

Effects of speculum lubrication on cervical smears for cervical cancer screening: a double blind randomized clinical trial

Authors:

Chito P. Ilika¹; George U. Eleje^{1,2}; Michael E. Chiemeka³; Frances N. Ilika⁴; Joseph I. Ikechebelu^{1,2}; Valentine C. Ilika⁵; Emmanuel O. Ugwu⁶; Ifeanyiichukwu, J. Ofor⁷; Onyecherelam M. Ogelle^{1,2}; Osita S. Umeononihu^{1,2}; Johnbosco E. Mamah⁸; Chinedu L. Olisa^{1,9}; Chijioke O. Ezeigwe^{1,2}; Malarchy E. Nwankwo^{1,2}; Chukwuemeka J. Ofojebe^{1,2}; Chidinma C. Okafor¹⁰; Onyeka C. Ekwebene¹¹; Obinna K. Nnabuchi¹; Chigozie G. Okafor¹

Affiliations

¹Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Teaching Hospital, Nnewi, Anambra State, Nigeria.

²Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.

³Department of Anatomic Pathology and Forensic Medicine, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Teaching Hospital, Nnewi, Anambra State, Nigeria.

⁴Health Policy Plus (HP+), Abuja, Nigeria.

⁵Department of Internal medicine, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Teaching Hospital, Nnewi, Anambra State, Nigeria.

⁶Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, College of Medicine, University of Nigeria Teaching Hospital, Enugu Campus, Enugu State, Nigeria.

⁷Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, College of Medicine, Enugu State University Teaching, Parklane, Enugu State, Nigeria.

⁸Alex-Ekwueme Federal University Teaching Hospital, Abakaliki, Nigeria

⁹Department of Pharmacology and Therapeutics, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria

¹⁰Department of Psychiatry, Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust, Leicester, United Kingdom.

¹¹Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, East Tennessee State University, USA.

Correspondence:

DR CHIGOZIE GEOFFREY OKAFOR

Consultant Obstetrician and Gynaecologist

Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology

Nnamdi Azikiwe University Teaching Hospital (NAUTH)

Nnewi,

Anambra State,

Nigeria.

Orcid no: 0000-0003-4458-8216

Phone no. +2348034802657

Email: chigolz@yahoo.com

The Trial was registered with **Pan-African Clinical Trial Registry** with unique identification/registration no: **PACTR2020077533364675**.

ABSTACT

Background: Speculum lubrication may help to reduce the pain experienced during Pap-smears collection and hence increase uptake of cervical cancer screening and repeat testing but there are fears of its interference with cytological results.

Aim: To determine and compare adequacy of cervical cytology smears and mean pain scores of women undergoing cervical cancer screening with or without speculum lubrication.

Methods: This was a randomized controlled study of 132 women having cervical cancer screening at a tertiary hospital in Nigeria. Sixty-six participants each were randomly assigned to the ‘Gel’ and ‘No Gel’ groups respectively. Pap-smears were collected from each participant with lubricated speculum (‘Gel group’) or non-lubricated speculum (‘No Gel group’). The primary outcome measures were; the proportion of women with unsatisfactory cervical cytology smears and the mean numeric rating scale pain scores while the secondary outcome measures were the proportion of women that are willing to come for repeat testing and the cytological diagnosis of Pap-smear results.

Results: The baseline socio-demographic variables were similar in both groups. There was no significant difference in the proportion of unsatisfactory cervical smear results between the two groups (13.6% vs. 21.2% $p = 0.359$). However, the mean pain scores were significantly lower in the gel group than in the no gel group (45.04 vs 87.96; $p < 0.001$). An equal proportion of the participants in each group (90.9% vs. 90.9%; $p > 0.999$) were willing to come for repeat cervical smears in the future.

Conclusion: Speculum lubrication did not affect the adequacy of cervical-smears but significantly reduced the pain experienced during Pap-smear collection. Also, it did not significantly affect willingness to come for repeat cervical smears in the future.

The Trial was registered with **Pan-African Clinical Trial Registry** with unique identification/registration no: **PACTR2020077533364675**.

Keywords: Pap-smears, Speculum lubrication, Pain, Cervical cancer, Screening.

1 **Introduction**

2 Cancer of the cervix is the fourth most prevalent malignancies in females with a projected incidence of
3 570,000 in 2018.¹ It represents 6.6 per cent of all gynaecological carcinomas and is responsible for 7.5 per
4 cent of all female malignancy mortality worldwide.¹ Out of the 311 000 cases of mortality estimated from
5 carcinoma of the cervix yearly, greater than 85% of these deaths happen in areas that are less developed¹.

6 Introducing screening for cancer of the cervix and improving its uptake especially in developing countries
7 is key to decreasing the death burdens from malignancy of the cervix. In addition, the usage of screening
8 programs can be improved via increasing sensitization on the risk factors of carcinoma of the cervix which
9 include early coitarche, multiple sexual partners, HPV infections, extensive use of oral contraceptives and
10 HIV infections².

