

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

The impact of relationship to cancer patient and extent of caregiving on adherence to cancer screening in a diverse inner-city community

Cynthia Matsumura¹, Brieyona C. Reaves¹, Bruce D. Rapkin¹

¹Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, New York, United States of America

23

Abstract

24 **Introduction**

25 The number of individuals called upon to provide support for cancer patients within their
26 personal networks is steadily increasing. Prior studies show that caregiver screening
27 rates either decrease due to caregiving demands and associated fatalism or increase
28 due to risk perception and healthcare involvement. However, there remains a gap in
29 research in understanding how cancer screening relates to extent of caregiving and
30 relationship to cancer patient, particularly non-family/spouse. This study aims to assess
31 the impact of degrees of relationship to cancer patient(s) and extent of caregiving on
32 adherence to breast, cervical, prostate, and colorectal cancer screening guidelines.

33 **Methods**

34 Participants of Bronx, New York were recruited online or through community events to
35 complete a set of core items adapted from the NCI Health Information National Trends
36 Survey and other sources. Logistic regression analyses identified factors associated
37 with variation in screening.

38 **Results**

39 Analyses were based on 1430 participants (73% female, mean age 50 years, 43%
40 Hispanic). An unexpectedly large proportion had cancer within their families (72%)
41 and/or provided some support to a cancer patient (79%). Four support patterns were
42 found- none, emotional support only, less intensive, and more intensive support.
43 Women who provided emotional support only were less likely to be screened for breast
44 and cervical cancer. Among more active caregivers, cervical and prostate cancer
45 screening were greater among those who provided more intensive support.

46 **Conclusions**

47 Having family or friends with cancer is a normative experience that affects one's own
48 preventive care. Those with a family member or spouse with cancer have increased
49 personal screening. As involvement in cancer caregiving deepens, one's own screening
50 rises. Caregivers that provided only emotional support are the exception, potentially
51 because they have greater distance from the cancer experience. Findings suggest the
52 potential value of tailoring interventions to address personal experiences with cancer
53 caregiving.

54 **Introduction**

55
56 The incidence of cancer continues to rise and with it, the number of individuals in the
57 community called upon to provide support and care for cancer patients. Cancer remains
58 the second leading cause of death in the United States, and 15 million people are
59 projected to be diagnosed by the year 2020 [1,2]. Due to advances in treatment,
60 diagnosed patients now have the chance to live longer, though not without a lengthy
61 cancer experience. As such, exposure to cancer in one's personal networks and
62 provision of support for family and friends with cancer have become normative
63 experiences [3]. Indeed, over the adult lifespan, individuals may provide support and
64 care for multiple family members and friends affected by cancer. Cancer caregivers
65 assume significant supportive roles, ranging from emotional support, meal provision,
66 financial assistance, housing accommodation, household management, treatment
67 coordination, and accompaniment during hospital visits [4]. The extent of cancer
68 caregiving often depends on the complexities surrounding the care of a particular

69 patient. The unique nature of the diagnosis, including cancer type, stage, and treatment,
70 in part determines the duration and intensity of caregiving needs [5]. Extent of
71 caregiving is also influenced by patients' needs and capacities, particularly for spouses,
72 children and others who remain with the patient throughout their cancer journey. When
73 patients require daily assistance, caregiving can become a full-time job of coordinating
74 care and meeting the escalating demands of decision-making and problem-solving. In
75 low-income communities, social determinants of health can exacerbate stress
76 associated with cancer caregiving [6,7]. Even caregivers less directly involved in
77 personal or practical aspects of care can face challenges helping patients cope with
78 emotional needs. Given this broad range of caregiving experiences, it is worthwhile to
79 consider how the varying challenges and demands faced by cancer caregivers affects
80 their own cancer screening behavior.

81

82 **Caregiver stress and burden**

83

84 It has been well-documented that caregivers' own self-care and health seeking behavior
85 may be affected by the level of physical and psychological burden associated with the
86 role [8,9]. Studies have paralleled caregivers' slow deterioration of physical health with
87 the accumulation of chronic stress, which in turn is associated with inflammatory
88 processes and increased relative risk of cardiovascular disease [10,11]. Beyond the
89 amount of time devoted to caregiving or the severity of patient symptoms, caregivers'
90 experience of burden is also associated with feelings of lower self-efficacy and
91 inadequacy to perform what is expected [12,13]. The loss of predictability that is often

92 tied to cancer can overwhelm caregivers' perception of control and lead to anxiety and
93 depression. Caregivers may also become socially isolated, worsening mental health
94 symptoms as well as sleep disturbances and fatigue [14,15]. The stress of caregiving
95 can exacerbate health-risk behaviors and pose as a perceived barrier in the ability to
96 preserve one's health [7,8]. Although adopting healthy behaviors could safeguard
97 against these detrimental health effects, caregivers often have little time or energy to
98 focus on their own well-being.

