



HAL
open science

Cross-Cultural Adaptation and Psychometric Validation of the French Version of the FAMCARE-Patient (FFP-16) Questionnaire for Outpatients With Advanced-Stage Cancer

François Chaumier, Thomas Flament, Thierry Lecomte, H el ene Vegas, Marion Stacoffe, Eric Pichon, B erang ere Narciso, Morgane Caulet, Catherine Barbe, Ana is Jaillais, et al.

► To cite this version:

Fran ois Chaumier, Thomas Flament, Thierry Lecomte, H el ene Vegas, Marion Stacoffe, et al.. Cross-Cultural Adaptation and Psychometric Validation of the French Version of the FAMCARE-Patient (FFP-16) Questionnaire for Outpatients With Advanced-Stage Cancer. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 2020, 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2020.02.007 . hal-03159461

HAL Id: hal-03159461

<https://hal.science/hal-03159461>

Submitted on 22 Aug 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destin ee au d ep ot et  a la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publi es ou non,  emanant des  tablissements d'enseignement et de recherche fran ais ou  trangers, des laboratoires publics ou priv es.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Cross-cultural Adaptation and Psychometric Validation of the French Version of the FAMCARE-Patient Questionnaire (FFP-16) for Outpatients with Advanced-stage Cancer

Authors: François Chaumier, MD^{1,2}, Thomas Flament, MD⁵, Thierry Lecomte, MD, PhD⁴, Hélène Vegas, MD³, Marion Stacoffe, MD³, Eric Pichon, MD⁵, Bérangère Narciso, MD³, Morgane Caulet, MD⁴, Catherine Barbe, MD³, Anaïs Jaillais, MD⁴, Delphine Carmier, MD⁵, Marie-Agnès By, MD³, Marianne Bourdon, PhD², Jean-Benoît Hardouin, PhD²

Affiliations:

¹ Palliative Care Team, CHRU de Tours, Tours, France

² INSERM SPHERE U1246, Université de Tours, Université de Nantes, Tours, France

³ Oncology Department, CHRU de Tours, Tours, France

⁴ Gastroenterology Department, CHRU de Tours, Tours, France

⁵ Pneumology Department, CHRU de Tours, Tours, France

Corresponding Author:

François Chaumier, MD,
Equipe Mobile de Soins Palliatifs 37,
CHRU de Tours, 2 boulevard Tonnellé,
37044 Tours cedex 9, France.

Number of tables: 2 ; Number of figures: 1 ; Number of references: 25 ; Number of supplemental data: 1

Number of words: 2500

Abstract

Context: Satisfaction is known to be correlated with the quality of care; it indicates the adequacy of the caregivers' responses in meeting the needs and expectations of patients. The FAMCARE-Patient questionnaire has been used to quantify satisfaction level in outpatients with advanced-stage cancers.

Objectives: To translate and cross-culturally adapt the FAMCARE-Patient questionnaire for French patients and to evaluate the psychometric properties of this version.

Methods: The original questionnaire was translated into French and adapted to French cultural context by an expert committee. The French FAMCARE-Patient version (FFP-16) was then pilot tested among 51 patients. Subsequently, psychometric properties were evaluated in a cross-sectional study by administering the new tool to 176 adult outpatients with advanced-stage cancer who underwent oncological care at our university hospital.

Results: We performed a confirmatory factor analysis and assessed the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. The one-factor structure was confirmed, and it had an acceptable fit with a comparative fit index and root mean square error of approximation of 0.93 and 0.07 respectively. Internal reliability was high as shown by Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = 0.95$). Reproducibility was very good (intraclass correlation coefficient = 0.91). The FFP-16 score was independent of the ECOG and the overall ESAS Distress Scores. It was significantly but weakly correlated with anxiety, well-being and overall quality-of-life (Spearman's correlation coefficient = -0.18, -0.20 and 0.30 respectively, $p < 0.05$).

