


Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union




LUCAS Methodology Pilot Actions Results Data Analysis



This project 557075-EPP-1-2014-1-IT-SPO-SCP has been funded with support from the European Commission.

This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.





Frequencies

Frequency Tables

Physical Functioning (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	20	11,5	13,0	13,0
5	7	4,0	4,5	17,5
10	4	2,3	2,6	20,1
15	1	,6	,6	20,8
20	3	1,7	1,9	22,7
28	1	,6	,6	23,4
30	4	2,3	2,6	26,0
35	2	1,1	1,3	27,3
Valid 40	8	4,6	5,2	32,5
45	4	2,3	2,6	35,1
50	7	4,0	4,5	39,6
55	4	2,3	2,6	42,2
60	5	2,9	3,2	45,5
65	2	1,1	1,3	46,8
70	6	3,4	3,9	50,6
75	19	10,9	12,3	63,0
80	5	2,9	3,2	66,2



	85	13	7,5	8,4	74,7
	90	5	2,9	3,2	77,9
	95	8	4,6	5,2	83,1
	100	26	14,9	16,9	100,0
	Total	154	88,5	100,0	
Missing	System	20	11,5		
Total		174	100,0		

Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	36	20,7	23,8	23,8
6	2	1,1	1,3	25,2
19	2	1,1	1,3	26,5
25	15	8,6	9,9	36,4
31	4	2,3	2,6	39,1
33	2	1,1	1,3	40,4
38	1	,6	,7	41,1
44	3	1,7	2,0	43,0
50	9	5,2	6,0	49,0
56	2	1,1	1,3	50,3
63	6	3,4	4,0	54,3
69	7	4,0	4,6	58,9



	75	4	2,3	2,6	61,6
	94	5	2,9	3,3	64,9
	100	53	30,5	35,1	100,0
	Total	151	86,8	100,0	
Missing	System	23	13,2		
Total		174	100,0		

Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	31	17,8	20,5	20,5
1	1	,6	,7	21,2
25	2	1,1	1,3	22,5
33	10	5,7	6,6	29,1
42	4	2,3	2,6	31,8
50	6	3,4	4,0	35,8
Valid 58	7	4,0	4,6	40,4
67	12	6,9	7,9	48,3
75	7	4,0	4,6	53,0
83	9	5,2	6,0	58,9
92	2	1,1	1,3	60,3
100	60	34,5	39,7	100,0
Total	151	86,8	100,0	



Missing System	23	13,2	
Total	174	100,0	

Energy / Fatigue (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
5	1	,6	,6	,6
10	3	1,7	1,9	2,6
15	1	,6	,6	3,2
20	6	3,4	3,9	7,1
25	1	,6	,6	7,8
30	2	1,1	1,3	9,1
35	8	4,6	5,2	14,3
40	10	5,7	6,5	20,8
45	8	4,6	5,2	26,0
50	23	13,2	14,9	40,9
55	12	6,9	7,8	48,7
60	10	5,7	6,5	55,2
65	13	7,5	8,4	63,6
70	16	9,2	10,4	74,0
75	14	8,0	9,1	83,1
80	11	6,3	7,1	90,3





	85	7	4,0	4,5	94,8
	90	3	1,7	1,9	96,8
	95	2	1,1	1,3	98,1
	100	3	1,7	1,9	100,0
	Total	154	88,5	100,0	
Missing	System	20	11,5		
Total		174	100,0		

Emotional Well-Being (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	24	2	1,1	1,3
	32	3	1,7	3,2
	36	6	3,4	7,1
	40	2	1,1	8,4
	44	7	4,0	13,0
	48	8	4,6	18,2
	52	11	6,3	25,3
	56	15	8,6	35,1
	60	14	8,0	44,2
	64	7	4,0	48,7
	68	12	6,9	56,5
	72	19	10,9	68,8



	76	12	6,9	7,8	76,6
	80	14	8,0	9,1	85,7
	84	7	4,0	4,5	90,3
	88	2	1,1	1,3	91,6
	92	5	2,9	3,2	94,8
	96	4	2,3	2,6	97,4
	100	4	2,3	2,6	100,0
	Total	154	88,5	100,0	
Missing	System	20	11,5		
Total		174	100,0		

Social Functioning (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	3	1,7	1,9
	13	4	2,3	4,5
	25	9	5,2	10,4
	38	23	13,2	25,3
Valid	48	1	,6	26,0
	50	15	8,6	35,7
	63	23	13,2	50,6
	75	29	16,7	69,5
	88	22	12,6	83,8



	100	25	14,4	16,2	100,0
	Total	154	88,5	100,0	
Missing	System	20	11,5		
Total		174	100,0		

Pain (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 10	2	1,1	1,3	1,3
20	4	2,3	2,6	3,9
23	6	3,4	3,9	7,8
33	9	5,2	5,8	13,6
35	6	3,4	3,9	17,5
40	2	1,1	1,3	18,8
43	4	2,3	2,6	21,4
45	14	8,0	9,1	30,5
50	2	1,1	1,3	31,8
55	4	2,3	2,6	34,4



58	5	2,9	3,2	37,7
60	1	,6	,6	38,3
63	1	,6	,6	39,0
65	2	1,1	1,3	40,3
68	7	4,0	4,5	44,8
70	2	1,1	1,3	46,1
75	1	,6	,6	46,8
78	12	6,9	7,8	54,5
80	7	4,0	4,5	59,1
88	4	2,3	2,6	61,7
90	11	6,3	7,1	68,8
95	1	,6	,6	69,5
100	47	27,0	30,5	100,0
Total	154	88,5	100,0	
Missing System	20	11,5		
Total	174	100,0		

General Health (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 5	1	,6	,6	,6
Valid 10	1	,6	,6	1,3
Valid 20	4	2,3	2,6	3,9





25	7	4,0	4,5	8,4
30	9	5,2	5,8	14,3
35	12	6,9	7,8	22,1
40	5	2,9	3,2	25,3
45	9	5,2	5,8	31,2
50	18	10,3	11,7	42,9
55	14	8,0	9,1	51,9
60	13	7,5	8,4	60,4
65	26	14,9	16,9	77,3
70	13	7,5	8,4	85,7
75	9	5,2	5,8	91,6
80	3	1,7	1,9	93,5
85	1	,6	,6	94,2
90	3	1,7	1,9	96,1
95	1	,6	,6	96,8
100	5	2,9	3,2	100,0
Total	154	88,5	100,0	
Missing System	20	11,5		
Total	174	100,0		

PCRS (Max score 150 - Higher is better)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	-----------	---------	---------------	-----------------------





Valid	43	1	,6	,6	,6
	54	1	,6	,6	1,3
	56	1	,6	,6	1,9
	57	1	,6	,6	2,6
	58	1	,6	,6	3,2
	60	1	,6	,6	3,9
	61	1	,6	,6	4,5
	62	2	1,1	1,3	5,8
	64	2	1,1	1,3	7,1
	66	1	,6	,6	7,8
	67	1	,6	,6	8,4
	68	2	1,1	1,3	9,7
	69	2	1,1	1,3	11,0
	70	1	,6	,6	11,7
	71	1	,6	,6	12,3
	72	3	1,7	1,9	14,3
	73	3	1,7	1,9	16,2
	74	1	,6	,6	16,9
	75	2	1,1	1,3	18,2
	76	2	1,1	1,3	19,5
77	4	2,3	2,6	22,1	
78	3	1,7	1,9	24,0	
80	1	,6	,6	24,7	
81	2	1,1	1,3	26,0	





82	2	1,1	1,3	27,3
83	4	2,3	2,6	29,9
85	1	,6	,6	30,5
86	1	,6	,6	31,2
87	2	1,1	1,3	32,5
89	2	1,1	1,3	33,8
90	3	1,7	1,9	35,7
91	3	1,7	1,9	37,7
93	1	,6	,6	38,3
94	2	1,1	1,3	39,6
95	4	2,3	2,6	42,2
96	1	,6	,6	42,9
97	3	1,7	1,9	44,8
98	1	,6	,6	45,5
99	4	2,3	2,6	48,1
100	3	1,7	1,9	50,0
101	3	1,7	1,9	51,9
102	2	1,1	1,3	53,2
104	7	4,0	4,5	57,8
105	1	,6	,6	58,4
106	1	,6	,6	59,1
107	3	1,7	1,9	61,0
109	1	,6	,6	61,7
110	1	,6	,6	62,3





111	4	2,3	2,6	64,9
112	5	2,9	3,2	68,2
114	2	1,1	1,3	69,5
115	6	3,4	3,9	73,4
116	1	,6	,6	74,0
117	9	5,2	5,8	79,9
118	1	,6	,6	80,5
119	3	1,7	1,9	82,5
120	2	1,1	1,3	83,8
121	2	1,1	1,3	85,1
122	3	1,7	1,9	87,0
123	2	1,1	1,3	88,3
125	1	,6	,6	89,0
126	1	,6	,6	89,6
127	2	1,1	1,3	90,9
128	2	1,1	1,3	92,2
133	4	2,3	2,6	94,8
135	2	1,1	1,3	96,1
136	1	,6	,6	96,8
137	1	,6	,6	97,4
139	1	,6	,6	98,1
142	1	,6	,6	98,7
144	1	,6	,6	99,4
146	1	,6	,6	100,0



Total	154	88,5	100,0
Missing System	20	11,5	
Total	174	100,0	

CIQ - Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	23	13,2	15,3	15,3
1	10	5,7	6,7	22,0
2	6	3,4	4,0	26,0
3	12	6,9	8,0	34,0
4	17	9,8	11,3	45,3
5	18	10,3	12,0	57,3
Valid 6	9	5,2	6,0	63,3
7	8	4,6	5,3	68,7
8	11	6,3	7,3	76,0
9	13	7,5	8,7	84,7
10	17	9,8	11,3	96,0
11	4	2,3	2,7	98,7
13	2	1,1	1,3	100,0
Total	150	86,2	100,0	
Missing System	24	13,8		
Total	174	100,0		



CIQ - Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	1	,6	,7	,7
1	4	2,3	2,7	3,3
2	3	1,7	2,0	5,3
3	12	6,9	8,0	13,3
4	10	5,7	6,7	20,0
5	21	12,1	14,0	34,0
6	16	9,2	10,7	44,7
7	18	10,3	12,0	56,7
8	19	10,9	12,7	69,3
9	19	10,9	12,7	82,0
10	16	9,2	10,7	92,7
11	7	4,0	4,7	97,3
12	4	2,3	2,7	100,0
Total	150	86,2	100,0	
Missing System	24	13,8		
Total	174	100,0		

CIQ - Integration into Productive Activities - Max score 7 - Higher is better





	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	9	5,2	6,0	6,0
1	20	11,5	13,3	19,3
2	18	10,3	12,0	31,3
3	19	10,9	12,7	44,0
4	12	6,9	8,0	52,0
5	16	9,2	10,7	62,7
Valid 6	22	12,6	14,7	77,3
7	22	12,6	14,7	92,0
9	3	1,7	2,0	94,0
10	2	1,1	1,3	95,3
11	5	2,9	3,3	98,7
12	1	,6	,7	99,3
14	1	,6	,7	100,0
Total	150	86,2	100,0	
Missing System	24	13,8		
Total	174	100,0		

EPIC (0-3 points - Low burden; 4-6 points - Moderate burden; 7-9 points -High burden)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	-----------	---------	---------------	-----------------------





	0	1	,6	1,3	1,3
	1	4	2,3	5,3	6,6
	2	3	1,7	3,9	10,5
	3	3	1,7	3,9	14,5
	4	4	2,3	5,3	19,7
	5	3	1,7	3,9	23,7
	6	4	2,3	5,3	28,9
	7	8	4,6	10,5	39,5
	8	13	7,5	17,1	56,6
	9	13	7,5	17,1	73,7
Valid	18	1	,6	1,3	75,0
	19	1	,6	1,3	76,3
	21	2	1,1	2,6	78,9
	22	7	4,0	9,2	88,2
	26	1	,6	1,3	89,5
	27	1	,6	1,3	90,8
	29	1	,6	1,3	92,1
	30	1	,6	1,3	93,4
	31	2	1,1	2,6	96,1
	32	2	1,1	2,6	98,7
	34	1	,6	1,3	100,0
	Total	76	43,7	100,0	
Missing	System	98	56,3		
Total		174	100,0		



ADL - Max score 60 - Lower is better

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	2	1,1	2,0	2,0
4	1	,6	1,0	3,1
5	3	1,7	3,1	6,1
6	11	6,3	11,2	17,3
7	9	5,2	9,2	26,5
8	4	2,3	4,1	30,6
9	4	2,3	4,1	34,7
10	1	,6	1,0	35,7
11	2	1,1	2,0	37,8
13	1	,6	1,0	38,8
14	1	,6	1,0	39,8
16	2	1,1	2,0	41,8
17	1	,6	1,0	42,9
20	1	,6	1,0	43,9
21	1	,6	1,0	44,9
24	3	1,7	3,1	48,0
25	5	2,9	5,1	53,1
26	2	1,1	2,0	55,1
30	2	1,1	2,0	57,1
32	2	1,1	2,0	59,2





	34	1	,6	1,0	60,2
	39	1	,6	1,0	61,2
	40	6	3,4	6,1	67,3
	41	1	,6	1,0	68,4
	43	1	,6	1,0	69,4
	44	3	1,7	3,1	72,4
	45	1	,6	1,0	73,5
	47	3	1,7	3,1	76,5
	48	1	,6	1,0	77,6
	49	3	1,7	3,1	80,6
	51	8	4,6	8,2	88,8
	52	2	1,1	2,0	90,8
	53	2	1,1	2,0	92,9
	54	2	1,1	2,0	94,9
	55	2	1,1	2,0	96,9
	56	1	,6	1,0	98,0
	78	2	1,1	2,0	100,0
	Total	98	56,3	100,0	
Missing	System	76	43,7		
Total		174	100,0		

EPIC Ordinal






	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low Burden	11	6,3	19,6
	Moderate Burden	11	6,3	39,3
	High Burden	34	19,5	60,7
	Total	56	32,2	100,0
Missing	System	118	67,8	
Total		174	100,0	


Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union





Histogram








































Frequencies variables

Notes

Output Created		28-NOV-2016 12:11:30
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\lu0008250\Documents\lucas\analyse\dataset.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet0





	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data	174
	File	
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data.
Syntax		FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=Partner IDNr patcare patient Caregiver Prepost /PIECHART PERCENT /ORDER=ANALYSIS.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00,58
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00,59

Statistics

		Partner	Patientnumber	Patient or Cargiver	Patient	Caregiver
N	Valid	174	174	174	174	174
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0





Frequency Tables

Partner

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Belgium	20	11,5	11,5	11,5
Cyprus	40	23,0	23,0	34,5
Italy	24	13,8	13,8	48,3
Valid Lituania	40	23,0	23,0	71,3
Portugal	10	5,7	5,7	77,0
Spain	40	23,0	23,0	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	

Patientnumber

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	22	12,6	12,6	12,6





2	22	12,6	12,6	25,3
3	20	11,5	11,5	36,8
4	18	10,3	10,3	47,1
5	18	10,3	10,3	57,5
6	18	10,3	10,3	67,8
7	14	8,0	8,0	75,9
8	14	8,0	8,0	83,9
9	14	8,0	8,0	92,0
10	14	8,0	8,0	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	

Patient or Cargiver

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Patient	98	56,3	56,3	56,3
Valid Caregiver	76	43,7	43,7	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	

Patient

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Patient	98	56,3	56,3	56,3
2	76	43,7	43,7	100,0





Total	174	100,0	100,0
-------	-----	-------	-------

Caregiver

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	98	56,3	56,3	56,3
Valid Caregiver	76	43,7	43,7	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	

Time of measurement

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Baseline	87	50,0	50,0	50,0
Valid Post-intervention	87	50,0	50,0	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union




Pie Chart






Partner






Patient or Cargiver





Time of measurement





Data analysis

For a statistical clean analysis, all data were transferred from ratio scaled to ordinal scaled. As a consequence, the statistics performed have less power. This procedure however is necessary to find significant results, and can be justified by the fact that all data have a normal distribution, and that not enough participants were recruited for a ratio scaled analysis (in combination with the low number of degrees of freedom due to the high number of co-variables / independent variables).

Frequency Table





EPIC Ordinal

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Moderate Burden	67	38,5	38,5
	High Burden	9	5,2	43,7
	Low Burden	98	56,3	100,0
	Total	174	100,0	100,0

Physical Functioning (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Weak	35	20,1	20,1
	Moderate	26	14,9	35,1
	Strong	36	20,7	55,7
	Very strong	77	44,3	100,0
	Total	174	100,0	100,0

Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)



	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Weak	55	31,6	31,6	31,6
Moderate	19	10,9	10,9	42,5
Strong	19	10,9	10,9	53,4
Very strong	81	46,6	46,6	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	

Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Weak	34	19,5	19,5	19,5
Moderate	20	11,5	11,5	31,0
Strong	26	14,9	14,9	46,0
Very strong	94	54,0	54,0	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	

Energy / Fatigue (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Weak	12	6,9	6,9	6,9
Moderate	51	29,3	29,3	36,2





Strong	65	37,4	37,4	73,6
Very strong	46	26,4	26,4	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	

Emotional Well-Being (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Weak	2	1,1	1,1	1,1
Moderate	26	14,9	14,9	16,1
Valid Strong	78	44,8	44,8	60,9
Very strong	68	39,1	39,1	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	

Social Functioning (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Weak	16	9,2	9,2	9,2
Moderate	39	22,4	22,4	31,6
Valid Strong	52	29,9	29,9	61,5
Very strong	67	38,5	38,5	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	



Pain (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Weak	12	6,9	6,9	6,9
Moderate	37	21,3	21,3	28,2
Valid Strong	23	13,2	13,2	41,4
Very strong	102	58,6	58,6	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	

General Health (%)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Weak	13	7,5	7,5	7,5
Moderate	53	30,5	30,5	37,9
Valid Strong	75	43,1	43,1	81,0
Very strong	33	19,0	19,0	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union




Pie Chart



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union




EPIC Ordinal






Physical Functioning (%)






Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)






Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)






Energy / Fatigue (%)






Emotional Well-Being (%)






Social Functioning (%)






Pain (%)





General Health (%)





Crosstabs (Pre-post Comparisons)

Patients and caregivers combined

Case Processing Summary

	Cases		
	Valid	Missing	Total





	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Physical Functioning (%) *	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Time of measurement						

Physical Functioning (%) * Time of measurement Crosstabulation

			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Physical Functioning (%)	Weak	Count	23	12	35
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	65,7%	34,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	26,4%	13,8%	20,1%
		% of Total	13,2%	6,9%	20,1%
	Moderate	Count	12	14	26
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	46,2%	53,8%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	13,8%	16,1%	14,9%
		% of Total	6,9%	8,0%	14,9%
	Strong	Count	21	15	36
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	24,1%	17,2%	20,7%
		% of Total	12,1%	8,6%	20,7%
Very strong	Count	31	46	77	



Total	% within Physical Functioning (%)	40,3%	59,7%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	35,6%	52,9%	44,3%
	% of Total	17,8%	26,4%	44,3%
	Count	87	87	174
	% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7,533 ^a	3	,057
Likelihood Ratio	7,616	3	,055
Linear-by-Linear Association	5,055	1	,025
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13,00.