99

100 **Cancer fatalism**

101

102 An examination of the 2007 National Cancer Institute's Health Information National
103 Trends Survey (HINTS) data found that those with personal or familial exposure to
104 cancer are more likely to worry about getting cancer, to agree that they will develop
105 cancer in the future, and to disagree that cancer is most often caused by individuals'
106 behavior or lifestyle [16]. A driver of these attitudes towards cancer are fatalistic beliefs
107 that events are inevitable, and human behavior cannot influence health outcomes. This
108 may be further reinforced by the belief that genetic factors determine cancer risk, not
109 lifestyle factors [17]. A recent study found that women held a strong misconception that
110 heredity was the most important factor in developing breast and colorectal cancer [18].
111 Lower educational levels and lower income are also correlated with lower levels of
112 health literacy, which in turn is associated with fatalistic cancer beliefs [19,20].
113 Helplessness associated with this sort of fatalism leads to reduced motivation to
114 maintain health behavior and to adhere to preventive screening [21,22].

115

116 **Caregiver risk perception and rates of screening**

117

118 Along with the stresses associated with caregiving, studies have also shown that
119 caregivers can become more cognizant of their own risks. This awareness of risk may
120 either exacerbate or offset distress associated with demands of caregiving. For
121 example, first-degree familial relations of cancer patients may worry that they are also at
122 risk for cancer due to family history. Even without explicit familial risk factors or genetic
123 syndromes, supporting a family member with cancer can lead caregivers to become
124 increasingly conscious of their own risk [23]. This heightened sense of risk may be
125 adaptive, leading caregivers to seek cancer information [24]. Prior studies have found
126 that greater family history predicts breast and colorectal cancer screening [25,26]. They
127 suggest that individuals who perceived that they were at greater risk of developing
128 cancer themselves are more aware of recommended guidelines and more motivated to
129 be screened. This also pertains to the greater use of preventive services, as well as
130 efforts to achieve healthy lifestyles with diet, exercise, smoking cessation, and
131 decreased alcohol consumption [9,27,28,29].

132

133 **Situational influences on caregivers' health behavior**

134

135 For spousal and familial relations of cancer patients, the shift in health behavior may
136 result from shared social context. Recent studies suggest that as the cancer patient
137 changes his or her health behaviors, the partner is also likely to do so [27]. As the main

138 confidante in a family member's journey to survivorship, caregivers themselves are
139 presented with more opportunities to reflect upon the consequences of not pursuing
140 screening. They also spend more time around providers, with ready access to
141 preventive services [30]. However, this may be counterbalanced by demands on
142 caregivers' time, finances, and motivation to take on another health issue. Cancer
143 caregivers may be more inclined than others to consider cancer screening and early
144 detection in terms of financial implications or cost-benefits [18]. Those exposed to
145 cancer patients may observe firsthand the significant economic and physical burden of
146 the disease and desire to prevent the same hardship for themselves and their families.
147 Rather than becoming fatalistic, it is ideal if these caregivers can become proactive
148 regarding their own health.

150 **Study goals and hypotheses**

151
152 Earlier studies support two competing hypotheses regarding caregivers' adherence to
153 recommended cancer screenings: caregivers either have lower than expected rates of
154 screening due to the demands of caregiving, perceived lack of control and fatalistic
155 beliefs, or caregivers increase their rates of screening due to proximity to the cancer
156 patient, direct awareness of the consequences of cancer, and involvement with the
157 healthcare system.

158
159 However, few studies have considered caregivers' cancer screening in light of the
160 interplay between caregivers' extent of caregiving and their relationship to patient.

161 Research considering the full range of caregiving roles, including involvement of non-
162 family/non-spousal caregivers, is particularly limited. Prior studies have grouped them
163 with relatives and partners as informal caregivers (persons who are unpaid and without
164 formal health care education) but have not studied how they may differ in their health
165 behavior [31]. An investigation of these relationships can produce a more
166 comprehensive understanding of how to address prevention and planning of care for
167 cancer caregivers [9].

