Safety and feasibility of supervised exercise during adjuvant treatment of high-grade glioma

Prue Cormie^{1,2}, Eva Zopf^{1,2}, Georgia Halkett³, Daphne Tsoi⁴, Arman Hasani^{5,6}, Daniel Galvão², Rob Newton² and Anna Nowak^{6,7}

¹Australian Catholic University; ²Edith Cowan University; ³Curtin University; ⁴St John of God Hospital; ⁵Genesis Cancer Care; ⁶Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital; ⁷University of Western Australia



BACKGROUND

Patients with high-grade glioma (HGG) undergo aggressive treatments, experience significant adverse-effects and report high unmet needs. Exercise may be an effective intervention to aid management of HGG but no previous research has examined the potential impact of exercise among these patients. The aim of this trial was to evaluate if exercise is a feasible and safe therapy in patients with HGG undergoing chemoradiotherapy.

METHODS

29 patients (69% men; 52±12 years) with HGG participated in this pilot study. Patients selfselected to receive either usual care (n=5) or a supervised exercise intervention (n=24) throughout chemoradiotherapy. The intervention involved an individualised prescription of moderate-intensity aerobic and resistance exercise during twice weekly sessions delivered at the hospital. Assessment of quality of life, fatigue, distress, physical function and body composition were conducted \leq 10 days prior to and following chemoradiotherapy.

RESULTS

Four (14%) participants withdrew; baseline characteristics did not differ significantly from non-withdrawers ($p \le 0.05$). Exercise session attendance was ~80±4% and one adverse event relating to the intervention was reported (Table 1). The intervention improved function but few other changes were observed (Table 2). The changes were influenced by whether participants were receiving dexamethasone (Table 3). Function significantly improved while QOL and symptoms did not worsen in exercising patients not receiving dexamethasone. Patients receiving dexamethasone significantly decreased QOL, increased fat mass and did not improve function despite exercising.