Physical functioning did not significantly improve after the 24 week intervention



Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%) * Time of measurement Crosstabulation

			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	Weak	Count	38	17	55
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	69,1%	30,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	43,7%	19,5%	31,6%
		% of Total	21,8%	9,8%	31,6%
	Moderate	Count	8	11	19
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	42,1%	57,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	9,2%	12,6%	10,9%
		% of Total	4,6%	6,3%	10,9%
	Strong	Count	6	13	19
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	31,6%	68,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	6,9%	14,9%	10,9%
		% of Total	3,4%	7,5%	10,9%
Very strong	Count	35	46	81	
	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	43,2%	56,8%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	40,2%	52,9%	46,6%	
	% of Total	20,1%	26,4%	46,6%	
Total	Count	87	87	174	



% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12,565 ^a	3	,006
Likelihood Ratio	12,840	3	,005
Linear-by-Linear Association	8,103	1	,004
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9,50.

Role limitations due to physical health significantly improved after the 24 week intervention

Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%) * Time of measurement Crosstabulation

			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Role Limitations due to	Weak	Count	28	6	34



Emotional Problems (%)		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	82,4%	17,6%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	32,2%	6,9%	19,5%	
		% of Total	16,1%	3,4%	19,5%	
		Count	9	11	20	
	Moderate		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	45,0%	55,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	10,3%	12,6%	11,5%
			% of Total	5,2%	6,3%	11,5%
			Count	11	15	26
	Strong		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	42,3%	57,7%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	12,6%	17,2%	14,9%
			% of Total	6,3%	8,6%	14,9%
			Count	39	55	94
Very strong		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	41,5%	58,5%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	44,8%	63,2%	54,0%	
		% of Total	22,4%	31,6%	54,0%	
		Count	87	87	174	
Total		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	



Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17,774 ^a	3	,000
Likelihood Ratio	19,001	3	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	13,390	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10,00.

Role limitations due to emotional problems significantly improved after the 24 week intervention

Energy / Fatigue (%) * Time of measurement Crosstabulation

			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Energy / Fatigue (%)	Weak	Count	9	3	12
		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	75,0%	25,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,3%	3,4%	6,9%
	% of Total	5,2%	1,7%	6,9%	
Moderate	Count	32	19	51	
	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	62,7%	37,3%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	36,8%	21,8%	29,3%	



Total	Strong	% of Total	18,4%	10,9%	29,3%
		Count	35	30	65
		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	53,8%	46,2%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	40,2%	34,5%	37,4%
		% of Total	20,1%	17,2%	37,4%
		Count	11	35	46
	Very strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	23,9%	76,1%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	12,6%	40,2%	26,4%
		% of Total	6,3%	20,1%	26,4%
		Count	87	87	174
		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19,220 ^a	3	,000
Likelihood Ratio	20,038	3	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	17,031	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,00.



Idem als hierboven.

Energy/Fatigue significantly improved after the 24 week intervention

Emotional Well-Being (%) * Time of measurement Crosstabulation

			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Emotional Well-Being (%)	Weak	Count	2	0	2
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	2,3%	0,0%	1,1%
		% of Total	1,1%	0,0%	1,1%
	Moderate	Count	16	10	26
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	18,4%	11,5%	14,9%
		% of Total	9,2%	5,7%	14,9%
	Strong	Count	47	31	78
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	60,3%	39,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	54,0%	35,6%	44,8%
		% of Total	27,0%	17,8%	44,8%



	Count	22	46	68
Very strong	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	32,4%	67,6%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	25,3%	52,9%	39,1%
	% of Total	12,6%	26,4%	39,1%
Total	Count	87	87	174
	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15,137 ^a	3	,002
Likelihood Ratio	16,131	3	,001
Linear-by-Linear Association	12,266	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.

Emtional well-being significantly improved after the 24 week intervention





Social Functioning (%) * Time of measurement Crosstabulation

			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Social Functioning (%)	Weak	Count	12	4	16
		% within Social Functioning (%)	75,0%	25,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	13,8%	4,6%	9,2%
		% of Total	6,9%	2,3%	9,2%
	Moderate	Count	23	16	39
		% within Social Functioning (%)	59,0%	41,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	26,4%	18,4%	22,4%
		% of Total	13,2%	9,2%	22,4%
	Strong	Count	29	23	52
		% within Social Functioning (%)	55,8%	44,2%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	33,3%	26,4%	29,9%
		% of Total	16,7%	13,2%	29,9%
Very strong	Count	23	44	67	
	% within Social Functioning (%)	34,3%	65,7%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	26,4%	50,6%	38,5%	
	% of Total	13,2%	25,3%	38,5%	
Total	Count	87	87	174	
	% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	



Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12,531 ^a	3	,006
Likelihood Ratio	12,837	3	,005
Linear-by-Linear Association	11,329	1	,001
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8,00.

Social functioning significantly improved after the 24 week intervention

Pain (%) * Time of measurement Crosstabulation

		Time of measurement		Total	
		Baseline	Post-intervention		
Pain (%)	Weak	Count	7	5	12
		% within Pain (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement		8,0%	5,7%	6,9%
	% of Total		4,0%	2,9%	6,9%
Moderate	Count	22	15	37	
	% within Pain (%)	59,5%	40,5%	100,0%	





	% within Time of measurement	25,3%	17,2%	21,3%
	% of Total	12,6%	8,6%	21,3%
	Count	13	10	23
Strong	% within Pain (%)	56,5%	43,5%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	14,9%	11,5%	13,2%
	% of Total	7,5%	5,7%	13,2%
	Count	45	57	102
Very strong	% within Pain (%)	44,1%	55,9%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	51,7%	65,5%	58,6%
	% of Total	25,9%	32,8%	58,6%
	Count	87	87	174
Total	% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3,461 ^a	3	,326
Likelihood Ratio	3,475	3	,324
Linear-by-Linear Association	2,966	1	,085
N of Valid Cases	174		



a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,00.

Pain did not significantly improve after the 24 week intervention

General Health (%) * Time of measurement Crosstabulation

		Time of measurement		Total	
		Baseline	Post-intervention		
General Health (%)	Weak	Count	8	5	13
		% within General Health (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	9,2%	5,7%	7,5%
		% of Total	4,6%	2,9%	7,5%
	Moderate	Count	31	22	53
		% within General Health (%)	58,5%	41,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	35,6%	25,3%	30,5%
		% of Total	17,8%	12,6%	30,5%
	Strong	Count	41	34	75
		% within General Health (%)	54,7%	45,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	47,1%	39,1%	43,1%
		% of Total	23,6%	19,5%	43,1%
Very strong	Count	7	26	33	
	% within General Health (%)	21,2%	78,8%	100,0%	



Total	% within Time of measurement	8,0%	29,9%	19,0%
	% of Total	4,0%	14,9%	19,0%
	Count	87	87	174
	% within General Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13,813 ^a	3	,003
Likelihood Ratio	14,531	3	,002
Linear-by-Linear Association	9,134	1	,003
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,50.

General health significantly improved after the 24 week intervention



Patients and caregivers separated

General Health (%) * Time of measurement * Patient or Cargiver Crosstabulation

Patient or Cargiver			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Patient	General Health (%)	Count	6	5	11	
		Weak	% within General Health (%)	54,5%	45,5%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	12,2%	10,2%	11,2%
			% of Total	6,1%	5,1%	11,2%
		Moderate	Count	20	14	34
			% within General Health (%)	58,8%	41,2%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	40,8%	28,6%	34,7%
		Strong	% of Total	20,4%	14,3%	34,7%
			Count	22	19	41
			% within General Health (%)	53,7%	46,3%	100,0%
		Very strong	% within Time of measurement	44,9%	38,8%	41,8%
			% of Total	22,4%	19,4%	41,8%
			Count	1	11	12
		Very strong	% within General Health (%)	8,3%	91,7%	100,0%



Caregiver	Total	% within Time of measurement	2,0%	22,4%	12,2%			
		% of Total	1,0%	11,2%	12,2%			
		Count	49	49	98			
	General Health (%)	Total	% within General Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
		Weak	Total	Count	2	0	2	
				% within General Health (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
				% within Time of measurement	5,3%	0,0%	2,6%	
		Moderate	Total	% of Total	2,6%	0,0%	2,6%	
				Count	11	8	19	
				% within General Health (%)	57,9%	42,1%	100,0%	
			Strong	Total	% within Time of measurement	28,9%	21,1%	25,0%
					% of Total	14,5%	10,5%	25,0%
					Count	19	15	34
	Very strong	Total	% within General Health (%)	55,9%	44,1%	100,0%		
			% within Time of measurement	50,0%	39,5%	44,7%		
			% of Total	25,0%	19,7%	44,7%		
		Total	Count	6	15	21		
			% within General Health (%)	28,6%	71,4%	100,0%		
% within Time of measurement			15,8%	39,5%	27,6%			
Total	% of Total	7,9%	19,7%	27,6%				
	Count	38	38	76				
	% within General Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%				
Total	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%				
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%				



Total	General Health (%)	Count	8	5	13	
		Weak	% within General Health (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	9,2%	5,7%	7,5%	
		% of Total	4,6%	2,9%	7,5%	
	Moderate	Count	31	22	53	
		% within General Health (%)	58,5%	41,5%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	35,6%	25,3%	30,5%	
		% of Total	17,8%	12,6%	30,5%	
	Strong	Count	41	34	75	
		% within General Health (%)	54,7%	45,3%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	47,1%	39,1%	43,1%	
		% of Total	23,6%	19,5%	43,1%	
Very strong	Count	7	26	33		
	% within General Health (%)	21,2%	78,8%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	8,0%	29,9%	19,0%		
	% of Total	4,0%	14,9%	19,0%		
Total	Count	87	87	174		
	% within General Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		

Chi-Square Tests



Patient or Cargiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	9,703 ^b	3	,021
	Likelihood Ratio	11,127	3	,011
	Linear-by-Linear Association	4,565	1	,033
	N of Valid Cases	98		
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	6,801 ^c	3	,079
	Likelihood Ratio	7,705	3	,053
	Linear-by-Linear Association	5,269	1	,022
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	13,813 ^a	3	,003
	Likelihood Ratio	14,531	3	,002
	Linear-by-Linear Association	9,134	1	,003
	N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,50.

b. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5,50.

c. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.

General health significantly improved after the 24 week intervention for the patients, but not for the caregivers.

EPIC Ordinal * Time of measurement * Patient or Cargiver

Patient or Cargiver	Time of measurement		Total
	Baseline	Post-intervention	





			Count	49	49	98	
Patient	EPIC Ordinal	4	% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	Total			Count	49	49	98
				% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Caregiver	EPIC Ordinal	Moderate Burden	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			Count	31	36	67	
			% within EPIC Ordinal	46,3%	53,7%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	81,6%	94,7%	88,2%	
			% of Total	40,8%	47,4%	88,2%	
			Count	7	2	9	
	High Burden			% within EPIC Ordinal	77,8%	22,2%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	18,4%	5,3%	11,8%
				% of Total	9,2%	2,6%	11,8%
				Count	38	38	76
				% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Total			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			Count	31	36	67	
			% within EPIC Ordinal	46,3%	53,7%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	35,6%	41,4%	38,5%	
			% of Total	17,8%	20,7%	38,5%	
			Count	7	2	9	



		% within EPIC Ordinal	77,8%	22,2%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	8,0%	2,3%	5,2%
		% of Total	4,0%	1,1%	5,2%
		Count	49	49	98
	4	% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	56,3%	56,3%	56,3%
		% of Total	28,2%	28,2%	56,3%
		Count	87	87	174
Total		% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient or Cargiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	. ^b				
	N of Valid Cases	98				
	Pearson Chi-Square	3,151 ^c	1	,076		
	Continuity Correction ^d	2,017	1	,156		
Caregiver	Likelihood Ratio	3,315	1	,069		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,153	,076
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3,109	1	,078		
	N of Valid Cases	76				



Total	Pearson Chi-Square	3,151 ^a	2	,207	
	Likelihood Ratio	3,315	2	,191	
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,068	1	,794	
	N of Valid Cases	174			

- a. 2 cells (33,3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,50.
- b. No statistics are computed because EPIC Ordinal is a constant.
- c. 2 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,50.
- d. Computed only for a 2x2 table

EPIC did not significantly improve after the 24 week intervention.

Physical Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Patient or Cargiver

Patient or Cargiver		Time of measurement		Total		
		Baseline	Post-intervention			
Patient	Physical Functioning (%)	Count	20	12	32	
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	62,5%	37,5%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	40,8%	24,5%	32,7%	
		% of Total	20,4%	12,2%	32,7%	
		Moderate	Count	10	14	24
		Weak	Count	10	12	22



		% within Physical Functioning (%)	41,7%	58,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	20,4%	28,6%	24,5%
		% of Total	10,2%	14,3%	24,5%
		Count	13	10	23
	Strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	56,5%	43,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	26,5%	20,4%	23,5%
		% of Total	13,3%	10,2%	23,5%
		Count	6	13	19
	Very strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	31,6%	68,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	12,2%	26,5%	19,4%
		% of Total	6,1%	13,3%	19,4%
		Count	49	49	98
	Total	% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	3	0	3
	Weak	% within Physical Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	7,9%	0,0%	3,9%
		% of Total	3,9%	0,0%	3,9%
		Count	2	0	2
Caregiver	Physical Functioning (%)				
		Moderate			



		% within Physical Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	5,3%	0,0%	2,6%
		% of Total	2,6%	0,0%	2,6%
		Count	8	5	13
	Strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	21,1%	13,2%	17,1%
		% of Total	10,5%	6,6%	17,1%
		Count	25	33	58
	Very strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	43,1%	56,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	65,8%	86,8%	76,3%
		% of Total	32,9%	43,4%	76,3%
		Count	38	38	76
Total	Physical Functioning (%)	% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	23	12	35
Total	Physical Functioning (%)	% within Physical Functioning (%)	65,7%	34,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	26,4%	13,8%	20,1%
		% of Total	13,2%	6,9%	20,1%
		Moderate	Count	12	14



		% within Physical Functioning (%)	46,2%	53,8%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	13,8%	16,1%	14,9%
		% of Total	6,9%	8,0%	14,9%
		Count	21	15	36
	Strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	24,1%	17,2%	20,7%
		% of Total	12,1%	8,6%	20,7%
		Count	31	46	77
	Very strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	40,3%	59,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	35,6%	52,9%	44,3%
		% of Total	17,8%	26,4%	44,3%
		Count	87	87	174
Total		% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient or Cargiver	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)





Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	5,637 ^b	3	,131
	Likelihood Ratio	5,724	3	,126
	Linear-by-Linear Association	2,919	1	,088
	N of Valid Cases	98		
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	6,796 ^c	3	,079
	Likelihood Ratio	8,737	3	,033
	Linear-by-Linear Association	6,460	1	,011
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	7,533 ^a	3	,057
	Likelihood Ratio	7,616	3	,055
	Linear-by-Linear Association	5,055	1	,025
	N of Valid Cases	174		

- a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13,00.
 b. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9,50.
 c. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.

Physical functioning did not significantly improve after the 24 week intervention.

Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%) * Time of measurement * Patient or Cargiver

Patient or Cargiver				Time of measurement		Total
				Baseline	Post-intervention	
Patient	Role Limitations due to Physical	Weak	Count	27	11	38



Health (%)		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	71,1%	28,9%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	55,1%	22,4%	38,8%	
		% of Total	27,6%	11,2%	38,8%	
		Count	4	10	14	
	Moderate		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	28,6%	71,4%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	8,2%	20,4%	14,3%
			% of Total	4,1%	10,2%	14,3%
			Count	3	4	7
	Strong		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	6,1%	8,2%	7,1%
			% of Total	3,1%	4,1%	7,1%
			Count	15	24	39
Very strong		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	38,5%	61,5%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	30,6%	49,0%	39,8%	
		% of Total	15,3%	24,5%	39,8%	
		Count	49	49	98	
Total		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	



Caregiver	Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	Weak	Count	11	6	17
			% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	64,7%	35,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	28,9%	15,8%	22,4%
		% of Total	14,5%	7,9%	22,4%	
		Moderate	Count	4	1	5
			% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	80,0%	20,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	10,5%	2,6%	6,6%
		% of Total	5,3%	1,3%	6,6%	
		Strong	Count	3	9	12
	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)		25,0%	75,0%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement		7,9%	23,7%	15,8%	
	% of Total		3,9%	11,8%	15,8%	
	Very strong		Count	20	22	42
			% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	47,6%	52,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	52,6%	57,9%	55,3%	
Total	% of Total	26,3%	28,9%	55,3%		
	Count	38	38	76		
	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
Total	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	Count	38	17	55		



Health (%)		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	69,1%	30,9%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	43,7%	19,5%	31,6%	
		% of Total	21,8%	9,8%	31,6%	
		Count	8	11	19	
	Moderate		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	42,1%	57,9%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	9,2%	12,6%	10,9%
			% of Total	4,6%	6,3%	10,9%
			Count	6	13	19
	Strong		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	31,6%	68,4%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	6,9%	14,9%	10,9%
			% of Total	3,4%	7,5%	10,9%
			Count	35	46	81
Very strong		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	43,2%	56,8%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	40,2%	52,9%	46,6%	
		% of Total	20,1%	26,4%	46,6%	
		Count	87	87	174	
Total		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	



Chi-Square Tests

Patient or Cargiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	11,528 ^b	3	,009
	Likelihood Ratio	11,847	3	,008
	Linear-by-Linear Association	6,794	1	,009
	N of Valid Cases	98		
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	6,366 ^c	3	,095
	Likelihood Ratio	6,655	3	,084
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,933	1	,164
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	12,565 ^a	3	,006
	Likelihood Ratio	12,840	3	,005
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,103	1	,004
	N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9,50.

b. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3,50.

c. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,50.

Role limitations due to physical health significantly improved after the 24 week intervention for the patients, but not for the caregivers.





Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%) * Time of measurement * Patient or Cargiver

Patient or Cargiver			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Patient	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	Count	20	3	23	
		Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	87,0%	13,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	40,8%	6,1%	23,5%	
		% of Total	20,4%	3,1%	23,5%	
		Moderate	Count	4	8	12
		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	8,2%	16,3%	12,2%	
		% of Total	4,1%	8,2%	12,2%	
		Strong	Count	5	7	12
	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	41,7%	58,3%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	10,2%	14,3%	12,2%		
	% of Total	5,1%	7,1%	12,2%		
	Very strong	Count	20	31	51	
	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	39,2%	60,8%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	40,8%	63,3%	52,0%		
% of Total	20,4%	31,6%	52,0%			
Total	Count	49	49	98		



Caregiver	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	8	3	11
		Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	72,7%	27,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	21,1%	7,9%	14,5%
			% of Total	10,5%	3,9%	14,5%
			Count	5	3	8
		Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	62,5%	37,5%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	13,2%	7,9%	10,5%
			% of Total	6,6%	3,9%	10,5%
			Count	6	8	14
		Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	15,8%	21,1%	18,4%
			% of Total	7,9%	10,5%	18,4%
			Count	19	24	43
Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	44,2%	55,8%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	50,0%	63,2%	56,6%		
	% of Total	25,0%	31,6%	56,6%		
	Count	38	38	76		
	Total					



		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	28	6	34
	Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	82,4%	17,6%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	32,2%	6,9%	19,5%
		% of Total	16,1%	3,4%	19,5%
		Count	9	11	20
	Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	45,0%	55,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,3%	12,6%	11,5%
		% of Total	5,2%	6,3%	11,5%
		Count	11	15	26
Total	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)				
	Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	42,3%	57,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	12,6%	17,2%	14,9%
		% of Total	6,3%	8,6%	14,9%
		Count	39	55	94
	Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	41,5%	58,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	44,8%	63,2%	54,0%
		% of Total	22,4%	31,6%	54,0%
	Total	Count	87	87	174



% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient or Cargiver	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	16,604 ^b	,001
	Likelihood Ratio	18,158	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	10,769	,001
	N of Valid Cases	98	
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	3,640 ^c	,303
	Likelihood Ratio	3,733	,292
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3,074	,080
	N of Valid Cases	76	
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	17,774 ^a	,000
	Likelihood Ratio	19,001	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	13,390	,000
	N of Valid Cases	174	

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10,00.

b. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,00.

c. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,00.