11 The conventional Papanicolaou test remains the commonest screening method for cancer of the cervix³. In
12 high income countries, there are well structured programs which enable vaccination of girls against HPV
13 and regular screening of women resulting in remarkable decrease in the development and complications of
14 carcinoma of the cervix^{4,5,6}. Screening helps to achieve early identification and intervention which prevents
15 up to 80% of cervical malignancies in high income countries,^{4,5,6} whereas in poor income countries, there
16 is poor access to vaccination and testing resulting in diagnosis of cervical cancer mainly in advanced
17 stages^{7,8}. In addition, these countries lack access to facilities required for the management of such advanced
18 stage diseases giving rise to a greater death rate from malignancy of the cervix in poor countries^{7,8}.

19 In as much as efforts are being made to improve vaccinations for HPV in order to prevent carcinoma of the
20 cervix, early identification of premalignant lesions of the cervix through cervical Papanicolaou smear
21 cytology screening remains a key factor for achieving a decline in the development and complications of
22 carcinoma of the cervix in low and middle income countries where vaccination for Human Papilloma Virus
23 services is limited⁹.

24 The Papanicolaou test is a well-recognized, efficient and reliable tool employed in early identification of
25 premalignant lesions of the cervix resulting in substantial decrease in disease burden of carcinoma of the
26 cervix¹⁰. It is cost-effective and the technique is simple. Despite this, the uptake of Papanicolaou smear in
27 our environment remains poor. Pain and discomfort associated with examination of the vagina can
28 discourage women from assessing regular test, other factors that may hinder compliance include lack of
29 awareness, cost implication, anxiety and cultural beliefs^{7,11}.

30 Insertion of speculum for examination of vagina is an important factor responsible for non- compliance to
31 regular screening and repeat testing for carcinoma of the cervix because of the embarrassment, anxiety,

32 pain and discomfort associated with it¹². In Australia, a research seeking to find out the attitude of women
33 concerning self-insertion compared to physician insertion of the speculum showed that 91% of the study
34 population will prefer to insert the speculum by themselves rather than a physician doing it because of the
35 embarrassment and discomfort associated with it¹³.

36 During intercourse, lubrication is physiologically essential for easy penetration of the vagina and absence
37 of optimal lubrication results in dyspareunia. So we cannot justify inserting without lubrication a rigid
38 instrument like a speculum into the vagina. Speculum lubrication should be employed to minimize
39 discomfort and pain during vaginal examinations thereby ultimately increasing compliance for screening.
40 However, applying lubricating gel on the vagina is not encouraged by gynaecologic literature, also students
41 and resident doctors in training are advised against lubricating the speculum while collecting sample due
42 to the worry that it may interfere with cytology results of cervical smears often leading to inadequacy.^{10,14}
43 However, there is paucity of convincing evidence to prove that using lubricating gel can prevent proper
44 cytological analysis^{15,16,17}.

45 The aim of this study was to determine the effects of speculum lubrication on the adequacy of cervical
46 cytology smears and to determine if it decreases pain/discomfort in women undergoing cervical cancer
47 screening by means of cervical smears and also compare the proportion of women willing to come for
48 repeat cervical smears in the future.

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58 **Materials and Methods**

59 This work was a prospective randomized controlled trial of 132 women having cervical cancer screening
60 at the gynaecologic clinic of Nnamdi Azikiwe University Teaching Hospital (NAUTH) Nnewi, Anambra
61 State, Nigeria from 21st Augusts, 2020 to 31st December, 2020. Ethical approval was obtained from NAUTH
62 Ethics review committee with the approval reference number: NAUTH /CS/66/VOL.12/098/2019/040.

63 The participants included pre-menopausal women of atleast 25years and post-menopausal women who
64 required pap smear screening. Women excluded were virgins, recent sexual intercourse, pregnant women,
65 women having their menstrual period, women with any overt cervical pathology and/or current treatment
66 of any vaginal condition, women with vulvar pathologies or those on hormone replacement therapy.
67 Women with vaginitis, those undergoing vulvectomy or vaginectomy and women who had fertility-sparing
68 surgery were also excluded.

69 The sample size was calculated using the formula for sample size determination of minimum sample size
70 for experimental studies (Difference in proportions). Substituting for the values of proportion of
71 unsatisfactory smears as found in a previous study ¹¹

$$72 \quad n = \frac{[(Z_{\beta} + Z_{\alpha/2})^2 \times 2P(1-P)]}{E^2}$$

73

74 Where $P = (P_1 + P_2) / 2 = (0.01 + 0.005) / 2 = 0.0075$, $E = \text{Effect size} = P_1 - P_2 = 0.01 - 0.005 = 0.005$, $Z_{\beta} =$
75 Corresponding Z value at 80% Power = 0.84. $Z_{\alpha/2} = 1.96$ (Corresponding Z value at 95% confidence level)

76 Adjusting for finite population, $N = 60$ samples from clinic in 3 months.

77 $n_s = n^1 / 1 + n^1/N$, where; $n_s = \text{Adjusted sample size}$, $n^1 = \text{Calculated sample size}$, $N = \text{population for study}$.
78 Considering attrition rate of 10.0%, the total number of subjects was 132 (66 in each arm).