168
169 This observational study draws upon a purposive sample of the population of the Bronx,
170 New York. The Bronx is the poorest county in New York State, designated as a
171 persistent poverty community by the USDA and a health services shortage area by
172 HRSA. Residents are predominately Latinx and non-Hispanic Black. Due to low
173 socioeconomic status and associated social determinants of health, Bronx residents are
174 already vulnerable to factors that discourage self-care. In these analyses, we examine
175 how caregivers' relationship to cancer patient(s) and extent of caregiving is associated
176 with challenges with adherence to age- and sex-specific guidelines for breast, cervical,
177 prostate, and colorectal cancer screening. The study also examines whether cancer
178 attitudes, perceived risk of developing cancer, and number of barriers to care were
179 associated with the caregiving relationship and extent of caregiving.

180
181 We hypothesize that respondents' screening will be positively associated with their
182 closeness to cancer patients (e.g., spouse vs family vs friend vs none) and with the
183 intensity of support provided to cancer patients (e.g., more intensive support, less

184 intensive support, emotional support only, no support). However, we will also examine
185 the competing hypothesis that greater caregiving demands may be associated with
186 fatalistic attitudes and beliefs about cancer and negatively impact screening behavior.
187 Our analyses will examine whether and how these factors compete and combine to
188 influence screening.

189

190 **Materials and Methods**

191

192 **Participant selection**

193

194 This survey was performed as part of a larger observational study by the Montefiore
195 Einstein Cancer Center (MECC) to assess the cancer attitudes, health risks and health
196 behavior evident in the diverse population of Bronx, New York. It was part of a larger
197 NCI effort to collect local data from designated cancer centers' catchment areas to
198 compile and compare with the national HINTS survey.

199

200 The Bronx is the catchment area served by MECC, characterized by very low
201 socioeconomic status, marked ethnic and racial diversity, and poor health outcomes.

202 The collection of data was initiated in May 2017 and completed in February 2018.

203 Inclusion criteria included adults 18 to 74 years of age, who speak English or Spanish,

204 and who reside in the Bronx at the time of survey. Survey participants were either

205 recruited online, through email addresses provided to our health system or in-person, at

206 community events. Email addresses were obtained through the hospital Electronic

207 Health Record (EHR). To increase likelihood of connecting with the intended
208 participants, we limited the email list to individuals who had a provider visit at least once
209 in the prior three years. Prior to initiating email waves, we stratified the list according to
210 Bronx community district of residence, age, and sex. We monitored responses in real
211 time and adjusted subsequent waves of email to ensure our sample included adequate
212 representation of males and younger respondents. We sent approximately 130,000
213 email invitations to complete the survey. Of this number, 6497 (5%) opened the email
214 and clicked on the REDCap survey link or contacted our toll-free number to schedule a
215 telephone interview. An additional 44 individuals were recruited at events held at
216 community venues (e.g., churches, schools, medical centers, homeless shelters) or
217 from locations within the community with heavy foot traffic (e.g., shopping centers). After
218 deduplication and removal of mostly empty records, 1883 (29%) provided usable data.
219 These individuals could complete the survey using REDCap, by telephone or in person
220 with paper and pencil. A total of 1430 respondents (76%) provided complete data on
221 family caregiving necessary for the present study.

222

223 **Survey development**

224

225 All participants completed a set of core items determined by a group of investigators
226 conducting this survey at 15 different cancer centers participating in the NCI's
227 Population Health Assessment Initiative [32]. Core survey domains included
228 demographics, health information seeking, access and barriers to health care, cancer
229 screening knowledge and behavior, tobacco usage, cancer beliefs, awareness of risk,

230 and barriers to care. Subsets of study participants were also randomly assigned to
231 complete one of two supplemental modules, either to describe a recent health care
232 episode or to assess social determinants of health, chronic conditions, and quality of
233 life. The variables included in these analyses were drawn from the core set of items
234 completed by all patients.

235

236 **Measures**

237

238 **Independent variable: extent of cancer caregiving.**

239 Our primary independent variable is the extent of cancer caregiving. To assess
240 caregiving, we asked respondents to indicate the types of support they had ever
241 provided to family or friends with cancer on a 12-item checklist- personal care,
242 household chores, accompaniment to appointments and other errands, help making
243 decisions about their care, help with money, rent, or other expenses, provision of a
244 place to stay, and emotional support. Participants were able to make as many
245 selections as applicable or indicate that they had not provided any support.