Role limitations due to emotional problems significantly improved after the 24 week intervention for the patients, but not for the caregivers.

Energy / Fatigue (%) * Time of measurement * Patient or Cargiver

Patient or Cargiver			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Patient	Energy / Fatigue (%)	Count	4	1	5	
		Weak	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	80,0%	20,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	8,2%	2,0%	5,1%
			% of Total	4,1%	1,0%	5,1%
		Moderate	Count	20	12	32
			% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	62,5%	37,5%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	40,8%	24,5%	32,7%
		% of Total	20,4%	12,2%	32,7%	
		Strong	Count	20	21	41
	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)		48,8%	51,2%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement		40,8%	42,9%	41,8%	
	% of Total	20,4%	21,4%	41,8%		
	Very strong	Count	5	15	20	
		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	25,0%	75,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	10,2%	30,6%	20,4%	
% of Total	5,1%	15,3%	20,4%			
Total	Count	49	49	98		



Caregiver	Energy / Fatigue (%)		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			Count	5	2	7	
			Weak	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	71,4%	28,6%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	13,2%	5,3%	9,2%
				% of Total	6,6%	2,6%	9,2%
			Moderate	Count	12	7	19
				% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	63,2%	36,8%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	31,6%	18,4%	25,0%
			Strong	% of Total	15,8%	9,2%	25,0%
				Count	15	9	24
				% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	62,5%	37,5%	100,0%
			Very strong	% within Time of measurement	39,5%	23,7%	31,6%
				% of Total	19,7%	11,8%	31,6%
				Count	6	20	26
			Total	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	23,1%	76,9%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	15,8%	52,6%	34,2%
				% of Total	7,9%	26,3%	34,2%
			Total	Count	38	38	76
% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%		100,0%			
% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%		100,0%			
Total	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%			
	Count	9	3	12			
	Weak	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	75,0%	25,0%	100,0%		
% within Time of measurement		10,3%	3,4%	6,9%			



	% of Total	5,2%	1,7%	6,9%
	Count	32	19	51
Moderate	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	62,7%	37,3%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	36,8%	21,8%	29,3%
	% of Total	18,4%	10,9%	29,3%
	Count	35	30	65
Strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	53,8%	46,2%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	40,2%	34,5%	37,4%
	% of Total	20,1%	17,2%	37,4%
	Count	11	35	46
Very strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	23,9%	76,1%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	12,6%	40,2%	26,4%
	% of Total	6,3%	20,1%	26,4%
	Count	87	87	174
Total	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient or Cargiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	8,824 ^b	3	,032
	Likelihood Ratio	9,206	3	,027



Caregiver	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,502	1	,004
	N of Valid Cases	98		
	Pearson Chi-Square	11,640 ^c	3	,009
	Likelihood Ratio	12,129	3	,007
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,524	1	,004
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	19,220 ^a	3	,000
	Likelihood Ratio	20,038	3	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	17,031	1	,000
	N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,00.

b. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,50.

c. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3,50.

Energy/fatigue significantly improved after the 24 week intervention for the patients and for the caregivers.

Emotional Well-Being (%) * Time of measurement * Patient or Cargiver

Patient or Cargiver				Time of measurement		Total
				Baseline	Post-intervention	
Patient	Emotional Well-Being (%)	Weak	Count	1	0	1
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	2,0%	0,0%	1,0%



			% of Total	1,0%	0,0%	1,0%
			Count	8	5	13
		Moderate	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	16,3%	10,2%	13,3%
			% of Total	8,2%	5,1%	13,3%
			Count	31	26	57
		Strong	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	54,4%	45,6%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	63,3%	53,1%	58,2%
			% of Total	31,6%	26,5%	58,2%
			Count	9	18	27
		Very strong	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	18,4%	36,7%	27,6%
			% of Total	9,2%	18,4%	27,6%
			Count	49	49	98
	Total		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	1	0	1
Caregiver	Emotional Well-Being (%)	Weak	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	2,6%	0,0%	1,3%



		% of Total	1,3%	0,0%	1,3%	
		Count	8	5	13	
	Moderate	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	21,1%	13,2%	17,1%	
		% of Total	10,5%	6,6%	17,1%	
		Count	16	5	21	
	Strong	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	76,2%	23,8%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	42,1%	13,2%	27,6%	
		% of Total	21,1%	6,6%	27,6%	
		Count	13	28	41	
	Very strong	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	31,7%	68,3%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	34,2%	73,7%	53,9%	
		% of Total	17,1%	36,8%	53,9%	
		Count	38	38	76	
	Total	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		Count	2	0	2	
Total	Emotional Well-Being (%)	Weak	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	2,3%	0,0%	1,1%
			% of Total	1,1%	0,0%	1,1%



	Count	16	10	26
	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
Moderate	% within Time of measurement	18,4%	11,5%	14,9%
	% of Total	9,2%	5,7%	14,9%
	Count	47	31	78
	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	60,3%	39,7%	100,0%
Strong	% within Time of measurement	54,0%	35,6%	44,8%
	% of Total	27,0%	17,8%	44,8%
	Count	22	46	68
	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	32,4%	67,6%	100,0%
Very strong	% within Time of measurement	25,3%	52,9%	39,1%
	% of Total	12,6%	26,4%	39,1%
	Count	87	87	174
	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
Total	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests





Patient or Cargiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	5,131 ^b	3	,162
	Likelihood Ratio	5,582	3	,134
	Linear-by-Linear Association	4,561	1	,033
	N of Valid Cases	98		
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	12,942 ^b	3	,005
	Likelihood Ratio	13,762	3	,003
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,039	1	,005
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	15,137 ^a	3	,002
	Likelihood Ratio	16,131	3	,001
	Linear-by-Linear Association	12,266	1	,000
	N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.

b. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.

Emotional well-being significantly improved after the 24 week intervention for the caregivers, but not for the patients.

Social Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Patient or Cargiver

Patient or Cargiver				Time of measurement		Total
				Baseline	Post-intervention	
Patient	Social Functioning (%)	Weak	Count	10	3	13





		% within Social Functioning (%)	76,9%	23,1%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	20,4%	6,1%	13,3%	
		% of Total	10,2%	3,1%	13,3%	
		Count	14	10	24	
	Moderate	% within Social Functioning (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	28,6%	20,4%	24,5%	
		% of Total	14,3%	10,2%	24,5%	
		Count	15	15	30	
	Strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	30,6%	30,6%	30,6%	
		% of Total	15,3%	15,3%	30,6%	
		Count	10	21	31	
	Very strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	32,3%	67,7%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	20,4%	42,9%	31,6%	
		% of Total	10,2%	21,4%	31,6%	
		Count	49	49	98	
	Total	% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		Count	2	1	3	
Caregiver	Social Functioning (%)	Weak	% within Social Functioning (%)	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	5,3%	2,6%	3,9%
			% of Total	2,6%	1,3%	3,9%
		Moderate	Count	9	6	15



		% within Social Functioning (%)	60,0%	40,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	23,7%	15,8%	19,7%
		% of Total	11,8%	7,9%	19,7%
		Count	14	8	22
	Strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	63,6%	36,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	36,8%	21,1%	28,9%
		% of Total	18,4%	10,5%	28,9%
		Count	13	23	36
	Very strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	36,1%	63,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	34,2%	60,5%	47,4%
		% of Total	17,1%	30,3%	47,4%
		Count	38	38	76
Total		% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	12	4	16
	Weak	% within Social Functioning (%)	75,0%	25,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	13,8%	4,6%	9,2%
		% of Total	6,9%	2,3%	9,2%
		Count	23	16	39
Total	Social Functioning (%)	% within Social Functioning (%)	59,0%	41,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	26,4%	18,4%	22,4%
		% of Total	13,2%	9,2%	22,4%
		Count	29	23	52
	Strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	55,8%	44,2%	100,0%



		% within Time of measurement	33,3%	26,4%	29,9%
		% of Total	16,7%	13,2%	29,9%
		Count	23	44	67
	Very strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	34,3%	65,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	26,4%	50,6%	38,5%
		% of Total	13,2%	25,3%	38,5%
		Count	87	87	174
Total		% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient or Cargiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	8,339 ^b	3	,039
	Likelihood Ratio	8,636	3	,035
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,057	1	,005
	N of Valid Cases	98		
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	5,347 ^c	3	,148
	Likelihood Ratio	5,416	3	,144
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3,698	1	,054
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	12,531 ^a	3	,006



Likelihood Ratio	12,837	3	,005
Linear-by-Linear Association	11,329	1	,001
N of Valid Cases	174		

- a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8,00.
- b. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,50.
- c. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.

Social functioning significantly improved after the 24 week intervention for the patients, but not for the caregivers.

Pain (%) * Time of measurement * Patient or Cargiver

Patient or Cargiver			Time of measurement		Total		
			Baseline	Post-intervention			
Patient	Pain (%)	Weak	Count	5	4	9	
			% within Pain (%)	55,6%	44,4%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	10,2%	8,2%	9,2%	
		% of Total	5,1%	4,1%	9,2%		
		Moderate	Count	14	8	22	
			% within Pain (%)	63,6%	36,4%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement		28,6%	16,3%	22,4%		
	Strong	% of Total	14,3%	8,2%	22,4%		
		Count	4	6	10		
		% within Pain (%)	40,0%	60,0%	100,0%		
				% within Time of measurement	8,2%	12,2%	10,2%





Caregiver	Pain (%)	Total	% of Total	4,1%	6,1%	10,2%	
			Count	26	31	57	
			Very strong	% within Pain (%)	45,6%	54,4%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	53,1%	63,3%	58,2%
				% of Total	26,5%	31,6%	58,2%
				Count	49	49	98
				% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
				% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				Count	2	1	3
			Weak	% within Pain (%)	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	5,3%	2,6%	3,9%
				% of Total	2,6%	1,3%	3,9%
				Count	8	7	15
			Moderate	% within Pain (%)	53,3%	46,7%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	21,1%	18,4%	19,7%
				% of Total	10,5%	9,2%	19,7%
				Count	9	4	13
			Strong	% within Pain (%)	69,2%	30,8%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	23,7%	10,5%	17,1%
	% of Total	11,8%	5,3%	17,1%			
	Count	19	26	45			
Very strong	% within Pain (%)	42,2%	57,8%	100,0%			
	% within Time of measurement	50,0%	68,4%	59,2%			
Total	% of Total	25,0%	34,2%	59,2%			
	Count	38	38	76			



Total	Pain (%)		% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			Count	7	5	12	
		Weak		% within Pain (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	8,0%	5,7%	6,9%
				% of Total	4,0%	2,9%	6,9%
			Count	22	15	37	
		Moderate		% within Pain (%)	59,5%	40,5%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	25,3%	17,2%	21,3%
				% of Total	12,6%	8,6%	21,3%
			Count	13	10	23	
		Strong		% within Pain (%)	56,5%	43,5%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	14,9%	11,5%	13,2%
				% of Total	7,5%	5,7%	13,2%
			Count	45	57	102	
		Very strong		% within Pain (%)	44,1%	55,9%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	51,7%	65,5%	58,6%
				% of Total	25,9%	32,8%	58,6%
			Count	87	87	174	
Total		% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		



Chi-Square Tests

Patient or Cargiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	2,586 ^b	3	,460
	Likelihood Ratio	2,610	3	,456
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,493	1	,222
	N of Valid Cases	98		
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	3,412 ^c	3	,332
	Likelihood Ratio	3,473	3	,324
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,532	1	,216
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	3,461 ^a	3	,326
	Likelihood Ratio	3,475	3	,324
	Linear-by-Linear Association	2,966	1	,085
	N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,00.

b. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,50.

c. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.

Pain did not significantly improve after the 24 week intervention.



Per partner

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EPIC Ordinal * Time of measurement * Partner	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Physical Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Partner	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%) * Time of measurement * Partner	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%) * Time of measurement * Partner	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Energy / Fatigue (%) * Time of measurement * Partner	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Emotional Well-Being (%) * Time of measurement * Partner	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Social Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Partner	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Pain (%) * Time of measurement * Partner	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%



EPIC Ordinal * Time of measurement * Partner

Partner			Time of measurement		Total		
			Baseline	Post-intervention			
Belgium	EPIC Ordinal	4	Count	10	10	20	
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	Total			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				Count	10	10	20
				% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	Moderate Burden			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
				% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				Count	10	10	20
EPIC Ordinal			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	50,0%	50,0%	50,0%	
			% of Total	25,0%	25,0%	50,0%	
Cyprus	EPIC Ordinal	4	Count	10	10	20	
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	50,0%	50,0%	50,0%	
	Total			% of Total	25,0%	25,0%	50,0%
				Count	20	20	40
				% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
Total			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	



Italy	EPIC Ordinal	Moderate Burden	Count	6	6	12
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	50,0%	50,0%	50,0%
			% of Total	25,0%	25,0%	50,0%
			Count	6	6	12
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	Total	4	% within Time of measurement	50,0%	50,0%	50,0%
			% of Total	25,0%	25,0%	50,0%
			Count	12	12	24
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
Lithuania	EPIC Ordinal	Moderate Burden	Count	10	10	20
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	50,0%	50,0%	50,0%
			% of Total	25,0%	25,0%	50,0%
			Count	10	10	20
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	Total	4	% within Time of measurement	50,0%	50,0%	50,0%
			% of Total	25,0%	25,0%	50,0%
			Count	20	20	40
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
Portugal	EPIC Ordinal	Moderate Burden	Count	2	2	4
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	40,0%	40,0%	40,0%



			% of Total	20,0%	20,0%	40,0%
			Count	3	3	6
	4		% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	60,0%	60,0%	60,0%
			% of Total	30,0%	30,0%	60,0%
			Count	5	5	10
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	3	8	11
		Moderate Burden	% within EPIC Ordinal	27,3%	72,7%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	15,0%	40,0%	27,5%
			% of Total	7,5%	20,0%	27,5%
			Count	7	2	9
			% within EPIC Ordinal	77,8%	22,2%	100,0%
		High Burden	% within Time of measurement	35,0%	10,0%	22,5%
			% of Total	17,5%	5,0%	22,5%
			Count	10	10	20
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		4	% within Time of measurement	50,0%	50,0%	50,0%
			% of Total	25,0%	25,0%	50,0%
			Count	20	20	40
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	31	36	67
			% within EPIC Ordinal	46,3%	53,7%	100,0%
Spain	Total					
			% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	31	36	67
			% within EPIC Ordinal	46,3%	53,7%	100,0%
Total	EPIC Ordinal	Moderate Burden				
			% within EPIC Ordinal	46,3%	53,7%	100,0%



		% within Time of measurement	35,6%	41,4%	38,5%
		% of Total	17,8%	20,7%	38,5%
		Count	7	2	9
	High Burden	% within EPIC Ordinal	77,8%	22,2%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	8,0%	2,3%	5,2%
		% of Total	4,0%	1,1%	5,2%
		Count	49	49	98
	4	% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	56,3%	56,3%	56,3%
		% of Total	28,2%	28,2%	56,3%
		Count	87	87	174
Total		% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Partner		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Belgium	Pearson Chi-Square	. ^b				
	N of Valid Cases	20				
Cyprus	Pearson Chi-Square	,000 ^c	1	1,000		
	Continuity Correction ^d	,000	1	1,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	,000	1	1,000		



Italy	Fisher's Exact Test				1,000	,624
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000		
	N of Valid Cases	40				
	Pearson Chi-Square	,000 ^e	1	1,000		
	Continuity Correction ^d	,000	1	1,000		
Lithuania	Likelihood Ratio	,000	1	1,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1,000	,658
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000		
	N of Valid Cases	24				
	Pearson Chi-Square	,000 ^c	1	1,000		
Portugal	Continuity Correction ^d	,000	1	1,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	,000	1	1,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1,000	,624
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000		
	N of Valid Cases	40				
Spain	Pearson Chi-Square	,000 ^f	1	1,000		
	Continuity Correction ^d	,000	1	1,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	,000	1	1,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1,000	,738
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000		
Total	N of Valid Cases	10				
	Pearson Chi-Square	5,051 ^a	2	,080		
	Likelihood Ratio	5,300	2	,071		
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,348	1	,555		
Total	N of Valid Cases	40				
	Pearson Chi-Square	3,151 ^a	2	,207		
	Likelihood Ratio	3,315	2	,191		



Linear-by-Linear Association	,068	1	,794	
N of Valid Cases	174			

- a. 2 cells (33,3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,50.
- b. No statistics are computed because EPIC Ordinal is a constant.
- c. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10,00.
- d. Computed only for a 2x2 table
- e. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,00.
- f. 4 cells (100,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,00.