Table 1. Safety and feasibility of exercise intervention. Variables presented for the exercise group as a whole as well as separated into patients not receiving (n = 16) vs. receiving (n = 8) dexemethasone				Table Z. Comparison of study endpoints between exercise and usual care groups							Table 3. Comparison of study endpoints among exercise group patients receiving patients not receiving (n = 16) vs. receiving (n = 8) dexamethasone (as self-reported at study entry).						
1	EXERCISE	EXERCISE PO devemethesone	EXERCISE (VES deverations)		EXERCISE			1	USUAL CARE	4		EXERCISE			EXERCISE		
Withdrawn	n=4 (14%)	n = 3 (10%)	n = 1 (3%)		Baseline	Post Chemo-	Change	Baseline	Post Chemo-	Change		(NO	Post Chemo-	one)	('125	Dexamethase Post Chemo-	one)
Reason – Time constraints	n = 3 (10%)	n = 3 (10%)		Quality of Life		radiotic app		\rightarrow	Tablotherapy			Baseline	radiotherapy	Change	Baseline	radiotherapy	Change
Reason - Too unwell	n = 1 (3%)	-	n = 1 (3%)	CONTRACTOR Clobal Health Status	63.9 + 17.7	58.3 + 34.8	564347	51.1 + 47.4	77.8 + 19.3	1674363	Quality of Life						P
Adverse Events Related to Exercise Intervention	1 - aggravated previous shoulder injury	1	•	EORIC-Cao Grobal Health Status	63.7 1 1/.r	56.3 2 26.6	-5.0 1 24.7	51.1 2 9/ 4	77.0 2 19.5	10.7 2 00.3	EORTC-C30 Global Health Status	64.2 ± 21.2	66.7 ± 24.9	2.5 ± 23.9	63.3 ± 9.5	41.7 ± 15.6	-21.7 ± 19.2
Attendance (%)	80.2 ± 3.7	90.0 ± 3.4	62.5 ± 37.9	EORTC-Cau Physical Functioning	91.1 1 1/10	87.3 ± 13.7	-9.8 1 10.5	57.8 1 40.2	11100	13.3 1 15.3	EORTC-C30 Physical Functioning	90.7 ± 20.7	86.0 ± 17.9•	-4.7 ± 15.1	92.0 ± 10.9	72.0 ± 19.7•	-20.0 ± 14.9*
Rating of Perceived Exertion (target score 12-14)	13.1 ± 1.3	13.5 ± 1.2	12.3 ± 0.9	SF-36 Physical Health Composite	46.8 ± 6.9	47.0 ± 8.6	0.2 ± 8.4	41.4 ± 14.5	41.3 ± 16.2	-0.1 ± 1.7	SF-36 Physical Health Composite	46.9 ± 8.0	50.4 ± 7.4 •	3.6 ± 7.5•	46.7 ± 4.5	40.0 ± 6.7•	-6.7 ± 5.7•
Barriers to Participating in Exercise Intervention				SF-36 Mental Health Composite	47.5 ± 11.9	45.0 ± 12.7	-2.5 ± 10.6	48.8 ± 8.6	46.9 ± 8.4	-1.9 ± 0.3	5F-36 Mental Health Composite	49.0 ± 12.7	47.7 ± 13.9	-1.3 ± 8.4	44.4 ± 10.7	39.5 ± 8.3	-4.9 ± 15.0
Time constraints	24%	24%		Fatigue	· '	I	L!	''	<u> </u>		Fatigue				8 V		() () () () () () () () () ()
Side Effects of Treatment	19%	5%	14%	FACIT-Fatigue †	41.4 ± 9.4	37.3 ± 11.1	-4.1 ± 9.5	36.3 ± 15.0	39.3 ± 8.4	3.0 ± 8.7	FACIT-Fatigue †	42.8 ± 7.8•	40.6 ± 11.1•	-2.2 ± 7.8	37.8 ± 13.2•	29.0 ± 5.5•	-8.8 ± 12.8
Issues with Transportation	19%	14%	5%	MFSI-SF	5.27 ± 5.96	8.20 ± 8.01	2.93 ± 5.86	5.33 ± 5.51	4.00 ± 3.46	-1.33 ± 3.21	MFSI-SF	4.20 ± 5.55	6.10 ± 7.52	1.90 ± 3.70	7.40 ± 6.80	12.40 ± 8.02	5.00 ± 9.03
Perception of Exercise Intervention	·		/	Psychological Distress (BSI-18)				· · · · ·		· · · · ·	Psychological Distress (BSI-18)			1.5.4.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.			
Beneficial	93%	89%	100%	Global Severity Index †	5.87 ± 7.57	8.13 ± 8.50	2.27 ± 3.63*	4.50 ± 6.36	3.50 ± 4.95	-1.00 ± 1.41	Global Severity index 1	5.50 ± 8.02	7,30 ± 9.58	1.80 ± 2.78	6-60 ± 7.40	9.80 ± 6.42	3.20 ± 5.22
Enjoyable	93%	100%	82%	Prevention 1	2.47 + 2.98	2 22 + 4 24	0.87 + 2.12	200 + 4 34	1 00 +1 41	200 + 2 92	Surveying t	240 + 4 27	210 + 4 45	* 70 + 1 77	2 60 4 2 79	200 4 4 00	1 20 4 2 85