Conclusion: We found the FFP-16 questionnaire to be a reliable and valid instrument for the assessment of satisfaction in French outpatients with advanced-stage cancer.

Key Message: Assessment of satisfaction is necessary to evaluate the quality of care. The FAMCARE-Patient questionnaire has been used to quantify satisfaction level in outpatients with advanced-stage cancer. We translated and cross-culturally adapted this questionnaire for French patients. Psychometric properties are good and allow its use in clinical or research context in France.

Key Words: Satisfaction, questionnaire, cancer, cross-cultural, validation, psychometric

Running Title: The French FAMCARE-Patient questionnaire

BACKGROUND

The quality of care indicates the adequacy of caregivers' responses in satisfying the needs and expectations of patients(1). Using a sample of 2249 American patients, Jenkinson identified three areas of patient care that influence satisfaction: (i) physical comfort and symptom management, (ii) emotional support and caregivers' availability, and (iii) respecting the patient's wishes and his/her place in decision-making(2). In advanced stages of a serious illness, satisfaction level is known to be correlated to the quality of life(3) and "quality of dying"(4), which includes accessibility, symptom management, emotional support, coordination and personalization of care, communication and education, and finally active participation in decision-making(5,6).

The FAMCARE-Patient scale or FAMCARE-P16 questionnaire(7,8) is the only satisfaction assessment tool specifically designed for outpatients with advanced-stage cancers. It is a self-administrated survey that was constructed on the basis of the 20-item FAMCARE measure for family satisfaction with care(9). It is structurally composed of 16 items, cohered into a single patient satisfaction factor. Each item is evaluated using a 5-point Likert scale (1–5; 1, very dissatisfied; 5, very satisfied), with a total score ranging from 16 to 80. Patients with an individual score of ≥ 64 are considered to be generally satisfied because this cut-off value is associated with a rating of 4 (satisfied) on all 16 items. This tool demonstrated high internal reliability, and patient satisfaction can be modified accordingly by a palliative care intervention(10–12).

In French, there is currently no tool dedicated to the assessment of satisfaction in outpatients with advanced-stage cancers. This entails the use of non-validated and heterogeneous measurement tools in this population. The aim of our study was to cross-culturally adapt the FAMCARE-Patient questionnaire for the French population and to subsequently perform a psychometric validation of this French version.

METHODS

Cross-cultural adaptation process

The FAMCARE-P16 questionnaire was translated into French following standard recommendations(13). Forward-backward translations were performed by four people—two native English speakers and two native French speakers—fluent in French and English. The backward translation was compared to the original version by the author herself. The forward semantic translated version was adapted to French cultural context and lifestyle by an expert committee with oncology and palliative care physicians and nurses, psychologists, anthropologist, and linguistic researchers and methodologists as members. A pre-final version was pilot tested using cognitive debriefing interviews to evaluate the acceptability and comprehension of each item. Modifications were made according to patients' comments, and the final version of the French FAMCARE-P16 (FFP-16) questionnaire was validated by the expert committee.

Psychometric validation process and analyses

Design

This was a single-centre, cross-sectional, and observational study specifically designed to validate the FFP-16 questionnaire. All procedures performed in the study were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional research committee (Committee for the Protection of Persons consenting to biomedical research, n°2015-S15). This study was registered in the European trial register (EudraCT n°2015-A01707-42).

Patients

Informed consent was obtained individually from all participants included in the study. The inclusion criteria were the same as those for the validation of the original English version: diagnosis of an advanced-stage cancer, *i.e.* metastatic gastrointestinal, genitourinary, breast, lung, or

gynaecological cancer (for lung cancer, stages IIIA and B were included; patients with metastatic breast or prostate cancer who were refractory to hormonal therapy and those with locally advanced pancreatic cancer were included); >18 years of age; native French-speakers; and ambulatory patients with an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status of 0–2. ECOG score is provided on a 6-point scale (0–5; 0, fully active; 5, dead) that assesses the patient’s ability for self-care and ambulation.