Physical Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Partner

Partner			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Belgium	Physical Functioning (%)	Moderate	Count	6	5	11
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	54,5%	45,5%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	60,0%	50,0%	55,0%	
		% of Total	30,0%	25,0%	55,0%	
		Count	4	5	9	
	Strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	44,4%	55,6%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	40,0%	50,0%	45,0%	
		% of Total	20,0%	25,0%	45,0%	
		Count	10	10	20	
	Total					



Cyprus	Physical Functioning (%)		% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			Count	10	8	18	
		Weak		% within Physical Functioning (%)	55,6%	44,4%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	50,0%	40,0%	45,0%
				% of Total	25,0%	20,0%	45,0%
				Count	0	1	1
		Moderate		% within Physical Functioning (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	0,0%	5,0%	2,5%
				% of Total	0,0%	2,5%	2,5%
				Count	3	4	7
		Strong		% within Physical Functioning (%)	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	15,0%	20,0%	17,5%
				% of Total	7,5%	10,0%	17,5%
				Count	7	7	14
		Very strong		% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	35,0%	35,0%	35,0%
				% of Total	17,5%	17,5%	35,0%
				Count	20	20	40
	Total						



Italy	Physical Functioning (%)		% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Moderate	Count	1	1	2
			% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	8,3%	8,3%	8,3%
		Strong	% of Total	4,2%	4,2%	8,3%
			Count	5	4	9
			% within Physical Functioning (%)	55,6%	44,4%	100,0%
		Very strong	% within Time of measurement	41,7%	33,3%	37,5%
			% of Total	20,8%	16,7%	37,5%
			Count	6	7	13
		Total	% within Physical Functioning (%)	46,2%	53,8%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	50,0%	58,3%	54,2%
			% of Total	25,0%	29,2%	54,2%
	Count	12	12	24		
	% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	Count	2	0	2		
Lituania	Physical Functioning (%)	Weak	% within Physical Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%



			% within Time of measurement	10,0%	0,0%	5,0%
			% of Total	5,0%	0,0%	5,0%
			Count	4	0	4
		Moderate	% within Physical Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	0,0%	10,0%
			% of Total	10,0%	0,0%	10,0%
			Count	5	0	5
		Strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	25,0%	0,0%	12,5%
			% of Total	12,5%	0,0%	12,5%
			Count	9	20	29
		Very strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	31,0%	69,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	45,0%	100,0%	72,5%
			% of Total	22,5%	50,0%	72,5%
			Count	20	20	40
	Total		% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	1	1	2
Portugal	Physical Functioning (%)	Weak	% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%
			% of Total	10,0%	10,0%	20,0%



		Count	2	2	4
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	Strong	% within Time of measurement	40,0%	40,0%	40,0%
		% of Total	20,0%	20,0%	40,0%
		Count	2	2	4
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	Very strong	% within Time of measurement	40,0%	40,0%	40,0%
		% of Total	20,0%	20,0%	40,0%
		Count	5	5	10
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	10	3	13
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	76,9%	23,1%	100,0%
	Weak	% within Time of measurement	50,0%	15,0%	32,5%
		% of Total	25,0%	7,5%	32,5%
		Count	1	7	8
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	12,5%	87,5%	100,0%
	Moderate	% within Time of measurement	5,0%	35,0%	20,0%
		% of Total	2,5%	17,5%	20,0%
		Count	2	0	2
	Strong				
Spain	Physical Functioning (%)				



		% within Physical Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,0%	0,0%	5,0%
		% of Total	5,0%	0,0%	5,0%
		Count	7	10	17
	Very strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	41,2%	58,8%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	35,0%	50,0%	42,5%
		% of Total	17,5%	25,0%	42,5%
		Count	20	20	40
Total		% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	23	12	35
	Weak	% within Physical Functioning (%)	65,7%	34,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	26,4%	13,8%	20,1%
		% of Total	13,2%	6,9%	20,1%
Total	Physical Functioning (%)	Count	12	14	26
	Moderate	% within Physical Functioning (%)	46,2%	53,8%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	13,8%	16,1%	14,9%
		% of Total	6,9%	8,0%	14,9%
	Strong	Count	21	15	36



Total	Very strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	24,1%	17,2%	20,7%	
		% of Total	12,1%	8,6%	20,7%	
		Count	31	46	77	
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	40,3%	59,7%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	35,6%	52,9%	44,3%	
			% of Total	17,8%	26,4%	44,3%
			Count	87	87	174
			% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Partner	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	
Belgium	Pearson Chi-Square	,202 ^b	1	,653		
	Continuity Correction ^c	,000	1	1,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	,202	1	,653		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1,000	,500
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,192	1	,661		



	N of Valid Cases	20			
Cyprus	Pearson Chi-Square	1,365 ^d	3	,714	
	Likelihood Ratio	1,752	3	,625	
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,119	1	,730	
	N of Valid Cases	40			
Italy	Pearson Chi-Square	,188 ^e	2	,910	
	Likelihood Ratio	,188	2	,910	
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,096	1	,756	
	N of Valid Cases	24			
Lithuania	Pearson Chi-Square	15,172 ^f	3	,002	
	Likelihood Ratio	19,528	3	,000	
	Linear-by-Linear Association	11,742	1	,001	
	N of Valid Cases	40			
Portugal	Pearson Chi-Square	,000 ^g	2	1,000	
	Likelihood Ratio	,000	2	1,000	
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000	
	N of Valid Cases	10			
Spain	Pearson Chi-Square	10,799 ^h	3	,013	
	Likelihood Ratio	12,343	3	,006	
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,691	1	,193	
	N of Valid Cases	40			
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	7,533 ^a	3	,057	
	Likelihood Ratio	7,616	3	,055	
	Linear-by-Linear Association	5,055	1	,025	
	N of Valid Cases	174			

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13,00.



b. 2 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,50.

c. Computed only for a 2x2 table

d. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.

e. 4 cells (66,7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.

f. 6 cells (75,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.

g. 6 cells (100,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.

h. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.

Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%) * Time of measurement * Partner

Partner			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Belgium	Strong	Count	2	1	3
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	20,0%	10,0%	15,0%
	Very strong	% of Total	10,0%	5,0%	15,0%
		Count	8	9	17
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	47,1%	52,9%	100,0%





		% within Time of measurement	80,0%	90,0%	85,0%
		% of Total	40,0%	45,0%	85,0%
		Count	10	10	20
	Total	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	10	7	17
	Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	58,8%	41,2%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	50,0%	35,0%	42,5%
		% of Total	25,0%	17,5%	42,5%
		Count	0	2	2
	Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	0,0%	10,0%	5,0%
		% of Total	0,0%	5,0%	5,0%
		Count	0	1	1
	Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	0,0%	5,0%	2,5%
		% of Total	0,0%	2,5%	2,5%
		Count	10	10	20
	Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	50,0%	50,0%	50,0%
Cyprus	Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)				



		% of Total	25,0%	25,0%	50,0%
		Count	20	20	40
	Total	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	8	6	14
	Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	57,1%	42,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	66,7%	50,0%	58,3%
		% of Total	33,3%	25,0%	58,3%
		Count	0	1	1
	Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	0,0%	8,3%	4,2%
	Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	% of Total	0,0%	4,2%	4,2%
Italy		Count	1	1	2
	Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	8,3%	8,3%	8,3%
		% of Total	4,2%	4,2%	8,3%
		Count	3	4	7
	Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	25,0%	33,3%	29,2%
		% of Total	12,5%	16,7%	29,2%
	Total	Count	12	12	24



		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	12	0	12
	Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	60,0%	0,0%	30,0%
	Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	% of Total	30,0%	0,0%	30,0%
		Count	8	20	28
Lituania	Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	28,6%	71,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	40,0%	100,0%	70,0%
		% of Total	20,0%	50,0%	70,0%
		Count	20	20	40
	Total	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	0	1	1
	Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	% within Time of measurement	0,0%	20,0%	10,0%
		% of Total	0,0%	10,0%	10,0%
		Count	2	1	3
Portugal	Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%



Spain	Total	Very strong	% within Time of measurement	40,0%	20,0%	30,0%
			% of Total	20,0%	10,0%	30,0%
			Count	3	3	6
		Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	60,0%	60,0%	60,0%
			% of Total	30,0%	30,0%	60,0%
		Weak	Count	5	5	10
			% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		Very weak	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	8	3	11
			% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	72,7%	27,3%	100,0%
	Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	Moderate	% within Time of measurement	40,0%	15,0%	27,5%
			% of Total	20,0%	7,5%	27,5%
			Count	6	7	13
		Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	46,2%	53,8%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	30,0%	35,0%	32,5%
			% of Total	15,0%	17,5%	32,5%
	Very strong	Count	3	10	13	
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	23,1%	76,9%	100,0%	
% within Time of measurement		15,0%	50,0%	32,5%		
		% of Total	7,5%	25,0%	32,5%	



		Count	3	0	3	
	Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	15,0%	0,0%	7,5%	
		% of Total	7,5%	0,0%	7,5%	
	Total	Count	20	20	40	
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	Weak	Count	38	17	55	
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	69,1%	30,9%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	43,7%	19,5%	31,6%	
		% of Total	21,8%	9,8%	31,6%	
Total	Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	Moderate	Count	8	11	19
			% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	42,1%	57,9%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	9,2%	12,6%	10,9%
			% of Total	4,6%	6,3%	10,9%
	Strong	Count	6	13	19	
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	31,6%	68,4%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	6,9%	14,9%	10,9%	
		% of Total	3,4%	7,5%	10,9%	



	Count	35	46	81
Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	43,2%	56,8%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	40,2%	52,9%	46,6%
	% of Total	20,1%	26,4%	46,6%
Total	Count	87	87	174
	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Partner	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	
Belgium	Pearson Chi-Square	,392 ^b	1	,531	1,000	,500
	Continuity Correction ^c	,000	1	1,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	,399	1	,528		
	Fisher's Exact Test					
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,373	1	,542		
	N of Valid Cases	20				
Cyprus	Pearson Chi-Square	3,529 ^d	3	,317		
	Likelihood Ratio	4,691	3	,196		
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,187	1	,666		



	N of Valid Cases	40				
Italy	Pearson Chi-Square	1,429 ^e	3	,699		
	Likelihood Ratio	1,816	3	,611		
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,350	1	,554		
	N of Valid Cases	24				
Lithuania	Pearson Chi-Square	17,143 ^f	1	,000		
	Continuity Correction ^c	14,405	1	,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	21,949	1	,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,000	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	16,714	1	,000		
	N of Valid Cases	40				
Portugal	Pearson Chi-Square	1,333 ^g	2	,513		
	Likelihood Ratio	1,726	2	,422		
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,070	1	,792		
	N of Valid Cases	10				
Spain	Pearson Chi-Square	9,119 ^h	3	,028		
	Likelihood Ratio	10,571	3	,014		
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,020	1	,312		
	N of Valid Cases	40				
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	12,565 ^a	3	,006		
	Likelihood Ratio	12,840	3	,005		
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,103	1	,004		
	N of Valid Cases	174				

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9,50.

b. 2 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.

c. Computed only for a 2x2 table



- d. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.
- e. 6 cells (75,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.
- f. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,00.
- g. 6 cells (100,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.
- h. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.

Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%) * Time of measurement * Partner

Partner			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Belgium	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	Moderate	Count	0	1	1
			% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	0,0%	10,0%	5,0%
		Strong	% of Total	0,0%	5,0%	5,0%
			Count	2	1	3
			% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
		Very strong	% within Time of measurement	20,0%	10,0%	15,0%
			% of Total	10,0%	5,0%	15,0%
			Count	8	8	16
			% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	80,0%	80,0%	80,0%
			% of Total	40,0%	40,0%	80,0%





		Count	10	10	20
	Total	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	7	0	7
	Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	35,0%	0,0%	17,5%
		% of Total	17,5%	0,0%	17,5%
		Count	1	0	1
	Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	5,0%	0,0%	2,5%
		% of Total	2,5%	0,0%	2,5%
Cyprus	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	Count	0	1	1
	Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	0,0%	5,0%	2,5%
		% of Total	0,0%	2,5%	2,5%
		Count	12	19	31
	Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	38,7%	61,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	60,0%	95,0%	77,5%
		% of Total	30,0%	47,5%	77,5%
	Total	Count	20	20	40



Italy	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			Count	6	5	11	
		Weak		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	54,5%	45,5%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	50,0%	41,7%	45,8%
				% of Total	25,0%	20,8%	45,8%
			Count	3	4	7	
		Moderate		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	25,0%	33,3%	29,2%
				% of Total	12,5%	16,7%	29,2%
			Count	0	1	1	
		Strong		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	0,0%	8,3%	4,2%
				% of Total	0,0%	4,2%	4,2%
			Count	3	2	5	
		Very strong		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	60,0%	40,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	25,0%	16,7%	20,8%
				% of Total	12,5%	8,3%	20,8%
			Count	12	12	24	
		Total		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%



		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	11	0	11
	Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	55,0%	0,0%	27,5%
		% of Total	27,5%	0,0%	27,5%
		Count	1	0	1
	Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	5,0%	0,0%	2,5%
		% of Total	2,5%	0,0%	2,5%
		Count	2	0	2
	Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,0%	0,0%	5,0%
		% of Total	5,0%	0,0%	5,0%
		Count	6	20	26
	Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	23,1%	76,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	30,0%	100,0%	65,0%
		% of Total	15,0%	50,0%	65,0%
		Count	20	20	40
	Total	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
Lithuania					



Portugal	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	Weak	Count	1	1	2
			% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%
		% of Total	10,0%	10,0%	20,0%	
		Strong	Count	0	1	1
			% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	0,0%	20,0%	10,0%
		% of Total	0,0%	10,0%	10,0%	
		Very strong	Count	4	3	7
	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)		57,1%	42,9%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement		80,0%	60,0%	70,0%	
	% of Total	40,0%	30,0%	70,0%		
	Total	Count	5	5	10	
		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%			
Spain	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	Weak	Count	3	0	3
			% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	15,0%	0,0%	7,5%
	% of Total	7,5%	0,0%	7,5%		
	Moderate	Count	4	6	10	
		% within Time of measurement				



			% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	40,0%	60,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	30,0%	25,0%
			% of Total	10,0%	15,0%	25,0%
			Count	7	11	18
		Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	38,9%	61,1%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	35,0%	55,0%	45,0%
			% of Total	17,5%	27,5%	45,0%
			Count	6	3	9
		Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	30,0%	15,0%	22,5%
			% of Total	15,0%	7,5%	22,5%
			Count	20	20	40
	Total		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	28	6	34
		Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	82,4%	17,6%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	32,2%	6,9%	19,5%
			% of Total	16,1%	3,4%	19,5%
		Moderate	Count	9	11	20
Total	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)					



		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	45,0%	55,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,3%	12,6%	11,5%
		% of Total	5,2%	6,3%	11,5%
		Count	11	15	26
	Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	42,3%	57,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	12,6%	17,2%	14,9%
		% of Total	6,3%	8,6%	14,9%
		Count	39	55	94
	Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	41,5%	58,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	44,8%	63,2%	54,0%
		% of Total	22,4%	31,6%	54,0%
		Count	87	87	174
Total		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Partner	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)





Belgium	Pearson Chi-Square	1,333 ^b	2	,513
	Likelihood Ratio	1,726	2	,422
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,165	1	,684
	N of Valid Cases	20		
Cyprus	Pearson Chi-Square	10,581 ^c	3	,014
	Likelihood Ratio	14,071	3	,003
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,804	1	,003
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Italy	Pearson Chi-Square	1,434 ^c	3	,698
	Likelihood Ratio	1,822	3	,610
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000
	N of Valid Cases	24		
Lithuania	Pearson Chi-Square	21,538 ^d	3	,000
	Likelihood Ratio	27,361	3	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	18,859	1	,000
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Portugal	Pearson Chi-Square	1,143 ^e	2	,565
	Likelihood Ratio	1,530	2	,465
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,064	1	,801
	N of Valid Cases	10		
Spain	Pearson Chi-Square	5,289 ^f	3	,152
	Likelihood Ratio	6,477	3	,091
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,033	1	,856
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	17,774 ^a	3	,000
	Likelihood Ratio	19,001	3	,000



Linear-by-Linear Association	13,390	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	174		

- a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10,00.
- b. 4 cells (66,7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.
- c. 6 cells (75,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.
- d. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.
- e. 6 cells (100,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.
- f. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.

Energy / Fatigue (%) * Time of measurement * Partner

Partner			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Belgium	Energy / Fatigue (%)	Moderate	Count	2	3	5
		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	40,0%	60,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	20,0%	30,0%	25,0%	
		% of Total	10,0%	15,0%	25,0%	
	Strong	Count	7	5	12	
		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	70,0%	50,0%	60,0%	
		% of Total	35,0%	25,0%	60,0%	
	Very strong	Count	1	2	3	
		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	10,0%	20,0%	15,0%	





			% of Total	5,0%	10,0%	15,0%
			Count	10	10	20
	Total		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	2	0	2
		Weak	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	10,0%	0,0%	5,0%
			% of Total	5,0%	0,0%	5,0%
			Count	4	1	5
		Moderate	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	80,0%	20,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	5,0%	12,5%
	Energy / Fatigue (%)		% of Total	10,0%	2,5%	12,5%
			Count	9	8	17
		Strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	52,9%	47,1%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	45,0%	40,0%	42,5%
			% of Total	22,5%	20,0%	42,5%
			Count	5	11	16
		Very strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	31,2%	68,8%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	25,0%	55,0%	40,0%
			% of Total	12,5%	27,5%	40,0%
			Count	20	20	40
	Total		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
Italy	Energy / Fatigue (%)	Weak	Count	2	1	3



		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	16,7%	8,3%	12,5%
		% of Total	8,3%	4,2%	12,5%
		Count	7	5	12
	Moderate	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	58,3%	41,7%	50,0%
		% of Total	29,2%	20,8%	50,0%
		Count	1	4	5
	Strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	20,0%	80,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	8,3%	33,3%	20,8%
		% of Total	4,2%	16,7%	20,8%
		Count	2	2	4
	Very strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	16,7%	16,7%	16,7%
		% of Total	8,3%	8,3%	16,7%
		Count	12	12	24
	Total	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	3	0	3
	Weak	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	15,0%	0,0%	7,5%
		% of Total	7,5%	0,0%	7,5%
		Count	6	0	6
	Moderate	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	30,0%	0,0%	15,0%
		% of Total	15,0%	0,0%	15,0%
Lithuania	Energy / Fatigue (%)				



Portugal	Total	Strong	Count	11	0	11	
			% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	55,0%	0,0%	27,5%	
				% of Total	27,5%	0,0%	27,5%
		Very strong	Count	0	20	20	
			% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	0,0%	100,0%	50,0%	
				% of Total	0,0%	50,0%	50,0%
		Total	Count	20	20	40	
	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)		50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement		100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	Energy / Fatigue (%)	Weak	Count	2	2	4	
			% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	40,0%	40,0%	40,0%	
				% of Total	20,0%	20,0%	40,0%
		Moderate	Count	2	2	4	
			% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	40,0%	40,0%	40,0%	
				% of Total	20,0%	20,0%	40,0%
Strong		Count	1	1	2		
	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%			
	% within Time of measurement	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%			
		% of Total	10,0%	10,0%	20,0%		
Total	Count	5	5	10			
	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%			
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%			



Spain	Energy / Fatigue (%)	Moderate	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	11	8	19
			% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	57,9%	42,1%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	55,0%	40,0%	47,5%
			% of Total	27,5%	20,0%	47,5%
			Count	6	12	18
		Strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	30,0%	60,0%	45,0%
			% of Total	15,0%	30,0%	45,0%
			Count	3	0	3
		Very strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	15,0%	0,0%	7,5%
			% of Total	7,5%	0,0%	7,5%
			Count	20	20	40
Total	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	Count	9	3	12		
Weak	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	75,0%	25,0%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	10,3%	3,4%	6,9%		
	% of Total	5,2%	1,7%	6,9%		
	Count	32	19	51		
Total	Energy / Fatigue (%)	Moderate	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	62,7%	37,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	36,8%	21,8%	29,3%
		Strong	% of Total	18,4%	10,9%	29,3%
			Count	35	30	65



		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	53,8%	46,2%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	40,2%	34,5%	37,4%
		% of Total	20,1%	17,2%	37,4%
		Count	11	35	46
	Very strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	23,9%	76,1%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	12,6%	40,2%	26,4%
		% of Total	6,3%	20,1%	26,4%
		Count	87	87	174
Total		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Partner		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Belgium	Pearson Chi-Square	,867 ^b	2	,648
	Likelihood Ratio	,876	2	,645
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000
	N of Valid Cases	20		
Cyprus	Pearson Chi-Square	6,109 ^c	3	,106
	Likelihood Ratio	7,065	3	,070
	Linear-by-Linear Association	5,932	1	,015
	N of Valid Cases	40		



Italy	Pearson Chi-Square	2,467 ^d	3	,481
	Likelihood Ratio	2,602	3	,457
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,773	1	,379
	N of Valid Cases	24		
Lithuania	Pearson Chi-Square	40,000 ^e	3	,000
	Likelihood Ratio	55,452	3	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	27,429	1	,000
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Portugal	Pearson Chi-Square	,000 ^f	2	1,000
	Likelihood Ratio	,000	2	1,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000
	N of Valid Cases	10		
Spain	Pearson Chi-Square	5,474 ^g	2	,065
	Likelihood Ratio	6,673	2	,036
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	19,220 ^a	3	,000
	Likelihood Ratio	20,038	3	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	17,031	1	,000
	N of Valid Cases	174		

- a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,00.
- b. 4 cells (66,7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.
- c. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.
- d. 6 cells (75,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.
- e. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.
- f. 6 cells (100,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.



g. 2 cells (33,3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.