Important	86%	100%	67%	Depression	24/ 1 3.74	3.33 1 4.34	0.8/ 12.15	5.00 2 4.24	1.00 2 1.91	-2.00 1 2.65	Depression	2.40 24.21	3.10 2 4.65	0.70 21.77	2.00 2 3.70	3.80 1 4.05	1.20 2 2.35
Tolerable	ash.	89%	82%	Anxiety†	2.33 ± 3.72	2.47 ± 3.48	0.13 ± 1.81	1.50 ± 2.12	0.50 ± 0.71	-1.00 ± 1.41	Anxiety*	2.10 ± 4.04	2.10 ± 4.01	-0.00 ± 0.47	2.80 ± 3.35	3.20 ± 2.28	0.40 ± 3.29
Energising	72%	78%	62%	Somatization †	1.07 ± 2.31	2.33 ± 2.19	1.27 ± 1.58*	0.00 ± 0.00	2.00 ± 2.83	2.00 ± 2.83	Sometization 1	1.00 ± 2.83	2.10 ± 2.64	1.10 ± 1.79	1.20 ± 0.84	2.80 ± 0.84	1.60 ± 1.14*
Would Continue to Exercise	100%	100%	100%	Physical Function	·		[]	()	[]		Physical Function						-
				400m Walk (s) †	229.4 ± 26.9	233.5 ± 67.4	4.1 ± 49.9	266.31 (n=1)	288.40 (n=1)	22.09 (n=1)	400m Walk (s) *	224.9 ± 26.9	216.6 ± 36.4	-8.3 ± 14.2	237.6 ± 27.1	264.6 ±100.5	26.9 ± 81.3
				Repeated Chair Rise (s) †	10.72 ± 1.98	10.06 ± 2.28	-0.66 ± 1.17*	[11.13 (n=1)	14.13 (n=1)	3.00 (n=1)	Repeated Chair Rise (s) 1	10.7 ± 2.3	9.9 ± 2.4	-0.8 ± 1.0*	10.7 ± 1.1	10.4 ± 2.3	-0.28 ± 1.6
	90	28		Leg Press 1-Repetition Maximum (kg)	116.3 ± 44.2	131.8 ± 51.8	15.5 ± 20.2*	67.5±6.4	61.9 ± 11.2	-5.6±17.5	Leg Press 1-Repetition Maximum (kg)	114.1 ± 47.6	135.4 ± 49.9	21.4 ± 11.6*	120.4 ± 41.2	125.3 ± 59.3	4.9 ± 28.6
		A Part		Ambulation (Fast pace 6-m walk) T	3.07 ± 0.37	2.94 ± 0.51	-0.13 ± 0.31	3.61 ± 0.44	4.05 ± 0.39	0.48 ± 0.05	Ambulation (Fast pace 6-m walk) †	3.15 ± 0.42	2.95 ± 0.58	-0.20 ± 0.26*	2.94 ± 0.21	2.93 ± 0.40	-0.01 ± 0.38
1			Charles Con	Dynamic Balance (backwards tandem	14.37 ± 6.36	14.51 ± 9.10	0.14 ± 4.57	14.77 (n=1)	14.02 (n=1)	-0.75 (n=1)	Dynamic Balance (backwards tandem 6-m walk) 7	14.90 ± 6.98	14.57 ±10.66	-0.32 ± 4.50	13.43 ± 5.68	14.40 ± 6.48	0.97 ± 5.11
		- 44	The second second	6-m wasy - Static Balance (Sensory Organisation Test)	76.7 + 9.0	74.7 + 12.1	-2.0+5.6	74.0 + 17.0	73.5 + 13.4	-0.5+3.5	Static Balance (Sensory Organisation Test)	79.5 ± 8.8	75.5 ± 14.8	-4.0 ± 6.5	72.5 ± 8.6	73.5 ± 8.6	1.0 ± 1.8
		977	AND THE REAL PROPERTY OF	Budy Composition	Per Les			/4.0 2 27.2	100 1100		Body Composition						1
	0			Body Composition	-	+		-	-	-	Lean Mass (kg)	53.8 ± 10.5	53.9 ± 10.6	0.05 ± 2.1	58.6 ± 8.5	58.0 ± 9.0	-0.5 ± 2.0
				Lean Mass (kg)	55.3 ± 9.5	55.2 ± 10.0	-0.1 ± 2.0	52.2 ±6.7	50.7±6.8	-1.5 ± 0.1	Fat Mass (kg)	23.3 ± 10.5	21.8 ± 9.6+	-1.4 ± 2.0*•	27.3 ± 2.3	30.9 ± 2.8+	3.5±1.8*•
			A CA	Fat Mass (kg)	24.5 ± 8.9	24.6 ± 9.1	0.1±0.3	32.2 ± 4.8	33.4 ± 9.5	1.2 ± 4.7	Percent Fat (%) †	28.7 ± 8.3	27.9 ± 8.5	-0.8 ± 1.7•	31.2 ± 5.0	34.0 ± 5.4	29±1.1*•
				Percent Fat (%) †	29.5 ± 7.4	29.8 ± 8.0	0.4 ± 2.3	37.0 ± 0.4	38.1 ± 3.5	1.2 ± 3.2	* Samificant (p 5 0.05) within group change fro	om haseline:					
	* Significant ($\rho \le 0.05$) within group change from † Reduction in value represents a beneficial im 1RM – one repetition maximum (i.e. the maximum)	om baseline; aprovement; mum amount of weight that can be lifted once].						 Significant (p ≤ 0.05) difference between patients not receiving vs. receiving dexamethasone as self-reported at study entry; 1 #aduction in value reported to maximum (i.e. the maximum amount of weight that can be lifted once). 									

CONCLUSIONS

Supervised exercise is safe and well tolerated by HGG patients undergoing chemoradiotherapy. Outcomes following exercise were better in HGG patients not receiving dexamethasone. Randomised controlled trials are required to further explore these findings.