246

247 **Dependent variables: adherence to cancer screening.**

248 Our main dependent variables addressed adherence to age and gender appropriate
249 cancer screening recommendations. All items of the cancer screening modules were
250 adapted from HINTS. Binary variables indicating adherence were derived for each

251 screening modality, as described below. Note that individuals who responded that they
252 'don't know or don't remember being screened' were coded as being unscreened.

253

254 1. Survey questions for colorectal cancer screening were only presented to men
255 and women over the age of 50, in accordance with the US Preventive Services'
256 guidelines in place at the time of the survey. Participants were asked if they have
257 ever had a blood stool test, colonoscopy, or sigmoidoscopy, and how long it had
258 been since their last home kit test or exam. We chose to analyze whether the
259 individual had ever had one of the approved screens.

260 2. The survey module for breast cancer screening was limited to only female
261 participants ages 40 and above. This section assessed whether the respondent
262 had ever had a mammogram, and if so, the time since their last mammogram.
263 For this analysis, we examined factors associated with mammography
264 completion in the past two years.

265 3. The module for cervical cancer screening was identical to the breast cancer
266 screening module but administered to all women participating in the survey.
267 Adherence to cervical cancer screening guidelines was assessed in terms of
268 completion of a pap test within the past two years.

269 4. Inclusion criteria for prostate cancer screening was limited to men aged 40 and
270 over. Given the USPSTF's Grade C recommendation regarding PSA testing
271 among men ages 55 to 69, participants were asked if a health care provider ever
272 talked about the pros and cons of having a PSA test to look for possible signs of
273 prostate cancer, as well as whether they had ever received the test. These two

274 variables were nearly identical, so our analysis included whether men had ever
275 had a PSA test.

276

277 **Moderator: relationship to cancer patient(s).**

278 Respondents' degree of exposure to friends and family with cancer was treated as both
279 a covariate and a potential moderator of the impact of caregiving experiences on
280 screening. Two binary items examined the participants' exposure to cancer: (1) Have
281 any of your blood relatives ever been told by a doctor that they had cancer? This
282 includes parents, grandparents, brothers, sisters, children, or grandchildren, and 2) Has
283 your spouse or partner ever been told by a doctor that she or he had cancer? In
284 addition, we also controlled for whether respondents themselves had ever been
285 diagnosed with cancer.

286

287 **Covariates: cancer attitudes, beliefs, and awareness.**

288 Six items from HINTS were used to evaluate cancer attitudes and beliefs: (1) It seems
289 like everything causes cancer, (2) There's not much you can do to lower your chances
290 of getting cancer, (3) There are so many different recommendations about preventing
291 cancer, it is hard to know which ones to follow, (4) When I think about cancer, I
292 automatically think about death, (5) Cancer is most often caused by a person's behavior
293 or lifestyle, and (6) I'd rather not know my chances of getting cancer. All items were
294 assessed using a 4-point scale with selections ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly
295 disagree.'

296

297 **Covariates: chances of getting cancer.**

298 One item from HINTS was included to examine how relationship to cancer patient and
299 extent of caregiving roles affected perception of personal risk: ‘Compared to other
300 people your age, how likely are you to get cancer in your lifetime?’ Respondents
301 indicated their likelihood of getting cancer on a 5-point scale, with selections ranging
302 from ‘much less likely’ to ‘about the same’ to ‘much more likely.’ In order to fully explore
303 risk perception, we derived three variables from this item. First was a linear measure of
304 perceived risk. To avoid missing data on this measure, people who responded that they
305 did not know their perceived risk were assigned the midpoint score of 3, “about the
306 same risk as others my age.” Second, we included a binary variable to distinguish
307 people who indicated that they did not know their risk compared to other respondents.
308 In addition to providing a statistical correction for imputation of the missing value, this
309 variable also allowed us to consider whether unwillingness or inability to judge one’s
310 own cancer risk was a meaningful predictor of behavior. Third, we included a quadratic
311 (squared) risk score to address the possibility that extreme high and extreme low
312 perceived risk could each discourage screening.