79 The procedure was explained and participants counselled on the procedure, pre-procedure precautions like
80 abstinence from sexual intercourse for atleast 24 hours prior to the procedure and avoidance of douching
81 were observed. Trained research assistants (Senior Registrars) and the researchers were involved in
82 counselling of participants and collection of the pap smears. Following a written informed consent, selected
83 women were randomly assigned to the gel group or no gel group. The sequence of randomization was
84 generated by the computer via randomly permuted blocks (blocks of 4, allocation ratio 1:1). To keep a
85 similar number of subjects in each group, a block randomization method with blocks of 4 was used. An
86 independent person who was not involved in the study performed the randomization using computer
87 software program available at <http://mahmoodsaghaei.tripod.com/Softwares/randalloc.html>. Allocation
88 concealment was done using serially numbered opaque sealed envelopes which contained either a sheet of
89 paper showing gel group (Group A) placing the participant into the group using the speculum lubrication

90 or a paper displaying no gel group (group B) placing the participant into the group receiving dry speculum
91 (without speculum lubrication). The envelopes were kept and opened by an independent person. Once the
92 envelope was opened the allocation of the participant was not changed. The histopathologist and
93 participants were blinded and so were not aware of the intervention arm hence double blind.

94 The study procedure required the participants to be placed in dorsal position with the legs flexed at the knee
95 and adducted at the hips. Following identification of appropriate size speculum, 2mls of KY jelly (Dionel,
96 Maryland -USA) was applied on the entire external surfaces of the metal Cusco's speculum and inserted
97 gently into the vagina to visualize the cervix. A non- lubricated speculum was used for the control group.
98 A dry gauze swab was used to clear any mucous on the cervix. A cytobrush (Liqui-PREP™ LGM
99 International, Inc. Melbourne USA) was used to take the sample for Pap smear. Having obtained the sample,
100 the head of the brush was removed and put into the liquid preparative collection vial containing a liquid
101 based medium. (Liqui-PREP™ LGM International, Inc. Melbourne USA) The specimen in the vial was
102 then carefully mixed in the liquid based medium. Then, the speculum was gently withdrawn. The patient
103 was cleaned and counselled on the outcome. After each smear the patient was asked to rate her pain at the
104 end of the procedure using a Numeric Rating Scale for pain from 0 (no discomfort) to 10 (most discomfort)
105 indicate if she was willing to come for repeat testing in the future. Numeric Rating Scale for pain was used
106 because it is authenticity and its universal acceptance for evaluation of pain.¹¹

107 At histopathology laboratory of NAUTH, the vial was transferred into a centrifuge tube with same quantity
108 of cleaning solution. The fluid was then centrifuged for 10 minutes at 1400 rpm; the supernatant was
109 removed. Smears were made from the sediments after mixing with the cellular base solution (Liqui-PREP™
110 LGM International, Inc. Melbourne USA), stained by the Papanicolaou staining method and reported using
111 the Bethesda system stating whether the sample was satisfactory or not and the reason for unsatisfactory
112 results. Samples were recorded as “unsatisfactory” if 75% of the cells were obscured by blood or
113 inflammation, or if drying artifact or gel overlay were present. Otherwise, they were recorded as
114 “satisfactory”.^{10,18}. The patients with unsatisfactory smear results and positive cytological result were
115 referred to the managing gynaecological unit for management and follow up while those with negative
116 cytological result were counselled for repeat testing.

117 The primary outcome measures were; The proportion of women with unsatisfactory cervical cytology
118 smears and the mean numeric rating scale pain scores. While the secondary outcome measures were; The
119 proportion of women that are willing to come for repeat testing and the cytological diagnosis of Pap smear
120 results.

121 Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) IBM Corp version 25.0 was employed in the analysis of
122 results. Tables were used to represent collected data. Means and standard deviations were used to represent
123 continuous data. Mann- Whitney U Test was used to assess non-parametrics variables and chi squared test
124 was used for categorical variables. Statistical significance was deduced at p-value less than 0.05.

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144 **Results**

145 149 women were assessed for eligibility, however, 132 participants met the inclusion criteria and were
146 randomized into the Gel group (n=66) and No gel group (n=66). A flow diagram describing the participants
147 flow through the study is shown in Figure 1. Table 1 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of
148 participants in both groups. In terms of educational qualification, 89 (67.4%) of the participants had tertiary
149 education while 28% and 4.5% attained secondary and primary education respectively. There was no
150 significant difference in the baseline sociodemographic data of the two groups.

151 There was no significant difference in the proportion of unsatisfactory cytology smear (13.6% vs 21.2%;
152 $p=0.359$) and normal Pap smear results (100.0% vs 98.1%; $p=0.477$) in the gel group and no gel group,
153 respectively. This is shown in Table 2.