Patients were all recruited from the outpatient clinic or chemotherapy day hospital of the University Hospital of Tours (France).

Questionnaires and Data Collection

During the psychometric validation process, two other questionnaires were selected in addition to the FFP-16 questionnaire. Patients completed all questionnaires, i.e., self-administrated FFP-16 questionnaire, the French versions of the QLQ-C15-PAL questionnaire from the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC), and the Edmonton Symptom Assessment Scale (ESAS), in the hospital on day-1.

EORTC-QLQ-C15-PAL is a 15-item quality-of-life questionnaire validated in advanced stages of cancer. Fourteen items, which are related to nine functional and symptom scales, were evaluated using a 4-category Likert scale. The last item is a 7-point global quality-of-life scale with a score ranging from 1 (very poor) to 7 (excellent)(14).

ESAS was designed to assess nine symptoms that commonly occur in patients with cancer. Severity of each symptom is rated from 0 to 10 on a numerical scale(15).

Questionnaires were collected by a protocol researcher. Some of the patients were asked to complete the FFP-16 questionnaire at home on day-3 to provide data for the assessment of test-retest reliability. This interval was chosen to be long enough so that the patients forgot their previous answers and close enough so that their clinical condition has not changed. Completed questionnaires were mailed back to the coordinator of the participating centre with a pre-stamped envelope.

Data on patients' clinical and demographic characteristics were also collected at inclusion.

Sample Size

A sample size of more than 100 patients is considered as a "very good" indicator of the quality of a patient-reported outcome measurement, according to the COSMIN recommendations(16). Our sample size determination was defined *a priori* with a subject to item ratio of 10 and was set to a minimum of 160 patients.

Analyses

Analyses were conducted using Stata 15.1 (StataCorp LLC, College station, TX, USA). Missing data were handled by Personal Mean Score (PMS) imputation(17). Validity of the questionnaire was appreciated using several indices(18).

- Content validity was determined on the basis of qualitative evaluation, which involves the judgement of coherence between the original and translated items and their relevance, by experts.
- Face validity was defined on the basis of interviews with the patients included in the cross-cultural adaptation process and by a quantitative analysis of the validation sample (rate of missing data and time to complete the questionnaire).
- Structural validity was evaluated by a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of patients' responses during the validation process, to confirm the one factor structure of the original English tool. A good fit is indicated by a comparative fit index (CFI) of >0.95 and a root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of <0.05. An acceptable fit is indicated by a CFI of 0.90–0.95 and a RMSEA of 0.05–0.08 (19). A factor loading of >0.5 was expected for each item.
- Reliability of the FFP-16 score was computed using the Cronbach's alpha coefficient ($\alpha > 0.7$ was expected)(18).

- Coherence of the FFP-16 responses was evaluated using the Mokken's model (a correct fit is indicated by Loevinger's coefficient of scalability (H) > 0.3, a good fit by H > 0.5)(20).
- Reproducibility of the FFP-16 score was computed using intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC; >0.6 was expected)(21).
- Criterion validity was determined by analysing non-trivial Spearman's correlation of the FFP-16 score with scores obtained from the EORTC-QLQ-C15-PAL and ESAS questionnaires(18). Our *a priori* hypothesis was an independence between the concept of satisfaction, performance status, symptoms, and quality-of-life.

RESULTS:

Cross-cultural adaptation and face validity

According to the original author of the FAMCARE-Patient questionnaire, there is no difference in meaning between the original version and the backward translated version. Content validity of the French version was assessed by the expert committee, and some items were reformulated to facilitate adaptation to French language and cultural context (Supplemental Data). A pilot version was tested by conducting interviews with 29 eligible patients. Most of the items were found to be clear and easy to understand; however, changes in format were needed with regard to three items (questions about prognosis and family) to limit misunderstanding and missing data. These successive modifications were tested with 12 then 10 additional patients, ie 51 patients in the cross-cultural adaptation process (Figure 1).