Emotional Well-Being (%) * Time of measurement * Partner

Partner			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Belgium	Emotional Well-Being (%)	Strong	Count	8	8	16
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	80,0%	80,0%	80,0%
			% of Total	40,0%	40,0%	80,0%
	Very strong	Count	2	2	4	
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%	
		% of Total	10,0%	10,0%	20,0%	
	Total	Count	10	10	20	
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
Cyprus	Emotional Well-Being (%)	Weak	Count	1	0	1
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	5,0%	0,0%	2,5%
			% of Total	5,0%	0,0%	2,5%





		% of Total	2,5%	0,0%	2,5%	
		Count	1	0	1	
	Moderate	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	5,0%	0,0%	2,5%	
		% of Total	2,5%	0,0%	2,5%	
		Count	10	7	17	
	Strong	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	58,8%	41,2%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	50,0%	35,0%	42,5%	
		% of Total	25,0%	17,5%	42,5%	
		Count	8	13	21	
	Very strong	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	38,1%	61,9%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	40,0%	65,0%	52,5%	
		% of Total	20,0%	32,5%	52,5%	
		Count	20	20	40	
	Total	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		Count	1	0	1	
	Weak	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	8,3%	0,0%	4,2%	
		% of Total	4,2%	0,0%	4,2%	
Italy	Emotional Well-Being (%)	Moderate	Count	3	2	5



			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	60,0%	40,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	25,0%	16,7%	20,8%
			% of Total	12,5%	8,3%	20,8%
			Count	5	6	11
		Strong	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	45,5%	54,5%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	41,7%	50,0%	45,8%
			% of Total	20,8%	25,0%	45,8%
			Count	3	4	7
		Very strong	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	25,0%	33,3%	29,2%
			% of Total	12,5%	16,7%	29,2%
			Count	12	12	24
	Total		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	5	0	5
		Moderate	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	25,0%	0,0%	12,5%
			% of Total	12,5%	0,0%	12,5%
			Count	11	0	11
Lituania	Emotional Well-Being (%)	Strong	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%



Portugal	Emotional Well-Being (%)	Very strong	% within Time of measurement	55,0%	0,0%	27,5%
			% of Total	27,5%	0,0%	27,5%
			Count	4	20	24
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	16,7%	83,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	100,0%	60,0%
			% of Total	10,0%	50,0%	60,0%
		Moderate	Count	20	20	40
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	3	3	6
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Strong	% within Time of measurement	60,0%	60,0%	60,0%
			% of Total	30,0%	30,0%	60,0%
			Count	2	2	4
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	40,0%	40,0%	40,0%
			% of Total	20,0%	20,0%	40,0%
Total	Count	5	5	10		
	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		



Spain	Emotional Well-Being (%)	Moderate	Count	4	5	9
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	44,4%	55,6%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	25,0%	22,5%
		% of Total	10,0%	12,5%	22,5%	
		Strong	Count	11	8	19
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	57,9%	42,1%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement		55,0%	40,0%	47,5%	
	Total	Very strong	% of Total	27,5%	20,0%	47,5%
			Count	5	7	12
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	41,7%	58,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	25,0%	35,0%	30,0%	
		% of Total	12,5%	17,5%	30,0%	
% of Total		50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
Total	Emotional Well-Being (%)	Weak	Count	20	20	40
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	Moderate	Count	2	0	2	
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
% within Time of measurement		2,3%	0,0%	1,1%		
Total	Emotional Well-Being (%)	Moderate	% of Total	1,1%	0,0%	1,1%
			Count	16	10	26



		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	18,4%	11,5%	14,9%
		% of Total	9,2%	5,7%	14,9%
		Count	47	31	78
	Strong	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	60,3%	39,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	54,0%	35,6%	44,8%
		% of Total	27,0%	17,8%	44,8%
		Count	22	46	68
	Very strong	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	32,4%	67,6%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	25,3%	52,9%	39,1%
		% of Total	12,6%	26,4%	39,1%
		Count	87	87	174
Total		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Partner	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)



Belgium	Pearson Chi-Square	,000 ^b	1	1,000		
	Continuity Correction ^c	,000	1	1,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	,000	1	1,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1,000	,709
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000		
	N of Valid Cases	20				
Cyprus	Pearson Chi-Square	3,720 ^d	3	,293		
	Likelihood Ratio	4,507	3	,212		
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3,486	1	,062		
	N of Valid Cases	40				
Italy	Pearson Chi-Square	1,434 ^e	3	,698		
	Likelihood Ratio	1,822	3	,610		
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,958	1	,328		
	N of Valid Cases	24				
Lithuania	Pearson Chi-Square	26,667 ^f	2	,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	33,825	2	,000		
	Linear-by-Linear Association	21,526	1	,000		
	N of Valid Cases	40				
Portugal	Pearson Chi-Square	,000 ^g	1	1,000		
	Continuity Correction ^c	,000	1	1,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	,000	1	1,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1,000	,738
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000		
	N of Valid Cases	10				
Spain	Pearson Chi-Square	,918 ^h	2	,632		
	Likelihood Ratio	,922	2	,631		



	Linear-by-Linear Association	,047	1	,828	
	N of Valid Cases	40			
	Pearson Chi-Square	15,137 ^a	3	,002	
	Likelihood Ratio	16,131	3	,001	
Total	Linear-by-Linear Association	12,266	1	,000	
	N of Valid Cases	174			

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.

b. 2 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,00.

c. Computed only for a 2x2 table

d. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.

e. 6 cells (75,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.

f. 2 cells (33,3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,50.

g. 4 cells (100,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,00.

h. 2 cells (33,3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,50.

Social Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Partner

Partner			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Belgium	Social Functioning (%)	Count	0	1	1	
		Moderate	% within Social Functioning (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	0,0%	10,0%	5,0%	
		% of Total	0,0%	5,0%	5,0%	
		Strong	Count	5	5	10
		% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	





Cyprus	Social Functioning (%)	Total	% within Time of measurement	50,0%	50,0%	50,0%	
			% of Total	25,0%	25,0%	50,0%	
			Count	5	4	9	
			Very strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	55,6%	44,4%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	50,0%	40,0%	45,0%
				% of Total	25,0%	20,0%	45,0%
			Moderate	Count	10	10	20
				% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			Weak	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				Count	4	0	4
				% within Social Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			Moderate	% within Time of measurement	20,0%	0,0%	10,0%
				% of Total	10,0%	0,0%	10,0%
				Count	4	2	6
			Strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	20,0%	10,0%	15,0%
				% of Total	10,0%	5,0%	15,0%
			Very strong	Count	4	5	9
				% within Social Functioning (%)	44,4%	55,6%	100,0%
% within Time of measurement	20,0%	25,0%		22,5%			
Very strong	% of Total	10,0%	12,5%	22,5%			
	Count	8	13	21			
	% within Social Functioning (%)	38,1%	61,9%	100,0%			
Very strong	% within Time of measurement	40,0%	65,0%	52,5%			
	% of Total	20,0%	32,5%	52,5%			



Italy	Total	Count	20	20	40	
		% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	Social Functioning (%)	Moderate	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	1	1	2
			% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Strong	% within Time of measurement	8,3%	8,3%	8,3%
			% of Total	4,2%	4,2%	8,3%
			Count	6	5	11
			% within Social Functioning (%)	54,5%	45,5%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	50,0%	41,7%	45,8%
			% of Total	25,0%	20,8%	45,8%
	Very strong	Count	5	6	11	
		% within Social Functioning (%)	45,5%	54,5%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	41,7%	50,0%	45,8%	
Total	Total	% of Total	20,8%	25,0%	45,8%	
		Count	12	12	24	
		% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	Social Functioning (%)	Weak	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	3	0	3
		Moderate	% within Social Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	15,0%	0,0%	7,5%
			% of Total	7,5%	0,0%	7,5%
Total	Total	Count	9	0	9	
		% within Social Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	45,0%	0,0%	22,5%	
Lithuania	Social Functioning (%)					



Portugal	Social Functioning (%)	Total	% of Total	22,5%	0,0%	22,5%	
			Count	7	0	7	
			Strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	35,0%	0,0%	17,5%
			Very strong	% of Total	17,5%	0,0%	17,5%
				Count	1	20	21
			Very strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	4,8%	95,2%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	5,0%	100,0%	52,5%
			Total	% of Total	2,5%	50,0%	52,5%
				Count	20	20	40
			Total	% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			Weak	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				Count	1	1	2
			Weak	% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%
			Moderate	% of Total	10,0%	10,0%	20,0%
				Count	2	2	4
			Moderate	% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	40,0%	40,0%	40,0%
			Strong	% of Total	20,0%	20,0%	40,0%
Count	1	1		2			
Strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%			
	% within Time of measurement	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%			
Very strong	% of Total	10,0%	10,0%	20,0%			
	Count	1	1	2			
Very strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%			



			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%
			% of Total	10,0%	10,0%	20,0%
			Count	5	5	10
	Total		% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	4	3	7
		Weak	% within Social Functioning (%)	57,1%	42,9%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	15,0%	17,5%
			% of Total	10,0%	7,5%	17,5%
			Count	7	10	17
		Moderate	% within Social Functioning (%)	41,2%	58,8%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	35,0%	50,0%	42,5%
			% of Total	17,5%	25,0%	42,5%
			Count	6	7	13
	Social Functioning (%)		% within Social Functioning (%)	46,2%	53,8%	100,0%
		Strong	% within Time of measurement	30,0%	35,0%	32,5%
			% of Total	15,0%	17,5%	32,5%
			Count	3	0	3
		Very strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	15,0%	0,0%	7,5%
			% of Total	7,5%	0,0%	7,5%
			Count	20	20	40
	Total		% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
Total	Social Functioning (%)	Weak	Count	12	4	16



	% within Social Functioning (%)	75,0%	25,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	13,8%	4,6%	9,2%
	% of Total	6,9%	2,3%	9,2%
	Count	23	16	39
Moderate	% within Social Functioning (%)	59,0%	41,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	26,4%	18,4%	22,4%
	% of Total	13,2%	9,2%	22,4%
	Count	29	23	52
Strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	55,8%	44,2%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	33,3%	26,4%	29,9%
	% of Total	16,7%	13,2%	29,9%
	Count	23	44	67
Very strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	34,3%	65,7%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	26,4%	50,6%	38,5%
	% of Total	13,2%	25,3%	38,5%
	Count	87	87	174
Total	% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Partner	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)





Belgium	Pearson Chi-Square	1,111 ^b	2	,574
	Likelihood Ratio	1,498	2	,473
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,559	1	,455
	N of Valid Cases	20		
Cyprus	Pearson Chi-Square	5,968 ^c	3	,113
	Likelihood Ratio	7,538	3	,057
	Linear-by-Linear Association	5,251	1	,022
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Italy	Pearson Chi-Square	,182 ^d	2	,913
	Likelihood Ratio	,182	2	,913
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,100	1	,752
	N of Valid Cases	24		
Lithuania	Pearson Chi-Square	36,190 ^e	3	,000
	Likelihood Ratio	47,411	3	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	27,423	1	,000
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Portugal	Pearson Chi-Square	,000 ^f	3	1,000
	Likelihood Ratio	,000	3	1,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000
	N of Valid Cases	10		
Spain	Pearson Chi-Square	3,749 ^g	3	,290
	Likelihood Ratio	4,911	3	,178
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,549	1	,459
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	12,531 ^a	3	,006
	Likelihood Ratio	12,837	3	,005



Linear-by-Linear Association	11,329	1	,001
N of Valid Cases	174		

- a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8,00.
- b. 4 cells (66,7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.
- c. 6 cells (75,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,00.
- d. 2 cells (33,3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.
- e. 6 cells (75,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.
- f. 8 cells (100,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.
- g. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.

Pain (%) * Time of measurement * Partner

Partner			Time of measurement		Total		
			Baseline	Post-intervention			
Belgium	Pain (%)	Very strong	Count	10	10	20	
			% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total			50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	Total			Count	10	10	20
				% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total			50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	Cyprus	Pain (%)	Weak	Count	1	0	1
% within Pain (%)				100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
% within Time of measurement				5,0%	0,0%	2,5%	



		% of Total	2,5%	0,0%	2,5%
		Count	1	1	2
	Moderate	% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	5,0%	5,0%	5,0%
		% of Total	2,5%	2,5%	5,0%
		Count	0	1	1
	Strong	% within Pain (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	0,0%	5,0%	2,5%
		% of Total	0,0%	2,5%	2,5%
		Count	18	18	36
	Very strong	% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	90,0%	90,0%	90,0%
		% of Total	45,0%	45,0%	90,0%
		Count	20	20	40
	Total	% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	3	3	6
	Moderate	% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	25,0%	25,0%	25,0%
		% of Total	12,5%	12,5%	25,0%
Italy	Pain (%)	Count	0	3	3
	Strong	% within Pain (%)	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	0,0%	25,0%	12,5%
		% of Total	0,0%	12,5%	12,5%
	Very strong	Count	9	6	15
		% within Pain (%)	60,0%	40,0%	100,0%



			% within Time of measurement	75,0%	50,0%	62,5%
			% of Total	37,5%	25,0%	62,5%
			Count	12	12	24
	Total		% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	2	0	2
		Weak	% within Pain (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	10,0%	0,0%	5,0%
			% of Total	5,0%	0,0%	5,0%
			Count	9	0	9
		Moderate	% within Pain (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	45,0%	0,0%	22,5%
			% of Total	22,5%	0,0%	22,5%
	Pain (%)		Count	6	0	6
		Strong	% within Pain (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	30,0%	0,0%	15,0%
			% of Total	15,0%	0,0%	15,0%
			Count	3	20	23
		Very strong	% within Pain (%)	13,0%	87,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	15,0%	100,0%	57,5%
			% of Total	7,5%	50,0%	57,5%
			Count	20	20	40
	Total		% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
Lituania						
	Pain (%)	Weak	Count	1	1	2
Portugal						



Spain	Pain (%)	Moderate	% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%
			% of Total	10,0%	10,0%	20,0%
			Count	2	1	3
		Strong	% within Pain (%)	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	40,0%	20,0%	30,0%
			% of Total	20,0%	10,0%	30,0%
			Count	1	3	4
		Very strong	% within Pain (%)	25,0%	75,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	60,0%	40,0%
			% of Total	10,0%	30,0%	40,0%
			Count	1	0	1
		Total	% within Pain (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	0,0%	10,0%
			% of Total	10,0%	0,0%	10,0%
			Count	5	5	10
		Weak	% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	3	4	7
Moderate	% within Pain (%)	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	15,0%	20,0%	17,5%		
	% of Total	7,5%	10,0%	17,5%		
	Count	7	10	17		
	% within Pain (%)	41,2%	58,8%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	35,0%	50,0%	42,5%		
	% of Total	17,5%	25,0%	42,5%		



Total	Pain (%)	Strong	Count	6	3	9
			% within Pain (%)	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	30,0%	15,0%	22,5%
		% of Total	15,0%	7,5%	22,5%	
		Very strong	Count	4	3	7
			% within Pain (%)	57,1%	42,9%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	15,0%	17,5%
		% of Total	10,0%	7,5%	17,5%	
		Total	Count	20	20	40
	% within Pain (%)		50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement		100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	Weak	Count	7	5	12	
		% within Pain (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	8,0%	5,7%	6,9%	
% of Total	4,0%	2,9%	6,9%			
Moderate	Count	22	15	37		
	% within Pain (%)	59,5%	40,5%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	25,3%	17,2%	21,3%		
% of Total	12,6%	8,6%	21,3%			
Strong	Count	13	10	23		
	% within Pain (%)	56,5%	43,5%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	14,9%	11,5%	13,2%		
% of Total	7,5%	5,7%	13,2%			
Very strong	Count	45	57	102		



	% within Pain (%)	44,1%	55,9%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	51,7%	65,5%	58,6%
	% of Total	25,9%	32,8%	58,6%
	Count	87	87	174
Total	% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Partner		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Belgium	Pearson Chi-Square	. ^b		
	N of Valid Cases	20		
Cyprus	Pearson Chi-Square	2,000 ^c	3	,572
	Likelihood Ratio	2,773	3	,428
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,238	1	,626
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Italy	Pearson Chi-Square	3,600 ^d	2	,165
	Likelihood Ratio	4,763	2	,092
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,489	1	,484
	N of Valid Cases	24		
Lithuania	Pearson Chi-Square	29,565 ^e	3	,000
	Likelihood Ratio	37,640	3	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	23,400	1	,000



Portugal	N of Valid Cases	40		
	Pearson Chi-Square	2,333 ^f	3	,506
	Likelihood Ratio	2,773	3	,428
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000
Spain	N of Valid Cases	10		
	Pearson Chi-Square	1,815 ^g	3	,612
	Likelihood Ratio	1,838	3	,607
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,934	1	,334
Total	N of Valid Cases	40		
	Pearson Chi-Square	3,461 ^a	3	,326
	Likelihood Ratio	3,475	3	,324
	Linear-by-Linear Association	2,966	1	,085
	N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,00.

b. No statistics are computed because Pain (%) is a constant.

c. 6 cells (75,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.

d. 4 cells (66,7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.

e. 6 cells (75,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.

f. 8 cells (100,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.

g. 6 cells (75,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3,50.

Patients and caregivers combined (continued)

Case Processing Summary





	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EPIC Ordinal * Time of measurement	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Physical Functioning (%) * Time of measurement	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%) * Time of measurement	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%) * Time of measurement	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Energy / Fatigue (%) * Time of measurement	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Emotional Well-Being (%) * Time of measurement	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Social Functioning (%) * Time of measurement	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Pain (%) * Time of measurement	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%

EPIC Ordinal * Time of measurement

	Time of measurement	Total
--	---------------------	-------





		Baseline	Post-intervention		
EPIC Ordinal	Moderate Burden	Count	31	36	67
		% within EPIC Ordinal	46,3%	53,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	35,6%	41,4%	38,5%
		% of Total	17,8%	20,7%	38,5%
	High Burden	Count	7	2	9
		% within EPIC Ordinal	77,8%	22,2%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	8,0%	2,3%	5,2%
		% of Total	4,0%	1,1%	5,2%
	4	Count	49	49	98
% within EPIC Ordinal		50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
% within Time of measurement		56,3%	56,3%	56,3%	
	% of Total	28,2%	28,2%	56,3%	
Total	Count	87	87	174	
	% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3,151 ^a	2	,207
Likelihood Ratio	3,315	2	,191
Linear-by-Linear Association	,068	1	,794




N of Valid Cases	174
------------------	-----

a. 2 cells (33,3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,50.

EPIC did not significantly improve after the 24 week intervention.





Physical Functioning (%) * Time of measurement

	Time of measurement	Total





			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Physical Functioning (%)	Weak	Count	23	12	35
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	65,7%	34,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	26,4%	13,8%	20,1%
		% of Total	13,2%	6,9%	20,1%
	Moderate	Count	12	14	26
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	46,2%	53,8%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	13,8%	16,1%	14,9%
		% of Total	6,9%	8,0%	14,9%
	Strong	Count	21	15	36
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	24,1%	17,2%	20,7%
		% of Total	12,1%	8,6%	20,7%
Very strong	Count	31	46	77	
	% within Physical Functioning (%)	40,3%	59,7%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	35,6%	52,9%	44,3%	
	% of Total	17,8%	26,4%	44,3%	
Total	Count	87	87	174	
	% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	




% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7,533 ^a	3	,057
Likelihood Ratio	7,616	3	,055
Linear-by-Linear Association	5,055	1	,025
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13,00.

Physical Functioning did not significantly improve after the 24 week intervention.



Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%) * Time of measurement

Time of measurement	Total





			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	Weak	Count	38	17	55
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	69,1%	30,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	43,7%	19,5%	31,6%
		% of Total	21,8%	9,8%	31,6%
	Moderate	Count	8	11	19
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	42,1%	57,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	9,2%	12,6%	10,9%
		% of Total	4,6%	6,3%	10,9%
	Strong	Count	6	13	19
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	31,6%	68,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	6,9%	14,9%	10,9%
		% of Total	3,4%	7,5%	10,9%
Very strong	Count	35	46	81	
	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	43,2%	56,8%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	40,2%	52,9%	46,6%	
	% of Total	20,1%	26,4%	46,6%	
Total	Count	87	87	174	
	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	




% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12,565 ^a	3	,006
Likelihood Ratio	12,840	3	,005
Linear-by-Linear Association	8,103	1	,004
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9,50.

Role limitations due to physical health significantly improved after the 24 week intervention.



Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%) * Time of measurement

Time of measurement	Total
---------------------	-------





			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	Weak	Count	28	6	34
		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	82,4%	17,6%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	32,2%	6,9%	19,5%
		% of Total	16,1%	3,4%	19,5%
	Moderate	Count	9	11	20
		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	45,0%	55,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,3%	12,6%	11,5%
		% of Total	5,2%	6,3%	11,5%
	Strong	Count	11	15	26
		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	42,3%	57,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	12,6%	17,2%	14,9%
		% of Total	6,3%	8,6%	14,9%
Very strong	Count	39	55	94	
	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	41,5%	58,5%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	44,8%	63,2%	54,0%	
	% of Total	22,4%	31,6%	54,0%	
Total	Count	87	87	174	
	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	



% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17,774 ^a	3	,000
Likelihood Ratio	19,001	3	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	13,390	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10,00.

Role limitations due to emotional problems significantly improved after the 24 week intervention.

Energy / Fatigue (%) * Time of measurement

			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
	Count		9	3	12
Energy / Fatigue (%)	Weak	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	75,0%	25,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,3%	3,4%	6,9%





	% of Total	5,2%	1,7%	6,9%
	Count	32	19	51
Moderate	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	62,7%	37,3%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	36,8%	21,8%	29,3%
	% of Total	18,4%	10,9%	29,3%
	Count	35	30	65
Strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	53,8%	46,2%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	40,2%	34,5%	37,4%
	% of Total	20,1%	17,2%	37,4%
	Count	11	35	46
Very strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	23,9%	76,1%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	12,6%	40,2%	26,4%
	% of Total	6,3%	20,1%	26,4%
	Count	87	87	174
Total	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19,220 ^a	3	,000
Likelihood Ratio	20,038	3	,000






Linear-by-Linear Association	17,031	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,00.

Energy/Fatigue significantly improved after the 24 week intervention.





Emotional Well-Being (%) * Time of measurement

Time of measurement	Total
---------------------	-------





			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Emotional Well-Being (%)	Weak	Count	2	0	2
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	2,3%	0,0%	1,1%
		% of Total	1,1%	0,0%	1,1%
	Moderate	Count	16	10	26
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	18,4%	11,5%	14,9%
		% of Total	9,2%	5,7%	14,9%
	Strong	Count	47	31	78
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	60,3%	39,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	54,0%	35,6%	44,8%
		% of Total	27,0%	17,8%	44,8%
Very strong	Count	22	46	68	
	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	32,4%	67,6%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	25,3%	52,9%	39,1%	
	% of Total	12,6%	26,4%	39,1%	
Total	Count	87	87	174	
	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	




% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15,137 ^a	3	,002
Likelihood Ratio	16,131	3	,001
Linear-by-Linear Association	12,266	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.

Emotional Well-Being significantly improved after the 24 week intervention.



Social Functioning (%) * Time of measurement

Time of measurement	Total
---------------------	-------





			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Social Functioning (%)	Weak	Count	12	4	16
		% within Social Functioning (%)	75,0%	25,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	13,8%	4,6%	9,2%
		% of Total	6,9%	2,3%	9,2%
	Moderate	Count	23	16	39
		% within Social Functioning (%)	59,0%	41,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	26,4%	18,4%	22,4%
		% of Total	13,2%	9,2%	22,4%
	Strong	Count	29	23	52
		% within Social Functioning (%)	55,8%	44,2%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	33,3%	26,4%	29,9%
		% of Total	16,7%	13,2%	29,9%
Very strong	Count	23	44	67	
	% within Social Functioning (%)	34,3%	65,7%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	26,4%	50,6%	38,5%	
	% of Total	13,2%	25,3%	38,5%	
Total	Count	87	87	174	
	% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	

Chi-Square Tests






	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12,531 ^a	3	,006
Likelihood Ratio	12,837	3	,005
Linear-by-Linear Association	11,329	1	,001
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8,00.

Social functioning significantly improved after the 24 week intervention.





Pain (%) * Time of measurement

	Time of measurement	Total
--	---------------------	-------





		Baseline	Post-intervention		
Pain (%)	Weak	Count	7	5	12
		% within Pain (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	8,0%	5,7%	6,9%
		% of Total	4,0%	2,9%	6,9%
	Moderate	Count	22	15	37
		% within Pain (%)	59,5%	40,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	25,3%	17,2%	21,3%
		% of Total	12,6%	8,6%	21,3%
	Strong	Count	13	10	23
		% within Pain (%)	56,5%	43,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	14,9%	11,5%	13,2%
		% of Total	7,5%	5,7%	13,2%
Very strong	Count	45	57	102	
	% within Pain (%)	44,1%	55,9%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	51,7%	65,5%	58,6%	
	% of Total	25,9%	32,8%	58,6%	
Total	Count	87	87	174	
	% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	

Chi-Square Tests






	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3,461 ^a	3	,326
Likelihood Ratio	3,475	3	,324
Linear-by-Linear Association	2,966	1	,085
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,00.

Pain did not significantly improve after the 24 week intervention.







Patients separated

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EPIC Ordinal * Time of measurement * Patient	98	56,3%	76	43,7%	174	100,0%
Physical Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Patient	98	56,3%	76	43,7%	174	100,0%
Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%) * Time of measurement * Patient	98	56,3%	76	43,7%	174	100,0%
Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%) * Time of measurement * Patient	98	56,3%	76	43,7%	174	100,0%
Energy / Fatigue (%) * Time of measurement * Patient	98	56,3%	76	43,7%	174	100,0%
Emotional Well-Being (%) * Time of measurement * Patient	98	56,3%	76	43,7%	174	100,0%
Social Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Patient	98	56,3%	76	43,7%	174	100,0%
Pain (%) * Time of measurement * Patient	98	56,3%	76	43,7%	174	100,0%

Physical Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Patient





Patient			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Patient	Physical Functioning (%)	Count	20	12	32	
		Weak	% within Physical Functioning (%)	62,5%	37,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	40,8%	24,5%	32,7%	
		% of Total	20,4%	12,2%	32,7%	
	Moderate	Count	10	14	24	
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	41,7%	58,3%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	20,4%	28,6%	24,5%	
		% of Total	10,2%	14,3%	24,5%	
	Strong	Count	13	10	23	
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	56,5%	43,5%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	26,5%	20,4%	23,5%	
		% of Total	13,3%	10,2%	23,5%	
Very strong	Count	6	13	19		
	% within Physical Functioning (%)	31,6%	68,4%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	12,2%	26,5%	19,4%		
	% of Total	6,1%	13,3%	19,4%		
Total	Count	49	49	98		



Total	Physical Functioning (%)		% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			Count	20	12	32	
		Weak		% within Physical Functioning (%)	62,5%	37,5%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	40,8%	24,5%	32,7%
				% of Total	20,4%	12,2%	32,7%
				Count	10	14	24
		Moderate		% within Physical Functioning (%)	41,7%	58,3%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	20,4%	28,6%	24,5%
				% of Total	10,2%	14,3%	24,5%
				Count	13	10	23
		Strong		% within Physical Functioning (%)	56,5%	43,5%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	26,5%	20,4%	23,5%
				% of Total	13,3%	10,2%	23,5%
				Count	6	13	19
		Very strong		% within Physical Functioning (%)	31,6%	68,4%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	12,2%	26,5%	19,4%
				% of Total	6,1%	13,3%	19,4%




Total	Count	49	49	98
	% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	5,637 ^a	3	,131
	Likelihood Ratio	5,724	3	,126
	Linear-by-Linear Association	2,919	1	,088
	N of Valid Cases	98		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	5,637 ^a	3	,131
	Likelihood Ratio	5,724	3	,126
	Linear-by-Linear Association	2,919	1	,088
	N of Valid Cases	98		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9,50.

Physical Functioning did not significantly improve after the 24 week intervention.



Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%) * Time of measurement * Patient





Patient			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Patient Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	Weak	Count	27	11	38
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	71,1%	28,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	55,1%	22,4%	38,8%
		% of Total	27,6%	11,2%	38,8%
	Moderate	Count	4	10	14
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	28,6%	71,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	8,2%	20,4%	14,3%
		% of Total	4,1%	10,2%	14,3%
	Strong	Count	3	4	7
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	6,1%	8,2%	7,1%
		% of Total	3,1%	4,1%	7,1%
	Very strong	Count	15	24	39
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	38,5%	61,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	30,6%	49,0%	39,8%
% of Total		15,3%	24,5%	39,8%	
Total	Count	49	49	98	



Total	Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	27	11	38
		Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	71,1%	28,9%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	55,1%	22,4%	38,8%
			% of Total	27,6%	11,2%	38,8%
			Count	4	10	14
		Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	28,6%	71,4%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	8,2%	20,4%	14,3%
			% of Total	4,1%	10,2%	14,3%
			Count	3	4	7
		Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	6,1%	8,2%	7,1%
			% of Total	3,1%	4,1%	7,1%
			Count	15	24	39
Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	38,5%	61,5%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	30,6%	49,0%	39,8%		
	% of Total	15,3%	24,5%	39,8%		




	Count	49	49	98
Total	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	11,528 ^a	3	,009
	Likelihood Ratio	11,847	3	,008
	Linear-by-Linear Association	6,794	1	,009
	N of Valid Cases	98		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	11,528 ^a	3	,009
	Likelihood Ratio	11,847	3	,008
	Linear-by-Linear Association	6,794	1	,009
	N of Valid Cases	98		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3,50.

Role Limitations due to physical health significantly improved after the 24 week intervention.



Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%) * Time of measurement * Patient

Patient	Time of measurement	Total
---------	---------------------	-------





			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Patient	Weak	Count	20	3	23
		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	87,0%	13,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	40,8%	6,1%	23,5%
	Moderate	% of Total	20,4%	3,1%	23,5%
		Count	4	8	12
		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%
	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	% within Time of measurement	8,2%	16,3%	12,2%
		% of Total	4,1%	8,2%	12,2%
		Count	5	7	12
	Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	41,7%	58,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,2%	14,3%	12,2%
		% of Total	5,1%	7,1%	12,2%
	Very strong	Count	20	31	51
		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	39,2%	60,8%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	40,8%	63,3%	52,0%
Total	% of Total	20,4%	31,6%	52,0%	
	Count	49	49	98	
	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	



		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	20	3	23
	Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	87,0%	13,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	40,8%	6,1%	23,5%
		% of Total	20,4%	3,1%	23,5%
		Count	4	8	12
	Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	8,2%	16,3%	12,2%
Total	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	% of Total	4,1%	8,2%	12,2%
		Count	5	7	12
	Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	41,7%	58,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,2%	14,3%	12,2%
		% of Total	5,1%	7,1%	12,2%
		Count	20	31	51
	Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	39,2%	60,8%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	40,8%	63,3%	52,0%
		% of Total	20,4%	31,6%	52,0%
	Total	Count	49	49	98




	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	16,604 ^a	3	,001
	Likelihood Ratio	18,158	3	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	10,769	1	,001
	N of Valid Cases	98		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	16,604 ^a	3	,001
	Likelihood Ratio	18,158	3	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	10,769	1	,001
	N of Valid Cases	98		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,00.

Role Limitations due to emotional problems significantly improved after the 24 week intervention.



Energy / Fatigue (%) * Time of measurement * Patient





Patient			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Patient	Weak	Count	4	1	5	
		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	80,0%	20,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	8,2%	2,0%	5,1%	
		% of Total	4,1%	1,0%	5,1%	
	Moderate	Count	20	12	32	
		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	62,5%	37,5%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	40,8%	24,5%	32,7%	
		% of Total	20,4%	12,2%	32,7%	
	Strong	Count	20	21	41	
		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	48,8%	51,2%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	40,8%	42,9%	41,8%	
		% of Total	20,4%	21,4%	41,8%	
	Very strong	Count	5	15	20	
		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	25,0%	75,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	10,2%	30,6%	20,4%	
	% of Total	5,1%	15,3%	20,4%		
Total	Count	49	49	98		
	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
Total	Energy / Fatigue (%)	Weak	Count	4	1	5
			% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	80,0%	20,0%	100,0%





		% within Time of measurement	8,2%	2,0%	5,1%
		% of Total	4,1%	1,0%	5,1%
		Count	20	12	32
	Moderate	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	62,5%	37,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	40,8%	24,5%	32,7%
		% of Total	20,4%	12,2%	32,7%
		Count	20	21	41
	Strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	48,8%	51,2%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	40,8%	42,9%	41,8%
		% of Total	20,4%	21,4%	41,8%
		Count	5	15	20
	Very strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	25,0%	75,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,2%	30,6%	20,4%
		% of Total	5,1%	15,3%	20,4%
		Count	49	49	98
Total		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	8,824 ^a	3	,032






	Likelihood Ratio	9,206	3	,027
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,502	1	,004
	N of Valid Cases	98		
	Pearson Chi-Square	8,824 ^a	3	,032
Total	Likelihood Ratio	9,206	3	,027
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,502	1	,004
	N of Valid Cases	98		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,50.

Role Limitations due to emotional problems significantly improved after the 24 week intervention.





Emotional Well-Being (%) * Time of measurement * Patient

Patient	Time of measurement	Total
---------	---------------------	-------





			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Patient	Weak	Count	1	0	1
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	2,0%	0,0%	1,0%
		% of Total	1,0%	0,0%	1,0%
	Moderate	Count	8	5	13
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	16,3%	10,2%	13,3%
		% of Total	8,2%	5,1%	13,3%
	Strong	Count	31	26	57
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	54,4%	45,6%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	63,3%	53,1%	58,2%
		% of Total	31,6%	26,5%	58,2%
	Very strong	Count	9	18	27
		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	18,4%	36,7%	27,6%
% of Total		9,2%	18,4%	27,6%	
Total	Count	49	49	98	
	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	



Total	Emotional Well-Being (%)	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		Count	1	0	1	
		Weak	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	2,0%	0,0%	1,0%
			% of Total	1,0%	0,0%	1,0%
		Moderate	Count	8	5	13
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	16,3%	10,2%	13,3%
		Strong	% of Total	8,2%	5,1%	13,3%
			Count	31	26	57
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	54,4%	45,6%	100,0%
		Very strong	% within Time of measurement	63,3%	53,1%	58,2%
			% of Total	31,6%	26,5%	58,2%
			Count	9	18	27
Total	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	18,4%	36,7%	27,6%		
	% of Total	9,2%	18,4%	27,6%		
	Count	49	49	98		




	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	5,131 ^a	3	,162
	Likelihood Ratio	5,582	3	,134
	Linear-by-Linear Association	4,561	1	,033
	N of Valid Cases	98		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	5,131 ^a	3	,162
	Likelihood Ratio	5,582	3	,134
	Linear-by-Linear Association	4,561	1	,033
	N of Valid Cases	98		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.

Emotional Well-being did not significantly improve after the 24 week intervention.



Social Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Patient





Patient			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Patient	Social Functioning (%)	Count	10	3	13	
		Weak	% within Social Functioning (%)	76,9%	23,1%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,4%	6,1%	13,3%
			% of Total	10,2%	3,1%	13,3%
		Moderate	Count	14	10	24
			% within Social Functioning (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	28,6%	20,4%	24,5%
		Strong	% of Total	14,3%	10,2%	24,5%
			Count	15	15	30
	% within Social Functioning (%)		50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	Very strong	% within Time of measurement	30,6%	30,6%	30,6%	
		% of Total	15,3%	15,3%	30,6%	
		Count	10	21	31	
	Total	Total	% within Social Functioning (%)	32,3%	67,7%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,4%	42,9%	31,6%
% of Total			10,2%	21,4%	31,6%	
Total	Total	Count	49	49	98	
		% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
Total	Total	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		Count	10	3	13	
		% within Social Functioning (%)	76,9%	23,1%	100,0%	



		% within Time of measurement	20,4%	6,1%	13,3%
		% of Total	10,2%	3,1%	13,3%
		Count	14	10	24
	Moderate	% within Social Functioning (%)	58,3%	41,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	28,6%	20,4%	24,5%
		% of Total	14,3%	10,2%	24,5%
		Count	15	15	30
	Strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	30,6%	30,6%	30,6%
		% of Total	15,3%	15,3%	30,6%
		Count	10	21	31
	Very strong	% within Social Functioning (%)	32,3%	67,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	20,4%	42,9%	31,6%
		% of Total	10,2%	21,4%	31,6%
		Count	49	49	98
Total		% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	8,339 ^a	3	,039






	Likelihood Ratio	8,636	3	,035
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,057	1	,005
	N of Valid Cases	98		
	Pearson Chi-Square	8,339 ^a	3	,039
Total	Likelihood Ratio	8,636	3	,035
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,057	1	,005
	N of Valid Cases	98		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6,50.

Social functioning significantly improved after the 24 week intervention.



Pain (%) * Time of measurement * Patient

Patient	Time of measurement	Total
---------	---------------------	-------





			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Patient	Weak	Count	5	4	9
		% within Pain (%)	55,6%	44,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,2%	8,2%	9,2%
	Moderate	% of Total	5,1%	4,1%	9,2%
		Count	14	8	22
		% within Pain (%)	63,6%	36,4%	100,0%
	Pain (%)	% within Time of measurement	28,6%	16,3%	22,4%
		% of Total	14,3%	8,2%	22,4%
		Count	4	6	10
	Strong	% within Pain (%)	40,0%	60,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	8,2%	12,2%	10,2%
		% of Total	4,1%	6,1%	10,2%
	Very strong	Count	26	31	57
		% within Pain (%)	45,6%	54,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	53,1%	63,3%	58,2%
	Total	% of Total	26,5%	31,6%	58,2%
Count		49	49	98	
% within Pain (%)		50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
Total	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
	Count	5	4	9	
Total	Pain (%)	Weak	55,6%	44,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,2%	8,2%	9,2%



		% of Total	5,1%	4,1%	9,2%
		Count	14	8	22
	Moderate	% within Pain (%)	63,6%	36,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	28,6%	16,3%	22,4%
		% of Total	14,3%	8,2%	22,4%
		Count	4	6	10
	Strong	% within Pain (%)	40,0%	60,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	8,2%	12,2%	10,2%
		% of Total	4,1%	6,1%	10,2%
		Count	26	31	57
	Very strong	% within Pain (%)	45,6%	54,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	53,1%	63,3%	58,2%
		% of Total	26,5%	31,6%	58,2%
		Count	49	49	98
Total		% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	2,586 ^a	3	,460
Patient	Likelihood Ratio	2,610	3	,456





	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,493	1	,222
	N of Valid Cases	98		
	Pearson Chi-Square	2,586 ^a	3	,460
	Likelihood Ratio	2,610	3	,456
Total	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,493	1	,222
	N of Valid Cases	98		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,50.