154 The reasons for the unsatisfactory smear results were due to obscurity by marked inflammation (11.1% vs
155 14.3%; $p=0.691$) and presence of scanty cells (88.9% vs 85.7%; $p=0.691$) in the Gel and No Gel group
156 respectively. Drying artifact due to gel was not reported by the histopathologist. This is shown in Table 3.

157 The mean pain scores were statistically lower in the Gel group than in the No gel group (45.04 vs 87.96;
158 $p<0.001$). While 3 people from the no gel group had scores of 9 and 10, the pain scores in the gel group
159 were less than 9. Additionally, 69.7%, 22.7%, and 7.6% of the women in the gel group had mild, moderate
160 and severe pain respectively, while 3.0%, 68.2%, and 18.2% in the no gel group had mild moderate and
161 severe pain respectively ($p<0.001$). This is shown in Table 4 and 5.

162 The association between category of pain and parity among the participants is shown in Table 6. The pain
163 scores appear to be more at the extremes of parity.

164 Majority of the participants in both groups (90.9% vs 90.9%; $p>0.999$) were willing to come for repeat
165 cervical smears in the future after undergoing initial cervical cancer screening. Although more participants
166 in Gel group (98.5% vs 92.4%; $p=0.208$) were more satisfied with smear collection procedure than in the
167 no Gel group, however, the difference was not statistically significant. This is shown in table 7.

168 Some participants were unwilling to repeat Pap smear test because the procedure was discomforting (33.3%
169 vs 16.7%; $p=0.691$), painful (66.7% vs 66.7%; $p=0.691$) and very uncomfortable (0.0% vs 16.7%; $p=0.691$)
170 in the Gel and No Gel group respectively. This is shown in table 8.

171

172

173 Discussion

174 The practice of speculum lubrication for vaginal examination is varied due to the fears that lubricants can
175 alter the adequacy of cytological smears. However, recent studies documenting the relationship between
176 speculum lubrication and Pap smear accuracy have showed evidence supporting that speculum lubrication
177 does not disrupt the evaluation of cytological smears.

178 Our findings revealed that there was no significant difference in the proportion of unsatisfactory cytology
179 smear results in the gel group and no gel group (13.6% vs 21.2%; $p=0.359$) respectively. This was similar
180 to the findings in previous studies.^{10,11,18,19} However; this was in contradiction to the findings of
181 Charoenkwan et al and Kosus et al which showed statistically significant greater numbers of unsatisfactory
182 smears in the participants that received speculum lubrication^{20,21}. The reason for the differing report by
183 Charoenkwan et al may be because; there was direct contamination of the smears with gel in their study as
184 against speculum lubrication employed in our present study. Similarly, in Kosus et al, the risk of
185 significantly higher inadequate results in the gel group could be because of the personnel that collected the
186 smears as majority were inexperienced trainees.²¹ The experience of the provider has been implicated as
187 one of the risk factors for smear inadequacy.^{11,18,19} Also there are some reports in the literature that suggest
188 that lubricants can affect the result of cervical cytology^{22,23} In most of these studies, lubricant gel was added
189 intentionally to Liquid based cytology specimens. Most of these study designs do not reflect actual clinical
190 practice.

191 The Bethesda system requires that Papanicolaou preparations must include enough cells to cover 10% of a
192 slide.¹⁸ If 75% of the epithelial cells are obscured by blood, inflammation, or artifact, the slide is considered
193 unsatisfactory.^{18,19} The reasons for the unsatisfactory smears in this study were scanty cells (87%) and
194 obscurity by inflammation (13%). This finding was similar between the two groups. Gel overlay or
195 obscurity by gel was not recorded as a reason for unsatisfactory results. This is similar to the findings by
196 Amies et al and Gilson et al where the reason for unsatisfactory result was obscurity by blood, inflammation
197 and gel overlay was not documented as a reason for unsatisfaction^{10,18}.

198 This study has revealed that higher pain scores were recorded in the no gel group compared to the gel group
199 ($p<0.001$). This finding agrees with previous studies by Uygur et al and Gungorduk et al where the pain
200 scores were significantly higher in the arm that did not use speculum lubrication^{11,24}. However, our findings
201 differ from the work of Gilson et al that reported that speculum lubrication did not affect pain and
202 discomfort¹⁰. The difference between the present study and that of Gilson et al may be because of the method
203 of assessment of the pain used. In the study by Gilson et al, pain was assessed using Wong-Baker Faces

204 Pain Rating Scale which is less effective method of pain measurement. while in this study Numeric rating
205 scale for pain which has been shown to be widely appropriate for pain evaluation globally was utilized.

206 All the samples came out negative for intraepithelial lesion or malignancy except one that was low grade
207 squamous intraepithelial lesion. There was no diagnosis of invasive cancer or high grade squamous
208 intraepithelial lesion. This absence or insignificant number of positive cytological reports of epithelial
209 lesions has also been reported by other studies.^{19,22} This might be explained by the fact that study population
210 was more of the asymptomatic younger age group, healthy volunteers and not the age group with higher
211 risk of positive cytological reports of epithelial lesions.