With regard to acceptability, the translated questionnaire was considered to be good or very good by all patients. The completion mean time was 5.1 min (standard deviation 1.4 min).

Psychometric validation process

Patients

One hundred and seventy-six adults participated in the validation study. Their sociodemographic and clinical characteristics are presented in Table 1. The overall educational level was low. Time since diagnosis was <2 years in 95 patients (54%). Most patients received chemotherapy or hormonotherapy (97%) and were recruited from the chemotherapy day hospital (91%).

Acceptability and item-descriptive statistics

Item acceptability was considered to be good, except for three items with >10% missing data. Table 2 presents standardised factor loading for each item, all of which are >0.6 — better than the expected value. There was no floor or ceiling effects for all the items.

Statistical analyses

CFA indicated that a one-factor structure had an acceptable fit to the FFP-16 questionnaire, with CFI = 0.93 and RMSEA = 0.07. Internal reliability was high as shown by Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = 0.95$) and coherence of the responses to the questionnaire was strong as shown by H values (significantly positive and >0.5) (Table 2). Furthermore, reproducibility of the FFP-16 score in 43 patients was very good (ICC = 0.91).

We correlated the summed score of the FFP-16 questionnaire with that of the ECOG, EDS, individual ESAS items, and individual QLQ-C15-PAL subscales. The FFP-16 score did not significantly correlate with the scores of these scales, with the exception of the anxiety- and well-being-related scores of ESAS (Spearman's correlation coefficient = -0.18 and -0.20 respectively, $p < 0.05$) and the overall quality-of-life score of QLQ-C15-PAL (Spearman's correlation coefficient = 0.30 , $p < 0.05$).

DISCUSSION:

The cross-cultural adaptation of the FAMCARE-P questionnaire for the French population was achieved with satisfaction, and this version showed satisfactory psychometric properties in terms of structure, reliability, coherence, and reproducibility. CFA confirmed the validity of original one-factor model of the FFP-16 questionnaire. Regarding the reliability of the FFP-16 questionnaire, statistical analysis demonstrated an adequate internal consistency. This questionnaire was confirmed to be acceptable to patients. However, there was a significant quantity of missing data with regard to two items about loved ones (items 15 and 16). Most of the patients who did not answer these items did not identify relatives (family or friends) for the dedicated previous question. They may not have been concerned but they had no possibility of a “not applicable” response.

Compared to the original English version, the FFP-16 questionnaire showed an acceptable fit of a single-factor structure, with higher Cronbach’s alpha (0.95 vs. 0.94), higher CFI (0.93 vs. 0.88) and lower RMSEA (0.07 vs. 0.11)(8). Factor loadings of the French version were approximately same as those of the original version(7,8). An English shorter 13-item version (FAMCARE-P13) showed an acceptable fit compared to the poor one of the original 16-item version, but with a lower internal reliability(8). The FAMCARE-P13 was also translated from English to Greek(22). In this study, the CFA showed a very poor CFI with a one-factor structure (0.59). It could be explained by translation errors or by Greek cultural specificities. Moreover, the Greek study used the FAMCARE-P13 in patients hospitalized in palliative care units, contrary to the original tool in ambulatory patients. In this work, the secondary exploratory factor analyses identified a two-factor structure with an acceptable fit. In our study, CFA confirmed a one-factor model with an acceptable fit and we found a good reliability of the 16-item version, better than the 13-item version (Cronbach’s alpha 0.95 vs 0.94).

