

Non-invasive technology to assess hydration status in advanced cancer to explore relationships between fluid-status and symptoms at the end-of-life: an observational study using bioelectrical impedance analysis

Normality test for the regression analysis

The Shapiro-Wilk test showed that the distribution of the impedance index departed significantly from normality ($W = 0.89$, $p < 0.01$).

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Impedance index	.119	124	<.001	.885	124	<.001

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on this outcome, we converted the impedance index to \log^{10} values and repeated the Shapiro-Wilk test, which did not show evidence of non normality ($W = 0.98$, $p = 0.053$).



Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Lg10_impedance_index	.056	124	.200*	.979	124	.053

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

We visually examined the histogram of the impedance index and the QQ plot and we were satisfied that the \log^{10} impedance index data met the normality requirements for the backward regression analysis.

Non-invasive technology to assess hydration status in advanced cancer to explore relationships between fluid-status and symptoms at the end-of-life: an observational study using bioelectrical impedance analysis



Non-invasive technology to assess hydration status in advanced cancer to explore relationships between fluid-status and symptoms at the end-of-life: an observational study using bioelectrical impedance analysis

Test of normality of repeat impedance assessment (i.e. end of life, dying phase assessment)

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Follow up impedance index	.204	18	.046	.915	18	.105

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The Shapiro-Wilk test showed that the distribution of the impedance index did not significantly depart from normality ($W = 0.92$, $p = 0.105$). Therefore, we used the unadjusted follow-up impedance index in the assessment of repeated values as outlined in the methods.