212 When the pain scores assessed were compared according to parity of the participants, it was observed that
213 the severity of the pains was seen at the extremes of parity. The reason for this peculiar finding may be
214 because at nulliparous state the vagina and introitus may be narrower than in the parous state. However, the
215 pain may also be more severe at higher parity because women with higher parity may have completed
216 family size and are older or may be postmenopausal resulting in the vaginal atrophy and vaginitis. These
217 conditions expectedly will elicit more pain reaction among the participants.

218 This study had revealed that more participants in Gel group (98.5% vs 92.4%; $p=0.208$) were more satisfied
219 in the Pap smear collection procedure than in the no Gel group, but the difference was not statistically
220 significant. In addition, equal proportion of the participants in each group (90.9% vs 90.9%; $p>0.999$) were
221 willing to come for repeat cervical smears in the future after undergoing initial cervical cancer screening.
222 This finding is not only interesting but encouraging. This could be explained by the fact that more than half
223 (67.4%) of the study population had tertiary education, and 28% had secondary education resulting in a
224 high level of awareness, knowledge and need for the uptake of the cervical screening among the study
225 population. In a previous review by Chorley et al, it was revealed that a single negative experience
226 prevented some women from re-attending screening, even if they had multiple positive previous
227 experiences to draw upon. However, the studies involved in the Chorley et al systematic review were not
228 randomized controlled trials and did not compare the failure at re-screening in women that received
229 speculum lubrication versus no speculum lubrication.²⁵

230 It was also noted that the reasons why some participants were unwilling to come for repeat testing in the
231 future was due to pain (66.7%) and discomfort (25%). Although these findings do not differ among the two
232 groups, it still helps to buttress the fact that pain while undergoing Pap smear collection is a strong reason
233 why some women would not present for repeating testing.

234 The strength of the study was that it is a double blind randomized controlled study. The study also employed
235 liquid based cytology thereby forming a literature base for future comparison as most of the studies in the
236 literature employed the conventional Pap smear technique. However, the limitation was that only one type
237 of water-based lubricant (KY-Jelly) was used, so results may not be applied to other kinds of lubricants.
238 Also, our study only utilized metal speculums so the findings may also not be applied to plastic type of
239 speculum. Perception of pain is complex and multifactorial, and so cultural, genetic and environmental
240 factors may affect these results in different populations. The study was a single center based hence multi-
241 center similar randomized studies are needed.

242 **Conclusion**

243 In conclusion, speculum lubrication did not affect the adequacy of the cervical cytology smears, satisfaction
244 for Pap smear procedure and the willingness to come for repeat cervical smears in the future after initial
245 cervical cancer screening but significantly reduced the pain and discomfort experienced at Pap smear
246 collection.

247 **Disclosure statement for publication**

248 This work or its part has not been submitted to another journal for publications. All the authors contributed
249 to conceptualization, or design, or drafting of manuscripts, or collection of data/data analysis and final
250 drafting and revision of manuscript for submission.

251 **Funding**

252 The researchers funded the research and none of the participants paid for the procedure or investigation

253 **Ethical considerations**

254 The study adhered to CONSORT guidelines²⁶. The approval for the study was obtained from the Ethics
255 committee of Nnamdi Azikiwe University Teaching Hospital Nnewi (NAUTH), Nnewi, Nigeria on 24th
256 September 2019 with the approval reference number: NAUTH /CS/66/VOL.12/098/2019/040. The study
257 was carried out in accordance with the ethical principles of clinical research involving human participants
258 according to Helsinki declarations

259 **Consent to participate**

260 All the recruited participants gave an informed written consent to participate in the study.

261

262 **Author contribution**

263 Chito P. Ilika, the principal author, was involved in the conceptualization/design of the study, manuscript
264 writing, revision, data collection. George U. Eleje; Michael E. Chiemeka, and Joseph I. Ikechebelu were
265 involved in manuscript writing, revision and supervision. Chigozie G. Okafor; Emmanuel O. Ugwu,
266 Ifeanyichukwu, J. Ofor, Onyecherelam M. Ogelle, Osita S. Umeononihu, Johnbosco E. Mamah, Chinedu
267 L. Olisa, Chijioke O. Ezeigwe, Malarchy E. Nwankwo and Chukwuemeka J. Ofojebe participated in
268 manuscript writing and revision. Frances N. Ilika; Valentine C. Ilika; Chidinma C. Okafor, Onyeka C.
269 Ekwebene and Obinna K. Nnabuchi participated in manuscript writing, revision and Data analysis.

270 **Trial Registration**

271 The Trial was registered with Pan-African-Clinical-Trial-Registry on 08/07/2020 with unique
272 identification/registration-no: PACTR2020077533364675.

273 **Acknowledgment**

274 The authors sincerely appreciate everyone that contributed to the success of this study especially the patients
275 that were recruited into the study and the NAUTH, Nnewi, Nigeria.