Caregivers separated

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EPIC Ordinal * Time of measurement * Caregiver Physical Functioning (%) *	76	43,7%	98	56,3%	174	100,0%
Time of measurement * Caregiver Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver Energy / Fatigue (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver Emotional Well-Being (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver Social Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver	76	43,7%	98	56,3%	174	100,0%



Pain (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver	76	43,7%	98	56,3%	174	100,0%
--	----	-------	----	-------	-----	--------

EPIC * Time of measurement * Patient

Caregiver			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Caregiver	EPIC Ordinal	Moderate Burden	Count	31	36	67
		% within EPIC Ordinal	46,3%	53,7%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	81,6%	94,7%	88,2%	
		% of Total	40,8%	47,4%	88,2%	
		Count	7	2	9	
		% within EPIC Ordinal	77,8%	22,2%	100,0%	
	Total	High Burden	% within Time of measurement	18,4%	5,3%	11,8%
			% of Total	9,2%	2,6%	11,8%
			Count	38	38	76
	Total	EPIC Ordinal	% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
Count			31	36	67	
% within EPIC Ordinal			46,3%	53,7%	100,0%	
% within Time of measurement			81,6%	94,7%	88,2%	
Total	High Burden	% of Total	40,8%	47,4%	88,2%	
		Count	7	2	9	




	% within EPIC Ordinal	77,8%	22,2%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	18,4%	5,3%	11,8%
	% of Total	9,2%	2,6%	11,8%
	Count	38	38	76
Total	% within EPIC Ordinal	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Caregiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	3,151 ^a	1	,076		
	Continuity Correction ^b	2,017	1	,156		
	Likelihood Ratio	3,315	1	,069		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,153	,076
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3,109	1	,078		
	N of Valid Cases	76				
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	3,151 ^a	1	,076		
	Continuity Correction ^b	2,017	1	,156		
	Likelihood Ratio	3,315	1	,069		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,153	,076
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3,109	1	,078		
	N of Valid Cases	76				



- a. 2 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,50.
- b. Computed only for a 2x2 table





Physical Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver

Caregiver			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Caregiver	Physical Functioning (%)	Count	3	0	3	
		Weak	% within Physical Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	7,9%	0,0%	3,9%
			% of Total	3,9%	0,0%	3,9%
			Count	2	0	2
		Moderate	% within Physical Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	5,3%	0,0%	2,6%
			% of Total	2,6%	0,0%	2,6%
			Count	8	5	13
		Strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	21,1%	13,2%	17,1%
			% of Total	10,5%	6,6%	17,1%
Count	25		33	58		
Very strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	43,1%	56,9%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	65,8%	86,8%	76,3%		
	% of Total	32,9%	43,4%	76,3%		



Total	Total	Count	38	38	76	
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
	Physical Functioning (%)	Weak	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	3	0	3
			% within Physical Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		Moderate	% within Time of measurement	7,9%	0,0%	3,9%
			% of Total	3,9%	0,0%	3,9%
			Count	2	0	2
		Strong	% within Physical Functioning (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	5,3%	0,0%	2,6%
			% of Total	2,6%	0,0%	2,6%
	Very strong	Count	8	5	13	
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	21,1%	13,2%	17,1%	
		% of Total	10,5%	6,6%	17,1%	
		Count	25	33	58	
		% within Physical Functioning (%)	43,1%	56,9%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	65,8%	86,8%	76,3%	




Total	% of Total	32,9%	43,4%	76,3%
	Count	38	38	76
	% within Physical Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Caregiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	6,796 ^a	3	,079
	Likelihood Ratio	8,737	3	,033
	Linear-by-Linear Association	6,460	1	,011
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	6,796 ^a	3	,079
	Likelihood Ratio	8,737	3	,033
	Linear-by-Linear Association	6,460	1	,011
	N of Valid Cases	76		

a. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.



Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver

Caregiver	Time of measurement	Total
-----------	---------------------	-------





			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Caregiver	Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	Count	11	6	17	
		Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	64,7%	35,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	28,9%	15,8%	22,4%
			% of Total	14,5%	7,9%	22,4%
		Moderate	Count	4	1	5
			% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	80,0%	20,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	10,5%	2,6%	6,6%
			% of Total	5,3%	1,3%	6,6%
		Strong	Count	3	9	12
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	25,0%	75,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	7,9%	23,7%	15,8%	
		% of Total	3,9%	11,8%	15,8%	
	Very strong	Count	20	22	42	
		% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	47,6%	52,4%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	52,6%	57,9%	55,3%	
	% of Total	26,3%	28,9%	55,3%		
Total	Count	38	38	76		
	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		



		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	11	6	17
	Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	64,7%	35,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	28,9%	15,8%	22,4%
		% of Total	14,5%	7,9%	22,4%
		Count	4	1	5
	Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	80,0%	20,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,5%	2,6%	6,6%
Total	Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	% of Total	5,3%	1,3%	6,6%
		Count	3	9	12
	Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	25,0%	75,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	7,9%	23,7%	15,8%
		% of Total	3,9%	11,8%	15,8%
		Count	20	22	42
	Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	47,6%	52,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	52,6%	57,9%	55,3%
		% of Total	26,3%	28,9%	55,3%
	Total	Count	38	38	76




% within Role Limitations due to Physical Health (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Caregiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	6,366 ^a	3	,095
	Likelihood Ratio	6,655	3	,084
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,933	1	,164
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	6,366 ^a	3	,095
	Likelihood Ratio	6,655	3	,084
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,933	1	,164
	N of Valid Cases	76		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,50.



Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver

Caregiver	Time of measurement	Total
-----------	---------------------	-------





			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Caregiver	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	Count	8	3	11	
		Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	72,7%	27,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	21,1%	7,9%	14,5%
			% of Total	10,5%	3,9%	14,5%
			Count	5	3	8
		Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	62,5%	37,5%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	13,2%	7,9%	10,5%
			% of Total	6,6%	3,9%	10,5%
			Count	6	8	14
	Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	15,8%	21,1%	18,4%	
		% of Total	7,9%	10,5%	18,4%	
		Count	19	24	43	
	Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	44,2%	55,8%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	50,0%	63,2%	56,6%	
	% of Total	25,0%	31,6%	56,6%		
Total		Count	38	38	76	
		% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	



		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	8	3	11
	Weak	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	72,7%	27,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	21,1%	7,9%	14,5%
		% of Total	10,5%	3,9%	14,5%
		Count	5	3	8
	Moderate	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	62,5%	37,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	13,2%	7,9%	10,5%
Total	Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	% of Total	6,6%	3,9%	10,5%
		Count	6	8	14
	Strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	15,8%	21,1%	18,4%
		% of Total	7,9%	10,5%	18,4%
		Count	19	24	43
	Very strong	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	44,2%	55,8%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	50,0%	63,2%	56,6%
		% of Total	25,0%	31,6%	56,6%
	Total	Count	38	38	76




	% within Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Caregiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	3,640 ^a	3	,303
	Likelihood Ratio	3,733	3	,292
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3,074	1	,080
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	3,640 ^a	3	,303
	Likelihood Ratio	3,733	3	,292
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3,074	1	,080
	N of Valid Cases	76		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,00.



Energy / Fatigue (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver

Caregiver	Time of measurement	Total
-----------	---------------------	-------





			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Caregiver	Energy / Fatigue (%)	Weak	Count	5	2	7
			% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	71,4%	28,6%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	13,2%	5,3%	9,2%
		% of Total	6,6%	2,6%	9,2%	
		Moderate	Count	12	7	19
			% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	63,2%	36,8%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	31,6%	18,4%	25,0%
		% of Total	15,8%	9,2%	25,0%	
		Strong	Count	15	9	24
	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)		62,5%	37,5%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement		39,5%	23,7%	31,6%	
	% of Total	19,7%	11,8%	31,6%		
	Very strong	Count	6	20	26	
		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	23,1%	76,9%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	15,8%	52,6%	34,2%	
% of Total	7,9%	26,3%	34,2%			
Total	Count	38	38	76		
	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%			
Total	Energy / Fatigue (%)	Weak	Count	5	2	7
			% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	71,4%	28,6%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	13,2%	5,3%	9,2%



		% of Total	6,6%	2,6%	9,2%
		Count	12	7	19
	Moderate	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	63,2%	36,8%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	31,6%	18,4%	25,0%
		% of Total	15,8%	9,2%	25,0%
		Count	15	9	24
	Strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	62,5%	37,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	39,5%	23,7%	31,6%
		% of Total	19,7%	11,8%	31,6%
		Count	6	20	26
	Very strong	% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	23,1%	76,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	15,8%	52,6%	34,2%
		% of Total	7,9%	26,3%	34,2%
		Count	38	38	76
Total		% within Energy / Fatigue (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests


Caregiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	11,640 ^a	3	,009
	Likelihood Ratio	12,129	3	,007





Total	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,524	1	,004
	N of Valid Cases	76		
	Pearson Chi-Square	11,640 ^a	3	,009
	Likelihood Ratio	12,129	3	,007
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,524	1	,004
	N of Valid Cases	76		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3,50.



Emotional Well-Being (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver





Caregiver			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Caregiver	Emotional Well-Being (%)	Count	1	0	1	
		Weak	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	2,6%	0,0%	1,3%
			% of Total	1,3%	0,0%	1,3%
		Moderate	Count	8	5	13
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	21,1%	13,2%	17,1%
		Strong	% of Total	10,5%	6,6%	17,1%
			Count	16	5	21
			% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	76,2%	23,8%	100,0%
		Very strong	% within Time of measurement	42,1%	13,2%	27,6%
			% of Total	21,1%	6,6%	27,6%
			Count	13	28	41
		Total	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	31,7%	68,3%	100,0%
% within Time of measurement	34,2%		73,7%	53,9%		
% of Total	17,1%		36,8%	53,9%		
Total		Count	38	38	76	



Total	Emotional Well-Being (%)		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			Count	1	0	1	
		Weak		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	2,6%	0,0%	1,3%
				% of Total	1,3%	0,0%	1,3%
				Count	8	5	13
		Moderate		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	21,1%	13,2%	17,1%
				% of Total	10,5%	6,6%	17,1%
				Count	16	5	21
		Strong		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	76,2%	23,8%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	42,1%	13,2%	27,6%
				% of Total	21,1%	6,6%	27,6%
				Count	13	28	41
Very strong		% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	31,7%	68,3%	100,0%		
		% within Time of measurement	34,2%	73,7%	53,9%		
		% of Total	17,1%	36,8%	53,9%		




Total	Count	38	38	76
	% within Emotional Well-Being (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Caregiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	12,942 ^a	3	,005
	Likelihood Ratio	13,762	3	,003
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,039	1	,005
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	12,942 ^a	3	,005
	Likelihood Ratio	13,762	3	,003
	Linear-by-Linear Association	8,039	1	,005
	N of Valid Cases	76		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.



Social Functioning (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver

Caregiver	Time of measurement	Total
-----------	---------------------	-------





			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Caregiver	Social Functioning (%)	Count	2	1	3	
		Weak	% within Social Functioning (%)	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	5,3%	2,6%	3,9%
			% of Total	2,6%	1,3%	3,9%
		Moderate	Count	9	6	15
			% within Social Functioning (%)	60,0%	40,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	23,7%	15,8%	19,7%
		Strong	% of Total	11,8%	7,9%	19,7%
			Count	14	8	22
	% within Social Functioning (%)		63,6%	36,4%	100,0%	
	Very strong	% within Time of measurement	36,8%	21,1%	28,9%	
		% of Total	18,4%	10,5%	28,9%	
		Count	13	23	36	
	Total	Social Functioning (%)	% within Social Functioning (%)	36,1%	63,9%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	34,2%	60,5%	47,4%
% of Total			17,1%	30,3%	47,4%	
Total	Social Functioning (%)	Count	38	38	76	
		% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
Total	Social Functioning (%)	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		Count	2	1	3	
		% within Social Functioning (%)	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%	
Total	Social Functioning (%)	Weak	% within Time of measurement	5,3%	2,6%	3,9%



		% of Total	2,6%	1,3%	3,9%
		Count	9	6	15
Moderate		% within Social Functioning (%)	60,0%	40,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	23,7%	15,8%	19,7%
		% of Total	11,8%	7,9%	19,7%
		Count	14	8	22
Strong		% within Social Functioning (%)	63,6%	36,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	36,8%	21,1%	28,9%
		% of Total	18,4%	10,5%	28,9%
		Count	13	23	36
Very strong		% within Social Functioning (%)	36,1%	63,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	34,2%	60,5%	47,4%
		% of Total	17,1%	30,3%	47,4%
		Count	38	38	76
Total		% within Social Functioning (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests


Caregiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	5,347 ^a	3	,148
	Likelihood Ratio	5,416	3	,144





Total	Linear-by-Linear Association	3,698	1	,054
	N of Valid Cases	76		
	Pearson Chi-Square	5,347 ^a	3	,148
	Likelihood Ratio	5,416	3	,144
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3,698	1	,054
	N of Valid Cases	76		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.



Pain (%) * Time of measurement * Caregiver

Caregiver	Time of measurement	Total
-----------	---------------------	-------





				Baseline	Post-intervention		
Caregiver	Weak	Count		2	1	3	
		% within Pain (%)		66,7%	33,3%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement		5,3%	2,6%	3,9%	
			% of Total		2,6%	1,3%	3,9%
	Moderate	Count		8	7	15	
		% within Pain (%)		53,3%	46,7%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement		21,1%	18,4%	19,7%	
	Pain (%)		% of Total		10,5%	9,2%	19,7%
		Strong	Count		9	4	13
			% within Pain (%)		69,2%	30,8%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement			23,7%	10,5%	17,1%	
			% of Total		11,8%	5,3%	17,1%
	Very strong	Count		19	26	45	
		% within Pain (%)		42,2%	57,8%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement		50,0%	68,4%	59,2%	
			% of Total		25,0%	34,2%	59,2%
	Total		Count		38	38	76
			% within Pain (%)		50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement		100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
		% of Total		50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
Total	Pain (%)	Weak	Count		2	1	3
			% within Pain (%)		66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement		5,3%	2,6%	3,9%



		% of Total	2,6%	1,3%	3,9%
		Count	8	7	15
	Moderate	% within Pain (%)	53,3%	46,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	21,1%	18,4%	19,7%
		% of Total	10,5%	9,2%	19,7%
		Count	9	4	13
	Strong	% within Pain (%)	69,2%	30,8%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	23,7%	10,5%	17,1%
		% of Total	11,8%	5,3%	17,1%
		Count	19	26	45
	Very strong	% within Pain (%)	42,2%	57,8%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	50,0%	68,4%	59,2%
		% of Total	25,0%	34,2%	59,2%
		Count	38	38	76
Total		% within Pain (%)	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%


Chi-Square Tests

Caregiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	3,412 ^a	3	,332
	Likelihood Ratio	3,473	3	,324



Total	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,532	1	,216
	N of Valid Cases	76		
	Pearson Chi-Square	3,412 ^a	3	,332
	Likelihood Ratio	3,473	3	,324
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,532	1	,216
	N of Valid Cases	76		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.



Frequencies





Notes

Output Created	09-DEC-2016 15:06:02	
Comments		
	Data	C:\Users\u0008250\Documents\ lucas\analyse\dataset.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
Input	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	174
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data.
Syntax	FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=HI_OR SI_OR /PIECHART PERCENT /ORDER=ANALYSIS.	
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00,19
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00,24

[DataSet1] C:\Users\u0008250\Documents\lucas\analyse\dataset.sav





Statistics

		Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better
N	Valid	174	174
	Missing	0	0

Frequency Table

Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very weak	39	22,4	22,4	22,4
	Weak	47	27,0	27,0	49,4
	Strong	28	16,1	16,1	65,5
	Very strong	60	34,5	34,5	100,0
	Total	174	100,0	100,0	





Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better


	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very weak	8	4,6	4,6	4,6
Weak	43	24,7	24,7	29,3
Valid Strong	53	30,5	30,5	59,8
Very strong	70	40,2	40,2	100,0
Total	174	100,0	100,0	

Pie Chart






Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better





Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better



CROSSTABS

/TABLES=HI_OR SI_OR BY Prepost





```

/FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
/STATISTICS=CHISQ
/CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN TOTAL
/COUNT ROUND CELL
/BARCHART.
    
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		09-DEC-2016 15:07:12
Comments		
	Data	C:\Users\u0008250\Documents\ lucas\analyse\dataset.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
Input	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	174
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.





Syntax	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table. CROSSTABS /TABLES=HI_OR SI_OR BY Prepost /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN TOTAL /COUNT ROUND CELL /BARCHART.	
	Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00,22
		Elapsed Time	00:00:00,23
		Dimensions Requested	2
		Cells Available	174762

[DataSet1] C:\Users\u0008250\Documents\lucas\analyse\dataset.sav

Case Processing Summary

	Cases		
	Valid	Missing	Total





	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better * Time of measurement	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better * Time of measurement	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%

Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better * Time of measurement

Crosstab

			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	Very weak	Count	21	18	39
		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	53,8%	46,2%	100,0%
	Weak	% within Time of measurement	24,1%	20,7%	22,4%
		% of Total	12,1%	10,3%	22,4%
	Count	29	18	47	
	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	61,7%	38,3%	100,0%	



		% within Time of measurement	33,3%	20,7%	27,0%
		% of Total	16,7%	10,3%	27,0%
		Count	16	12	28
	Strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	57,1%	42,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	18,4%	13,8%	16,1%
		% of Total	9,2%	6,9%	16,1%
		Count	21	39	60
	Very strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	35,0%	65,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	24,1%	44,8%	34,5%
		% of Total	12,1%	22,4%	34,5%
		Count	87	87	174
Total		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%


Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8,777 ^a	3	,032
Likelihood Ratio	8,887	3	,031



Linear-by-Linear Association	5,102	1	,024
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14,00.





Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better * Time of measurement

Crosstab

			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	Very weak	Count	7	1	8
		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	87,5%	12,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	8,0%	1,1%	4,6%
		% of Total	4,0%	0,6%	4,6%
	Weak	Count	25	18	43
		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	58,1%	41,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	28,7%	20,7%	24,7%
		% of Total	14,4%	10,3%	24,7%
	Strong	Count	29	24	53
		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	54,7%	45,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	33,3%	27,6%	30,5%
		% of Total	16,7%	13,8%	30,5%
Very strong	Count	26	44	70	




Total	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	37,1%	62,9%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	29,9%	50,6%	40,2%
	% of Total	14,9%	25,3%	40,2%
	Count	87	87	174
	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10,740 ^a	3	,013
Likelihood Ratio	11,360	3	,010
Linear-by-Linear Association	9,432	1	,002
N of Valid Cases	174		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,00.



CROSSTABS
/TABLES=HI_OR SI_OR BY Prepost BY Partner





```

/FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
/STATISTICS=CHISQ
/CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN TOTAL
/COUNT ROUND CELL
/BARCHART.
    
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		09-DEC-2016 15:07:49
Comments		
	Data	C:\Users\u0008250\Documents\ lucas\analyse\dataset.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
Input	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	174
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.