In our work, the satisfaction score was not correlated with the patient’s overall condition. Indeed, the ECOG score assesses the patient's ability to take care of himself and to move around. In advanced stages of cancer, this autonomy is often limited and decreased by fatigue. The absence of correlation between the FFP-16 score and ECOG status demonstrates that satisfaction is a distinct concept, independent of the patient's physical performance. We also found that satisfaction was not

correlated with the overall ESAS distress score as well as individual ESAS physical symptom score. These results further show that the concept of satisfaction is independent of the patient's general and physical condition. FFP-16 score was significantly correlated with the well-being and anxiety scores of ESAS as well as the overall QLQ-C15-PAL quality-of-life score. This could be explained by the subjective dimension of the concept of satisfaction, which can be influenced by uneasiness, anxiety, or a feeling of poor quality-of-life. It was similar for the original English FAMCARE-Patient questionnaire validation(8). However, these correlations are weak and close to independence. Moreover, we did not find correlation between FFP-16 score and the emotional functioning dimension scale of QLQ-C15-PAL questionnaire, which does not allow us to conclude that there is a clear correlation between these concepts. A French questionnaire assessing outpatient satisfaction with care in ambulatory chemotherapy or radiotherapy treatment was adapted from the In-Patsat32 questionnaire from the EORTC(23). It was not dedicated to patients with advanced-stage cancer but exclusively to patients undergoing cancer treatment. CFA revealed good convergent validity and excellent internal consistency. Items and subscales of this questionnaire were not significantly correlated to the quality of life, emphasising that satisfaction and quality of life are distinct concepts.

Our study could be criticized for choosing a questionnaire that is based on the data initially collected from American or Canadian patients. Indeed, it has not been demonstrated that French patients with advanced stages of cancer do have the same areas of satisfaction with care as North American patients. However, during the individual interviews for the cross-cultural adaptation process, most patients felt that the tool was suitable for assessing their satisfaction—with no missing areas identified. Furthermore, using the same questionnaire that is validated in several languages, improves the possibility of promoting international research. Secondly, our work could also be criticized for changing the form of the questionnaire, particularly with regard to family-related items. This was necessary to limit missing data for these items. During the individual interviews, questions about family and its place in medical decisions were misinterpreted because patients were committed to medical confidentiality and self-decision. This could be explained by a French cultural

specificity. That is why this change in form can be justified by a rigorous transcultural adaptation according to the French cultural context. Finally, we regret the absence of items related to the emotional, social and spiritual dimensions, especially in a questionnaire dedicated to patients with advanced stages of cancer. However, we have chosen to focus on the existing questionnaire without creating a new one. Despite these potential shortcomings, we obtained a version of the FAMCARE-P questionnaire adapted to the French cultural context, with good psychometric properties and according to a rigorous methodology.

CONCLUSION:

The present study will allow the use of a validated French scale to evaluate the satisfaction of outpatients with advanced stages of cancer. This will facilitate the improvement of the quality of patient care by caregivers and physicians. This will also allow the use of a validated tool in clinical research for international multicenter studies. This study will be continued with the development of a new clinical tool to assess patients' issues and supportive care needs, in order to improve their satisfaction of care.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank R. Aubry and D. Leboul for their help in designing the study and A. Caille, B. Discepoli, F. Etourneau, and D. Mallet for their expert advice. We are grateful to all the patients who participated in this study and to the clinical and research staff of the Chemotherapy Day Hospitals of Oncology, Pneumology and Gastroenterology Department of the University Hospital of Tours.

Funding sources: This study was supported by grants from *Fondation de France, Fonds pour les Soins Palliatifs, Ligue contre le Cancer, Société Française d'Accompagnement et de Soins Palliatifs*. They had

no involvement in the study design, collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, writing the report, or decision to submit the article for publication.