276 **Conflict of interest**

277 There was no conflict of interests.

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287 **References.**

- 288 1) Ferlay J, Colombet M, Soerjomataram I, Mathers C, Parkin DM. Estimating the global cancer
289 incidence and mortality in 2018: GLOBOCAN sources and methods. *Int J cancer*. 2019 Apr 15; 144
290 (8):1941-1953.
- 291 2) Eleje GU, Eke AC, Igberase GO, Igwegbe AO, Eleje LI. Palliative interventions for controlling vaginal
292 bleeding in advanced cervical cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019 Mar 19; 3: CD011000.
- 293 3) Mittal S, Kamath AJ. Cytological screening for cervical cancer in women of reproductive age group.
294 *Int J Reprod Contracept Obstet Gynecol* 2017; 6:5464-8.
- 295 4) White MC, Wong FL. Preventing premature deaths from breast and cervical cancers among
296 underserved women in the United States: insights gained from a national cancer screening
297 program. *Cancer Causes Control*, 2015; 26(5):805–9.
- 298 5) Miller JW, Royalty J, Henley J, White A, Richardson LC. Breast and cervical cancers diagnosed and
299 stage at diagnosis among women served through the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early
300 Detection Program. *Cancer Causes Control*, 2015; 26(5):741–7.
- 301 6) Ekwueme DU, Uzunangelov VJ, Hoerger TJ, Miller JW, Saraiya M, Benard VB. Impact of the National
302 Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program on cervical cancer mortality among uninsured
303 low-income women in the U.S., 1991–2007. *Am J Prev Med*. 2014; 47 (3):300–8.
- 304 7) Eleje GU, Eke AC, Igberase GO, Igwegbe AO, Eleje LI. Palliative interventions for controlling vaginal
305 bleeding in advanced cervical cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019 Mar 19; 3: CD011000.
306
- 307 8) Ikechebelu JI, Onyiaorah IV, Ugboaja JO, Anyiam DCD, Eleje GU. Clinicopathological analysis of
308 cervical cancer seen in a tertiary health facility in Nnewi, South-east Nigeria. *J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2010;
309 30(3):299-301.
- 310 9) Campos NG, Tsu V, Jeronimo J, Mvundura M, Kim JJ. Evidence-based policy choices for efficient and
311 equitable cervical cancer screening programs in low-resource settings. *Cancer Med*. 2017; 6(8):2008–
312 2014
- 313 10) Gilson M, Desai A, Cardoza-Favarato G, Vroman P, Thornton JA. Does gel affect cytology or comfort
314 in the screening Papanicolaou smear? *J Am Board Fam Med* 2006; 19:340–4.
- 315 11) Uygur D, Guler T ,Yayci E. Association of speculum lubrication with pain and Papanicolaou test
316 accuracy. *J Am Board Fam Med* 2012; 25:798-804.
- 317 12) Asiedu MN, Agudogo J, Krieger MS, et al. Design and preliminary analysis of a vaginal inserter for
318 speculum-free cervical cancer screening. *PLoS One*. 2017; 12(5):e0177782. Published 2017 May 31.

- 319 **13)** Wright D, Fenwick J, Stephenson P, Monterosso L. Speculum 'self-insertion': a pilot study. *J Clin Nurs*,
320 2005; 14(9): 1098–1111.
- 321 **14)** JK, Pathak PK, Maney R. Is liquid based Pap testing affected by water based lubricant? *Obstet Gynecol*
322 2006; 107; 66-70.
- 323 **15)** Pergialiotis V, Vlachos DG, Rodolakis A, Thomakos N. The effect of vaginal lubrication on
324 unsatisfactory results of cervical smears. *J Low Genit Tract Dis*. 2015 Jan; 19(1):55-61.
- 325 **16)** Allan GM, Korownyk C, Ivers N. Papanicolaou tests: does lubricant reduce the quality or
326 adequacy? *Can Fam Physician* 2011; **57**:309.
- 327 **17)** Harmanli O, Jones KA. Using lubricant for speculum insertion. *Obstet Gynecol* 2010;116(2 Pt 1):415–
328 7.
- 329 **18)** Amies AM, Miller L, Lee SK, Koutsky L. The effect of vaginal speculum lubrication on the rate of
330 unsatisfactory cervical cytology diagnosis. *Obstet Gynecol* 2002; 100(5 pt 1):889Y92.
- 331 **19)** Griffith WF, Stuart GS, Gluck KL. Vaginal speculum lubrication and its effects on cervical cytology
332 and microbiology. *Contraception* 2005; 72: 60-4.
- 333 **20)** Charoenkwan K, Ninunanahaeminda K, Khunamornpong S, Srisomboon. Effects of gel lubricant on
334 cervical cytology. *Acta Cytol* 2008;52(6):654–658
- 335 **21)** Köşüş A, Köşüş N, Duran M, Haltas H. Effect of liquid-based gel application during speculum
336 examination on satisfactory level of smear examination. *Arch Gynecol Obstet* 2012; 285:1599–602.
- 337 **22)** Holton T, Smith D, Terry M, Madgwick A, Levine T. The effect of lubricant contamination on
338 ThinPrep® (Cytoc) cervical cytology liquid based preparations. *Cytopathology*. 2008;19(4):236-243.
- 339 **23)** Abdullgaffar B, Kamal MO, Khalid M, Samuel R, AlGhufli R. Lubricant, mucus, and other
340 contaminant materials as a potential source of interpretation errors in ThinPrep cervical cytology. *J*
341 *Low Genit Tract Dis* 2010;14(1):22-8.
- 342 **24)** Gungorduk K, Ozdemir A, Gokcu M, Sancı M. Does lubrication of the vaginal speculum reduce pain
343 during a gynaecological oncologic examination? *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 2015; 184:84-8.
- 344 **25)** Chorley AJ, Marlow LAV, Forster AS, Haddrell JB, Waller J. Experiences of cervical screening and
345 barriers to participation in the context of an organised programme: a systematic review and thematic
346 synthesis. *Psychooncology*. 2017; 26:161–72.
- 347 **26)** Falci SG, Marques LS. CONSORT: when and how to use it. *Dental Press J Orthod*. 2015 May-Jun;
348 20(3):13-5.doi:10.1590/2176-9451.20.3,013-015.ebo.PMID: 26154451; PMCID: PMC4520133.

