Title of measure:
Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-General (FACT-G)
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DISCLAIMER:
This summary has been placed online by the Health Services and Research Outcomes (HSRO) Subcommittee of the Radiation Therapy Oncology Group (RTOG). It is meant to be an aid to others in the designing of clinical trials. This summary may not be redistributed without appropriate attribution. Furthermore, the posting of this catalog of assessment tools on the RTOG web site does not imply that the evaluation instruments themselves are in the public domain and are not subject to copyright protection. You must determine the proprietary status of each tool prior to incorporating it in a clinical protocol.

Brief overview:
FACT-G (now version 4) is a 27-item compilation of general questions divided into 4 primary QOL domains: physical well-being, social/family well-being, emotional well-being, and functional well-being. This instrument has been under development since 1987 (developed by Dr. David Cella) and represents the generic core questionnaire that is often combined with cancer site-specific questionnaires. FACT-G takes about 5-10 minutes to complete and has been written at the 6th grade level.

Validated:
Yes—the first FACT-G validation paper was published in 1993 by Cella et al, see references below.

Psychometric properties:
FACT-G was developed initially with 135 patients with advanced cancer, then validated on a second sample of 630 patients with a variety of cancers of different stages. Patients rate all items using a 5-point rating scale ranging from “not at all” to “very much”. The measure yields information about total quality of life as well as the dimensions listed above. FACT-G is able to distinguish between stage I, II, III and IV disease (p<.05). Concurrent validity is supported by strong Pearson correlations with the Functional Living Index – Cancer (.79) and the patient-completed version of the QL index (0.74). The initial paper documenting development and validation of this general measure is: Cella et al 1993, see references below.

Normative data:
Normative data is currently being developed with reference tables.

Clinically significant changes:
Using the global rating of change (GRC) scale as an anchor, Cella et al proposed that a clinically meaningful change corresponds to a total FACT-G raw score in the range of 5-7 points. (Cella et al 2002, see references below).

**Website or how to register to use:**
Go to www.facit.org and click on “Registration+Requests” to use one or more of the FACT scales, which can be obtained by completing a User’s Agreement and one Collaborator’s Project Information Form per project. This information can be found under the “User’s Agreement” link on the website. The permission information should be given to RTOG headquarters for each RTOG QOL study.

**List any fees for usage:**
Currently, there are no fees for use of any of the English versions of the FACT questionnaires.

**Languages available:**
FACT questionnaires are now available in more than 45 different languages, permitting cross-cultural comparisons of people from diverse backgrounds. Please check the website for the specific languages available for FACT-G.

**Instructions for CRAs and or credentialing for administration:**
There is no credentialing needed for administration of FACT-G. Each protocol has instructions for the CRAs. As well, a variety of information to assist in the administration of the FACT questionnaires is available from the website (under the administration and scoring guidelines link).

**Time to administer instrument:**
Five to ten minutes

**Quality assurance for administration (if needed):**
Each protocol has instructions for the CRA’s.

**Scoring of instrument:**
FACT-G is scored by summing the individual scale scores, with higher scores indicating better quality of life (Webster K, et al, see references below). Each domain, as well as the overall QOL score is calculated according to the scoring instructions for FACT. Briefly, after reversing the scoring of negatively worded items (so that a higher score always indicated a favorable response), item responses are summed. The average value of the items for a subscale is computed for missing values, as long as >50% of the questions in the subscale were answered. The website has a variety of information to assist in the scoring of the FACT questionnaires and in the interpretation of the results.
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