Competing interests:

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

REFERENCES:

1. Coulter A, Cleary P. Measuring and improving patients' experiences: How can we make health care systems work for patients? In: Measuring up: improving health system performance in OECD countries. Paris: OECD, 2002:211–224.
2. Jenkinson C, Coulter A, Bruster S, Richards N, Chandola T. Patients' experiences and satisfaction with health care: results of a questionnaire study of specific aspects of care. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2002;11:335–339. doi:10.1136/qhc.11.4.335
3. Lynn J. Measuring quality of care at the end of life: a statement of principles. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1997;45:526–527.
4. Morrison RS, Siu AL, Leipzig RM, Cassel CK, Meier DE. The hard task of improving the quality of care at the end of life. *Arch Intern Med* 2000;160:743–747.
5. Kaasa S, Loge JH. Quality of life in palliative care: principles and practice. *Palliat Med* 2003;17:11–20.
6. Hales S, Zimmermann C, Rodin G. The quality of dying and death. *Arch Intern Med* 2008;168:912–918. doi:10.1001/archinte.168.9.912

7. Lo C, Burman D, Rodin G, Zimmermann C. Measuring patient satisfaction in oncology palliative care: psychometric properties of the FAMCARE-patient scale. *Qual Life Res* 2009;18:747–752. doi:10.1007/s11136-009-9494-y
8. Lo C, Burman D, Hales S, *et al.* The FAMCARE-Patient scale: measuring satisfaction with care of outpatients with advanced cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 2009;45:3182–3188. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2009.09.003
9. Kristjanson LJ. Validity and reliability testing of the FAMCARE Scale: measuring family satisfaction with advanced cancer care. *Soc Sci Med* 1993;36:693–701.
10. Follwell M, Burman D, Le LW, *et al.* Phase II study of an outpatient palliative care intervention in patients with metastatic cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:206–213. doi:10.1200/JCO.2008.17.7568
11. Zimmermann C, Swami N, Krzyzanowska M, *et al.* Early palliative care for patients with advanced cancer: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2014;383:1721–1730. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62416-2
12. Groenvold M, Petersen MA, Damkier A, *et al.* Randomised clinical trial of early specialist palliative care plus standard care versus standard care alone in patients with advanced cancer: the Danish Palliative Care Trial. *Palliat Med* 2017;31:814–824. doi:10.1177/0269216317705100
13. Beaton DE, Bombardier C, Guillemin F, Ferraz MB. Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2000;25:3186–3191. doi:10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014
14. Groenvold M, Petersen MA, Aaronson NK, *et al.* The development of the EORTC QLQ-C15-PAL: a shortened questionnaire for cancer patients in palliative care. *Eur J Cancer* 1990 2006;42:55–64. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2005.06.022

15. Bruera E, Kuehn N, Miller MJ, Selmsler P, Macmillan K. The Edmonton Symptom Assessment System (ESAS): a simple method for the assessment of palliative care patients. *J Palliat Care* 1991;7:6–9.
16. Terwee CB, Prinsen CAC, Chiarotto A, *et al.* COSMIN methodology for evaluating the content validity of patient-reported outcome measures: a Delphi study. *Qual Life Res* 2018;27:1159-1170. doi:10.1007/s11136-018-1829-0
17. Huisman M. Imputation of missing item responses: some simple techniques. *Qual Quant* 2000;34:331–351. doi:10.1023/A:1004782230065
18. Vet HCW de, Terwee CB, Mokkink LB, *et al.* *Measurement in medicine: a practical guide.* Cambridge University Press, 2011. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511996214
19. Gadelrab H. *Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: sensitivity to specification error and descriptive goodness-of-fit Indices.* Saarbrück: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2013.
20. Sijtsma K, Molenaar IW. *Introduction to nonparametric item response theory.* Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, 2002.
21. Shrout PE, Fleiss JL. Intraclass correlations: uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychol Bull* 1979;86:420–428.
22. Parpa E, Galanopoulou N, Tsilika E, Galanos A, Mistakidou K. Psychometric properties of the patients' satisfaction instrument FAMCARE-P13 in a palliative care unit. *Am J Hosp Palliat Care* 2017;34:597-602.
23. Can G, Akin S, Aydiner A, *et al.* A psychometric validation study of the Quality of Life and FAMCARE scales in Turkish cancer family caregivers. *Qual Life Res* 2011;20:1319–1329.