350 **List of Table legends**

- 351 1. Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of the participants
- 352 2. Table 2: Comparison of cytology smear adequacy and cytological diagnosis of Pap Smears results
- 353 among the study participants.
- 354 3. Table 3: Comparison of the reasons for unsatisfactory smear results as reported by the
- 355 histopathologist.
- 356 4. Table 4: Comparison of Pain scores of the participants
- 357 5. Table 5: Comparison of Pain scores of the participants using Mann-Whitney U Test
- 358 6. Table 6: Association between category of pain and parity among the participants
- 359 7. Table 7: Satisfaction for Pap smear procedure and willingness for repeat of Pap smear among the
- 360 study participants.
- 361 8. Table 8: Participants' Reasons for unwillingness to repeat Pap smear test.

362

363

364 **Figure Legend**

- 365 i. Figure 1. Consort flowchart study participants

366

367

368

369

370

371


372

373

374

375

376



377

378 Figure 1: Consort flowchart for study participants

379

380

381

382

383

384

385 Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of the participants

Variables		Study Group		Total (%)	χ^2	p-value
		GEL (%)	No Gel (%)			
Age (in years)	25-34	25 (37.9)	23 (34.8)	48 (36.4)	0.589	0.911
	35-44	19 (28.8)	23 (34.8)	42 (31.8)		
	45-54	17 (25.8)	15 (22.7)	32 (24.2)		
	55 and above	5 (7.6)	5 (7.6)	10 (7.6)		
Marital status	Single	16 (24.2)	16 (24.2)	32 (24.2)	2.094	0.568†
	Married	43 (65.2)	47 (71.2)	90 (68.2)		
	Separated/Divorced	1 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.8)		
	Widowed	6 (9.1)	3 (4.5)	9 (6.8)		
Tribe	Igbo	65 (98.5)	65 (98.5)	130 (98.5)	2.812	>0.999†
	Ijaw	1 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.8)		
	Benin	0 (0.0)	1 (1.5)	1 (0.8)		
Educational status	Primary	4 (6.1)	2 (3.0)	6 (4.5)	0.711	0.819†
	Secondary	18 (27.3)	19 (28.8)	37 (28.0)		
	Tertiary	44 (66.7)	45 (68.2)	89 (67.4)		
Parity	P ₀	30 (45.5)	31 (47.0)	61 (46.2)	7.706	0.258†
	P ₁	9 (13.6)	5 (7.6)	14 (10.6)		
	P ₂	4 (6.1)	4 (6.1)	8 (6.1)		
	P ₃	2 (3.0)	6 (9.1)	8 (6.1)		

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

P_4	12 (18.2)	7 (10.6)	19 (14.4)
P_5	3 (4.5)	9 (13.6)	12 (9.1)
$P_{>5}$	6 (9.1)	4 (6.1)	10 (7.6)

386 † means Fishers Exact test applied.

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409 Table 2: Comparison of cytology smear adequacy and cytological diagnosis of Pap Smears results among
410 the study participants

Variables	Study Group		Total (%)	χ^2	p-value	
	GEL (%)	No Gel (%)				
Smear sample status	Satisfactory	57 (86.4)	52 (78.8)	109 (82.6)	1.316	0.359
	Unsatisfactory	9 (13.6)	14 (21.2)	23 (17.4)		
PAP smear result	LSIL	0 (0.0)	1 (1.9)	1 (0.9)	1.106	0.477†
	NILM	57 (100.0)	51 (98.1)	108 (99.1)		

411 † Fisher's Exact test used. LSIL = Low Grade Squamous Intraepithelial Lesion; NILM= Negative for
412 Intraepithelial lesion or malignancy