Syntax	Cases Used	<p>Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.</p> <p>CROSSTABS /TABLES=HI_OR SI_OR BY Prepost BY Partner /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN TOTAL /COUNT ROUND CELL /BARCHART.</p>
	Resources	<p>Processor Time 00:00:01,22 Elapsed Time 00:00:01,22 Dimensions Requested 3 Cells Available 142987</p>

[DataSet1] C:\Users\u0008250\Documents\lucas\analyse\dataset.sav

Case Processing Summary

	Cases		
	Valid	Missing	Total





	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better * Time of measurement * Partner	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%
Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better * Time of measurement * Partner	174	100,0%	0	0,0%	174	100,0%

Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better * Time of measurement * Partner

Crosstab

Partner			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Belgium	Weak	Count	3	2	5
		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	60,0%	40,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	30,0%	20,0%	25,0%
	Strong	% of Total	15,0%	10,0%	25,0%
		Count	5	6	11
		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	45,5%	54,5%	100,0%



			% within Time of measurement	50,0%	60,0%	55,0%		
			% of Total	25,0%	30,0%	55,0%		
			Count	2	2	4		
		Very strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%		
			% of Total	10,0%	10,0%	20,0%		
			Count	10	10	20		
	Total		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
			Count	11	10	21		
		Very weak	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	52,4%	47,6%	100,0%		
			% within Time of measurement	55,0%	50,0%	52,5%		
			% of Total	27,5%	25,0%	52,5%		
			Count	7	7	14		
	Cyprus	Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	Weak	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
					% within Time of measurement	35,0%	35,0%	35,0%
					% of Total	17,5%	17,5%	35,0%
			Count	1	2	3		
		Strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%		
			% within Time of measurement	5,0%	10,0%	7,5%		



Italy	Total	Very strong	% of Total	2,5%	5,0%	7,5%
			Count	1	1	2
			% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	5,0%	5,0%	5,0%
			% of Total	2,5%	2,5%	5,0%
			Count	20	20	40
		Very weak	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	4	4	8
			% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	33,3%	33,3%	33,3%
		Weak	% of Total	16,7%	16,7%	33,3%
			Count	2	2	4
			% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	16,7%	16,7%	16,7%
			% of Total	8,3%	8,3%	16,7%
			Count	1	1	2
		Strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	8,3%	8,3%	8,3%
% of Total	4,2%		4,2%	8,3%		
Very strong	Count		5	5	10	



Lithuania	Total		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	41,7%	41,7%	41,7%	
			% of Total	20,8%	20,8%	41,7%	
			Count	12	12	24	
			% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			Count	4	0	4	
		Very weak		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	20,0%	0,0%	10,0%
				% of Total	10,0%	0,0%	10,0%
				Count	9	0	9
	Weak		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	45,0%	0,0%	22,5%	
			% of Total	22,5%	0,0%	22,5%	
			Count	5	0	5	
	Strong		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	25,0%	0,0%	12,5%	
			% of Total	12,5%	0,0%	12,5%	
			Count	2	20	22	
	Very strong		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	9,1%	90,9%	100,0%	



Spain	Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	Very weak	Count	1	3	4
			% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	25,0%	75,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	5,0%	15,0%	10,0%
		% of Total	2,5%	7,5%	10,0%	
		Weak	Count	7	6	13
			% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	53,8%	46,2%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	35,0%	30,0%	32,5%
		% of Total	17,5%	15,0%	32,5%	
		Strong	Count	4	3	7
	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better		57,1%	42,9%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement		20,0%	15,0%	17,5%	
	% of Total	10,0%	7,5%	17,5%		
	Very strong	Count	8	8	16	
		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	40,0%	40,0%	40,0%	
% of Total	20,0%	20,0%	40,0%			
Total	Count	20	20	40		
	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%		
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%			
Total	Home Integration - Max score	Very weak	Count	21	18	39



10 - Higher is better		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	53,8%	46,2%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	24,1%	20,7%	22,4%	
		% of Total	12,1%	10,3%	22,4%	
		Count	29	18	47	
	Weak		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	61,7%	38,3%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	33,3%	20,7%	27,0%
			% of Total	16,7%	10,3%	27,0%
			Count	16	12	28
	Strong		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	57,1%	42,9%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	18,4%	13,8%	16,1%
			% of Total	9,2%	6,9%	16,1%
			Count	21	39	60
Very strong		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	35,0%	65,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	24,1%	44,8%	34,5%	
		% of Total	12,1%	22,4%	34,5%	
		Count	87	87	174	
Total		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	



Chi-Square Tests


Partner		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Belgium	Pearson Chi-Square	,291 ^b	2	,865
	Likelihood Ratio	,292	2	,864
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,106	1	,745
	N of Valid Cases	20		
Cyprus	Pearson Chi-Square	,381 ^c	3	,944
	Likelihood Ratio	,387	3	,943
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,144	1	,704
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Italy	Pearson Chi-Square	,000 ^d	3	1,000
	Likelihood Ratio	,000	3	1,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000
	N of Valid Cases	24		
Lithuania	Pearson Chi-Square	32,727 ^e	3	,000
	Likelihood Ratio	42,048	3	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	25,755	1	,000
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Portugal	Pearson Chi-Square	,000 ^f	2	1,000
	Likelihood Ratio	,000	2	1,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000
	N of Valid Cases	10		
Spain	Pearson Chi-Square	1,220 ^g	3	,748








	Likelihood Ratio	1,267	3	,737
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,198	1	,657
	N of Valid Cases	40		
	Pearson Chi-Square	8,777 ^a	3	,032
Total	Likelihood Ratio	8,887	3	,031
	Linear-by-Linear Association	5,102	1	,024
	N of Valid Cases	174		


- a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14,00.
- b. 4 cells (66,7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,00.
- c. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.
- d. 6 cells (75,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.
- e. 6 cells (75,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,00.
- f. 6 cells (100,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,00.
- g. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,00.
















Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better * Time of measurement * Partner

Crosstab

Partner			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Belgium	Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	Weak	Count	1	2	3
			% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	10,0%	20,0%	15,0%
			% of Total	5,0%	10,0%	15,0%
	Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	Strong	Count	4	3	7
			% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	57,1%	42,9%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	40,0%	30,0%	35,0%
			% of Total	20,0%	15,0%	35,0%
	Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	Very strong	Count	5	5	10
			% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	50,0%	50,0%	50,0%
			% of Total	25,0%	25,0%	50,0%
Total		Count	10	10	20	



		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	5	0	5
	Very weak	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	25,0%	0,0%	12,5%
		% of Total	12,5%	0,0%	12,5%
		Count	8	5	13
	Weak	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	40,0%	25,0%	32,5%
		% of Total	20,0%	12,5%	32,5%
		Count	3	5	8
Cyprus	Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	37,5%	62,5%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	15,0%	25,0%	20,0%
		% of Total	7,5%	12,5%	20,0%
		Count	4	10	14
	Very strong	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	28,6%	71,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	20,0%	50,0%	35,0%
		% of Total	10,0%	25,0%	35,0%
		Count	20	20	40
	Total				



Italy	Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			Count	1	0	1	
		Very weak		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	8,3%	0,0%	4,2%
				% of Total	4,2%	0,0%	4,2%
				Count	4	4	8
		Weak		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	33,3%	33,3%	33,3%
				% of Total	16,7%	16,7%	33,3%
				Count	4	5	9
		Strong		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	44,4%	55,6%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	33,3%	41,7%	37,5%
				% of Total	16,7%	20,8%	37,5%
				Count	3	3	6
		Very strong		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	25,0%	25,0%	25,0%
				% of Total	12,5%	12,5%	25,0%
				Count	12	12	24
			Total	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%



		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	1	0	1
	Very weak	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	5,0%	0,0%	2,5%
		% of Total	2,5%	0,0%	2,5%
		Count	2	0	2
	Weak	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	10,0%	0,0%	5,0%
		% of Total	5,0%	0,0%	5,0%
		Count	14	0	14
	Strong	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	70,0%	0,0%	35,0%
		% of Total	35,0%	0,0%	35,0%
		Count	3	20	23
	Very strong	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	13,0%	87,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	15,0%	100,0%	57,5%
		% of Total	7,5%	50,0%	57,5%
		Count	20	20	40
	Total	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%



			% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	56,2%	43,8%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	45,0%	35,0%	40,0%
			% of Total	22,5%	17,5%	40,0%
			Count	4	9	13
		Strong	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	30,8%	69,2%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	20,0%	45,0%	32,5%
			% of Total	10,0%	22,5%	32,5%
			Count	7	3	10
		Very strong	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	70,0%	30,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	35,0%	15,0%	25,0%
			% of Total	17,5%	7,5%	25,0%
			Count	20	20	40
	Total		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	7	1	8
		Very weak	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	87,5%	12,5%	100,0%
	Total		% within Time of measurement	8,0%	1,1%	4,6%
			% of Total	4,0%	0,6%	4,6%
		Weak	Count	25	18	43



		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	58,1%	41,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	28,7%	20,7%	24,7%
		% of Total	14,4%	10,3%	24,7%
		Count	29	24	53
	Strong	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	54,7%	45,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	33,3%	27,6%	30,5%
		% of Total	16,7%	13,8%	30,5%
		Count	26	44	70
	Very strong	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	37,1%	62,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	29,9%	50,6%	40,2%
		% of Total	14,9%	25,3%	40,2%
		Count	87	87	174
Total		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Partner	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)






Belgium	Pearson Chi-Square	,476 ^b	2	,788
	Likelihood Ratio	,483	2	,785
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,090	1	,764
	N of Valid Cases	20		
Cyprus	Pearson Chi-Square	8,764 ^c	3	,033
	Likelihood Ratio	10,792	3	,013
	Linear-by-Linear Association	7,826	1	,005
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Italy	Pearson Chi-Square	1,111 ^d	3	,774
	Likelihood Ratio	1,498	3	,683
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,221	1	,638
	N of Valid Cases	24		
Lithuania	Pearson Chi-Square	29,565 ^e	3	,000
	Likelihood Ratio	37,640	3	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	21,526	1	,000
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Portugal	Pearson Chi-Square	3,143 ^f	2	,208
	Likelihood Ratio	4,302	2	,116
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,000	1	1,000
	N of Valid Cases	10		
Spain	Pearson Chi-Square	4,773 ^g	3	,189
	Likelihood Ratio	5,256	3	,154
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,549	1	,459
	N of Valid Cases	40		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	10,740 ^a	3	,013
	Likelihood Ratio	11,360	3	,010





Linear-by-Linear Association	9,432	1	,002
N of Valid Cases	174		


- a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,00.
- b. 4 cells (66,7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,50.
- c. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,50.
- d. 8 cells (100,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.
- e. 4 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.
- f. 6 cells (100,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.
- g. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.

















```
CROSSTABS  
/TABLES=HI_OR SI_OR BY Prepost BY patient
```





```

/FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
/STATISTICS=CHISQ
/CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN TOTAL
/COUNT ROUND CELL
/BARCHART.
    
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		09-DEC-2016 15:08:03
Comments		
	Data	C:\Users\u0008250\Documents\ lucas\analyse\dataset.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
Input	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	174
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.





Syntax	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table. CROSSTABS /TABLES=HI_OR SI_OR BY Prepost BY patient /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN TOTAL /COUNT ROUND CELL /BARCHART.	
	Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00,25
		Elapsed Time	00:00:00,35
		Dimensions Requested	3
		Cells Available	142987

[DataSet1] C:\Users\u0008250\Documents\lucas\analyse\dataset.sav

Case Processing Summary

	Cases		
	Valid	Missing	Total





	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better * Time of measurement * Patient	98	56,3%	76	43,7%	174	100,0%
Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better * Time of measurement * Patient	98	56,3%	76	43,7%	174	100,0%

Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better * Time of measurement * Patient

Crosstab

Patient			Time of measurement		Total
			Baseline	Post-intervention	
Patient	Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	Count	18	13	31
		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	58,1%	41,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	36,7%	26,5%	31,6%
		% of Total	18,4%	13,3%	31,6%
	Weak	Count	11	5	16
		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	68,8%	31,2%	100,0%





			% within Time of measurement	22,4%	10,2%	16,3%
			% of Total	11,2%	5,1%	16,3%
			Count	8	9	17
		Strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	47,1%	52,9%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	16,3%	18,4%	17,3%
			% of Total	8,2%	9,2%	17,3%
			Count	12	22	34
		Very strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	35,3%	64,7%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	24,5%	44,9%	34,7%
			% of Total	12,2%	22,4%	34,7%
			Count	49	49	98
	Total		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
			Count	18	13	31
	Total	Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	58,1%	41,9%	100,0%
				% within Time of measurement	36,7%	26,5%
				% of Total	18,4%	13,3%
		Weak	Count	11	5	16



		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	68,8%	31,2%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	22,4%	10,2%	16,3%
		% of Total	11,2%	5,1%	16,3%
		Count	8	9	17
	Strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	47,1%	52,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	16,3%	18,4%	17,3%
		% of Total	8,2%	9,2%	17,3%
		Count	12	22	34
	Very strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	35,3%	64,7%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	24,5%	44,9%	34,7%
		% of Total	12,2%	22,4%	34,7%
		Count	49	49	98
Total		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%


Chi-Square Tests

Patient	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)



Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	6,056 ^a	3	,109
	Likelihood Ratio	6,160	3	,104
	Linear-by-Linear Association	4,338	1	,037
	N of Valid Cases	98		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	6,056 ^a	3	,109
	Likelihood Ratio	6,160	3	,104
	Linear-by-Linear Association	4,338	1	,037
	N of Valid Cases	98		

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8,00.





Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better * Time of measurement * Patient

Crosstab

Patient			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Patient	Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	Very weak	Count	7	0	7
			% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	14,3%	0,0%	7,1%
			% of Total	7,1%	0,0%	7,1%
	Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	Weak	Count	16	13	29
			% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	55,2%	44,8%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	32,7%	26,5%	29,6%
			% of Total	16,3%	13,3%	29,6%
	Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	Strong	Count	15	12	27
			% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	55,6%	44,4%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	30,6%	24,5%	27,6%
			% of Total	15,3%	12,2%	27,6%
Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	Very strong	Count	11	24	35	



Total		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	31,4%	68,6%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	22,4%	49,0%	35,7%
		% of Total	11,2%	24,5%	35,7%
		Count	49	49	98
		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	7	0	7
	Very weak	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	14,3%	0,0%	7,1%
		% of Total	7,1%	0,0%	7,1%
		Count	16	13	29
	Weak	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	55,2%	44,8%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	32,7%	26,5%	29,6%
		% of Total	16,3%	13,3%	29,6%
		Count	15	12	27
Strong	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	55,6%	44,4%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	30,6%	24,5%	27,6%	
	% of Total	15,3%	12,2%	27,6%	




	Count	11	24	35
Very strong	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	31,4%	68,6%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	22,4%	49,0%	35,7%
	% of Total	11,2%	24,5%	35,7%
Total	Count	49	49	98
	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Patient		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Patient	Pearson Chi-Square	12,472 ^a	3	,006
	Likelihood Ratio	15,295	3	,002
	Linear-by-Linear Association	9,752	1	,002
	N of Valid Cases	98		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	12,472 ^a	3	,006
	Likelihood Ratio	15,295	3	,002
	Linear-by-Linear Association	9,752	1	,002
	N of Valid Cases	98		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3,50.





```
CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=HI_OR SI_OR BY Prepost BY Caregiver
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=CHISQ
  /CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN TOTAL
  /COUNT ROUND CELL
  /BARCHART.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		09-DEC-2016 15:08:20
Comments		
	Data	C:\Users\u0008250\Documents\ lucas\analyse\dataset.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
Input	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	174
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.





Syntax	Cases Used	<p>Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.</p> <p>CROSSTABS /TABLES=HI_OR SI_OR BY Prepost BY Caregiver /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT ROW COLUMN TOTAL /COUNT ROUND CELL /BARChart.</p>
	Resources	<p>Processor Time 00:00:00,23</p> <p>Elapsed Time 00:00:00,23</p> <p>Dimensions Requested 3</p> <p>Cells Available 142987</p>

[DataSet1] C:\Users\u0008250\Documents\lucas\analyse\dataset.sav

Case Processing Summary

	Cases		
	Valid	Missing	Total





	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better * Time of measurement * Caregiver	76	43,7%	98	56,3%	174	100,0%
Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better * Time of measurement * Caregiver	76	43,7%	98	56,3%	174	100,0%

Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better * Time of measurement * Caregiver

Crosstab

Caregiver			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Caregiver	Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	Very weak	Count 3	5	8	
			% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	37,5%	62,5%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	7,9%	13,2%	10,5%
		% of Total	3,9%	6,6%	10,5%	
	Weak	Count	18	13	31	
		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	58,1%	41,9%	100,0%	



			% within Time of measurement	47,4%	34,2%	40,8%	
			% of Total	23,7%	17,1%	40,8%	
			Count	8	3	11	
		Strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	72,7%	27,3%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	21,1%	7,9%	14,5%	
			% of Total	10,5%	3,9%	14,5%	
			Count	9	17	26	
		Very strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	34,6%	65,4%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	23,7%	44,7%	34,2%	
			% of Total	11,8%	22,4%	34,2%	
			Count	38	38	76	
	Total		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
			% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%	
			Count	3	5	8	
	Total	Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	Very weak	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	37,5%	62,5%	100,0%
					% within Time of measurement	7,9%	13,2%
			% of Total	3,9%	6,6%	10,5%	
		Weak	Count	18	13	31	



		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	58,1%	41,9%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	47,4%	34,2%	40,8%
		% of Total	23,7%	17,1%	40,8%
		Count	8	3	11
	Strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	72,7%	27,3%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	21,1%	7,9%	14,5%
		% of Total	10,5%	3,9%	14,5%
		Count	9	17	26
	Very strong	% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	34,6%	65,4%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	23,7%	44,7%	34,2%
		% of Total	11,8%	22,4%	34,2%
		Count	38	38	76
Total		% within Home Integration - Max score 10 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests


Caregiver	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)





Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	6,041 ^a	3	,110
	Likelihood Ratio	6,176	3	,103
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,961	1	,327
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	6,041 ^a	3	,110
	Likelihood Ratio	6,176	3	,103
	Linear-by-Linear Association	,961	1	,327
	N of Valid Cases	76		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4,00.





Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better * Time of measurement * Caregiver

Crosstab

Caregiver			Time of measurement		Total	
			Baseline	Post-intervention		
Caregiver	Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	Very weak	Count	0	1	1
			% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	0,0%	2,6%	1,3%
			% of Total	0,0%	1,3%	1,3%
	Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	Weak	Count	9	5	14
			% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	64,3%	35,7%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	23,7%	13,2%	18,4%
			% of Total	11,8%	6,6%	18,4%
	Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	Strong	Count	14	12	26
			% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	53,8%	46,2%	100,0%
			% within Time of measurement	36,8%	31,6%	34,2%
			% of Total	18,4%	15,8%	34,2%
Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	Very strong	Count	15	20	35	





Total		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	39,5%	52,6%	46,1%
		% of Total	19,7%	26,3%	46,1%
		Count	38	38	76
		% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Count	0	1	1
	Very weak	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		% within Time of measurement	0,0%	2,6%	1,3%
		% of Total	0,0%	1,3%	1,3%
		Count	9	5	14
Weak	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	64,3%	35,7%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	23,7%	13,2%	18,4%	
	% of Total	11,8%	6,6%	18,4%	
	Count	14	12	26	
Strong	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	53,8%	46,2%	100,0%	
	% within Time of measurement	36,8%	31,6%	34,2%	
	% of Total	18,4%	15,8%	34,2%	




	Count	15	20	35
	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	42,9%	57,1%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	39,5%	52,6%	46,1%
	% of Total	19,7%	26,3%	46,1%
	Count	38	38	76
	% within Social Integration - Max score 12 - Higher is better	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
	% within Time of measurement	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Total	% of Total	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

Caregiver		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Caregiver	Pearson Chi-Square	3,011 ^a	3	,390
	Likelihood Ratio	3,416	3	,332
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,002	1	,317
	N of Valid Cases	76		
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	3,011 ^a	3	,390
	Likelihood Ratio	3,416	3	,332
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,002	1	,317
	N of Valid Cases	76		

a. 2 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,50.



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