24. Chattat R, Ottoboni G, Zeneli A, *et al.* The Italian version of the FAMCARE scale: a validation study. *Support Care Cancer* 2016;24:3821–3830.

25. Poinot R, Altmeyer A, Conroy T, *et al.* Multisite validation study of questionnaire assessing out-patient satisfaction with care questionnaire in ambulatory chemotherapy or radiotherapy treatment. *Bull Cancer* 2006;93:315–327.

Figure 1. French version of the FAMCARE-Patient questionnaire (FFP-16)

Legend: 1 (very dissatisfied), 2 (dissatisfied), 3 (undecided), 4 (satisfied), 5 (very satisfied)

How satisfied are you with:

1. Doctor's attention to your description of symptoms
2. the accuracy with which doctors assess your symptoms
3. Information given about how to manage pain
4. Information given about side effects
5. Speed with which symptoms are treated
6. Information given about your tests
7. The way tests and treatments are performed
8. The way tests and treatments are followed up by the doctor
9. How you are informed about your illness' progress
10. Answers from health professionals
11. Referrals to specialists, if necessary
12. The availability of doctors to answer your questions
13. The availability of nurses to answer your questions
14. Coordination of care

About your close surroundings:

Who are your loved ones: family, friends, other ?

How satisfied are you with:

15. The availability of doctors to your loved ones

Would you involve them in the medical decisions that concern you: yes/no

How satisfied are you with:

16. The way doctors respect this choice

Table 1. Characteristics of the participants involved in the validation process ($N = 176$)

Characteristic	<i>N (%) or Mean (SD)</i>	Min–Max	α
Sex			
Female	96 (55 %)		
Male	81 (45 %)		
Age (years)	64 (11)	23–89	
Married/common-law	117 (70 %)		
Bachelor’s degree or higher	55 (31 %)		
Disease site			
Gastrointestinal organs	52 (30 %)		
Breast	40 (23 %)		
Lung	42 (24 %)		
Female reproductive organs	14 (8 %)		
Genitourinary organs	27 (15 %)		
Other	1 (1 %)		
Performance status (ECOG)	0.86 (0.60)	0–2	
ESAS distress score (EDS)	19 (14)	0–73	
FFP-16 score	68 (23)	28–74	0.95

α = Cronbach’s alpha; maximum possible score for EDS = 90; maximum possible score for FFP-16 = 80

Table 2. Characteristics of FFP-16 items

<i>Item</i>	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>Missing data rate</i>	<i>Floor and ceiling effects</i>	<i>Factor loading</i>	<i>Loevinger's coefficient (H)</i>
1	4.4 (0.6)	1%	1% - 49%	0.76	0.64
2	4.3 (0.7)	1%	1% - 42%	0.79	0.63
3	4.2 (0.7)	4%	1% - 36%	0.70	0.55
4	4.1 (0.8)	1%	1% - 31%	0.72	0.59
5	4.3 (0.8)	1%	1% - 41%	0.77	0.61
6	4.1 (0.8)	1%	2% - 34%	0.70	0.58
7	4.4 (0.7)	1%	1% - 52%	0.65	0.54
8	4.4 (0.7)	2%	1% - 53%	0.72	0.60
9	4.2 (0.7)	2%	2% - 37%	0.73	0.58
10	4.2 (0.6)	4%	1% - 33%	0.81	0.66
11	4.2 (0.7)	12%	2% - 37%	0.74	0.58
12	4.3 (0.7)	1%	2% - 42%	0.76	0.60
13	4.5 (0.7)	2%	1% - 54%	0.67	0.56
14	4.3 (0.7)	1%	1% - 46%	0.69	0.55
15	4.2 (0.7)	15%	1% - 31%	0.64	0.52
16	4.3 (0.6)	19%	2% - 40%	0.71	0.55