagnostic criteria used in included studies to define ME/CFS (if reported).

Study	Diagnostic criteria used
Antcliff et al., 2016	No diagnostic criteria included. Participants had diagnosis of chronic low back pain, chronic widespread pain, fibromyalgia and ME/CFS for ≥ 3 months’.
Antcliff et al., 2017	No diagnostic criteria included. Participants had diagnosis of chronic low back pain, chronic widespread pain, fibromyalgia and ME/CFS for ≥ 3 months’.
Antcliff et al., 2021	No diagnostic criteria included. Participants had diagnosis of chronic low back pain, chronic widespread pain, fibromyalgia and ME/CFS for ≥ 3 months’.
ME association.,2015	No diagnostic criteria included. Survey open to anyone who had had ME, CFS, or post-viral fatigue syndrome.
Bourke et al., 2014	Oxford criteria (PACE trial sub-analysis).
Brown et al., 2011	Fukuda criteria.
Brown et al., 2013	No diagnostic criteria included.
Dougall et al., 2014	Oxford criteria (PACE trial sub-analysis).
Geraghty et al., 2017	No diagnostic criteria included. Survey open to anyone who had ME/CFS. According to self-report, 72% received a diagnosis of by a specialist, 22% from a general practitioner (family doctor), and 4.5% from other professional.
Jason et al., 2008	Fukuda criteria.
Kos et al., 2015	Fukuda criteria.
Meeus et al., 2010	Fukuda criteria.
Nijs et al., 2009	Fukuda criteria.
O’Connor et al., 2019	Fukuda criteria.
Sharpe et al., 2015	Oxford criteria (PACE trial sub-analysis).
White et al., 2011	Oxford criteria (PACE trial).
White et al., 2013	Oxford criteria (PACE trial sub-analysis).