413

414

415 Table 3: Comparison of the reasons for unsatisfactory smear results as reported by the histopathologist

	Gel (%)	No Gel (%)	Total (%)	Test value	p-value
Obscured by marked inflammation	1 (11.1)	2 (14.3)	3 (13.0)	4.740	0.691†
Scanty cells*	8 (88.9)	12 (85.7)	20 (87.0)		
Total	9 (100.0)	14 (100.0)	23 (100.0)		

416 † Fisher's Exact test used.* Drying artifact due to gel was not reported by the histopathologist

417

418

419 Table 4: Comparison of Pain scores of the participants

Variables	Study Group		Total (%)	χ^2	p-value
	GEL (%)	No Gel (%)			
Numeric rating scale for pain (0 = no pain, 10 = worst pain)	1	23 (34.8)	1 (1.5)	24 (18.2)	
	2	13 (19.7)	1 (1.5)	14 (10.6)	
	3	10 (15.2)	0 (0.0)	10 (7.6)	
	4	2 (3.0)	12 (18.2)	14 (10.6)	
	5	6 (9.1)	17 (25.8)	23 (17.4)	
	6	7 (10.6)	16 (24.2)	23 (17.4)	
	7	2 (3.0)	11 (16.7)	13 (9.8)	
	8	3 (4.5)	5 (7.6)	8 (6.1)	
	9	0 (0.0)	1 (1.5)	1 (0.8)	
	10	0 (0.0)	2 (3.0)	2 (1.5)	
Pain Category	Mild	46 (69.7)	2 (3.0)	48 (36.4)	63.500 <0.001
	Moderate	15 (22.7)	45 (68.2)	60 (45.5)	
	Severe	5 (7.6)	19 (28.8)	24 (18.2)	

420 Mild= 1-3, moderate = 4-6, severe = 7-10

421

422

423

424 Table 5: Comparison of Pain scores of the participants using Mann-Whitney U Test

	GEL (%)	No GEL (%)	Mann-Whitney U	Z- value	p-value
Mean Rank pain score	45.04	87.96	761.500	-6.514	<0.001*
Sum of ranks	2972.50	5805.50			

425 There is significant higher pain in the No-Gel group compared to the Gel group (U = 761.5, p < 0.001)

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445 Table 6: Association between category of pain and parity among the participants

Parity	Pain Category	Study Arms (%)		χ^2	p-value
		Gel	No Gel		
P₀	Mild	21 (70.0)	2 (6.5)	26.216	<0.001
	Moderate	6 (20.0)	19 (61.3)		
	Severe	3 (10.0)	10 (32.3)		
P₁	Mild	6 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	6.031†	0.056
	Moderate	2 (22.2)	4 (80.0)		
	Severe	1 (11.1)	1 (20.0)		
P₂	Mild	2 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	2.766†	0.429
	Moderate	2 (50.0)	3 (75.0)		
	Severe	0 (0.0)	1 ((25.0)		
P₃	Mild	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	2.895†	0.286
	Moderate	1 (50.0)	4 (66.7)		
	Severe	0 (0.0)	2 (33.3)		
P₄	Mild	9 (75.0)	0 (0.0)	10.276†	0.003
	Moderate	2 (16.7)	4 (57.1)		
	Severe	1 (8.3)	3 (42.9)		
P₅	Mild	2 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	5.660†	0.045
	Moderate	1 (33.3)	8 (88.9)		

	Severe	0 (0.0)	1 (11.1)		
p>5	Mild	5 (83.3)	0 (0.0)	6.407†	0.024
	Moderate	1 (16.7)	3 (75.0)		
	Severe	0 (0.0)	1 (25.0)		

446 † Fisher’s Exact test used.

447

448

449

450 Table 7: Satisfaction for Pap smear procedure and willingness for repeat of Pap smear among the study
451 participants

Variables	Study Group			Total (%)	χ^2	p-value
		GEL (%)	No Gel (%)			
Satisfied with the PAP smear procedure?	YES	65 (98.5)	61 (92.4)	126 (95.5)	2.794	0.208†
	NO	1 (1.5)	5 (7.6)	6 (4.5)		
Total		66 (100)	66 (100)	132 (100)		
Are you willing to come for repeat testing in future?	YES	60 (90.9)	60 (90.9)	120 (90.9)	0.000	>0.999
	NO	6 (9.1)	6 (9.1)	12 (9.1)		
Total		66 (100)	66 (100)	132 (100)		

452 † Fisher’s Exact test used.

453

454

455

456

457

458


459

460 Table 8: Participants' Reasons for unwillingness to repeat Pap smear test

	Gel (%)	No Gel (%)	Total (%)	Test value	p-value
Discomforting	2 (33.3)	1 (16.7)	3 (25.0)	1.409	>0.999†
Painful	4 (66.7)	4 (66.7)	8 (66.7)		
Very uncomfortable	0 (0.0)	1 (16.7)	1 (8.3)		
Total	6 (100.0)	6 (100.0)	12 (100.0)		

461 † Fisher's Exact test used.

462



Figure