313

314 **Covariates: barriers to care.**

315 Participants chose all that applied from the following measures for why they could not
316 see a doctor when they needed to within the past 12 months: (1) Cost, (2) Lack of time,
317 (3) Transportation, (4) Caring for children, (5) Caring for other family members, (6) Work
318 or school responsibilities, (7) Family disagreements about what to do, (8) Emotional
319 upset or stress, (9) Illness or fatigue, (10) Difficulties related to housing, (11) Legal

320 difficulties, or (12) Other. Given the relatively small number of people reporting five or
321 more barriers, we rescaled this count variable to indicate the number of barriers as
322 either zero, one, two, three, or four or greater.

323

324 **Data analysis**

325

326 **Describing relationship to cancer patient(s) and patterns of cancer** 327 **support.**

328 All statistical analyses were implemented using SPSS version 27.0. Descriptive
329 statistics were performed to characterize the study sample, including relationship to
330 people with cancer and extent of support provided to cancer patients. We divided the
331 sample into three groups to describe presence of cancer in the family: those with no
332 family indicated, with family but no spouse, and spouse with/without family. We derived
333 categorical variables to describe different patterns of caregiving support provided by the
334 respondent, which are defined below. Note that this included support for cancer patients
335 outside the family.

336

337 **Evaluating the effects of provision of cancer support on caregivers'** 338 **adherence to cancer screening.**

339 We conducted a series of logistic regression analyses to examine the effects of
340 caregiving for cancer patients on respondents' cancer screening. Dependent variables
341 for these analyses included screening measures described above. The sample size

342 differed for each logistic regression analysis and was based on respondents with
343 complete data eligible for a given screening modality by virtue of age and sex. We
344 conducted separate analyses of colorectal screening within sex, to allow comparison
345 with the other screening modalities that are sex specific. To isolate the independent
346 contributions of family involvement on screening, a variety of covariates were entered
347 into the regression model. Covariates were selected a priori because of their anticipated
348 relationships with cancer screening adherence. Covariates were permitted to enter
349 regression models at $p < 0.10$ using forward selection and were considered in the
350 following hierarchical order:

- 351
352 1. Demographic measures: Age, Race (Black, White, Other), Ethnicity (Hispanic
353 Origin)
- 354 2. Personal and Familial Exposure to Cancer: Personal (1,0), Family Member (1,0),
355 Spouse/Partner (1,0)
- 356 3. Number of Barriers (from 0 to 12)
- 357 4. Perceived Personal Risk of Cancer: Rating of Risk (1 to 4), Squared Risk, Don't
358 Know Risk (1, 0)
- 359 5. Cancer Attitudes: Six items, summarized into three orthogonal dimensions using
360 principal components analysis: Pessimistic/Fatalistic about Cancer Outcomes;
361 Preference to Not Learn One's Own Risk of Cancer; Belief that Cancer is Mostly
362 Caused by One's Behavior or Lifestyle (standardized scores)

363 On each step, we retained only covariates that contributed significantly to the model.
364 This hierarchical order of entry prioritized variables referring to personal and family

365 history of cancer before considering perceptions and attitudes. Instances of
366 multicollinearity among covariates are noted below in our description of regression
367 results.

368
369 The primary independent variable, extent of cancer caregiving, was entered next after
370 all significant covariates. This variable was represented by using orthogonal contrast
371 codes to distinguish the four levels of support provided to cancer patients that were
372 observed in the data. In the final step of the regression, we entered interaction effects to
373 determine whether and how the impact of caregiving on respondents' own cancer
374 screening differed, depending upon whether respondents' closest relationship with a
375 cancer patient was with a spouse/partner, family member, friend, or no caregiving
376 relationship. As the primary independent variable, all main effects and interactions
377 involving patterns of cancer caregiving were tested at $p < 0.05$ level of significance.

378

379

Results

380

381 Sample demographic characteristics

382 A total of 1430 participants with complete data met our study entry criteria. The
383 participants averaged 50 years (± 15 years) and were 73% female. The survey
384 participants were 32% non-Hispanic Black, 21% non-Hispanic White, 43% Hispanic any
385 race. Both the More Intensive and Less Intensive support groups (52 years) were older
386 than Emotional Only (50 years) and No Support (46 years) ($p < 0.001$). Both Blacks and
387 Whites were more likely to have family with cancer than to have no family indicated

388 (54.5% vs. 38.6%; $p < 0.001$; 62.9% vs. 28.1%; $p < 0.001$). Hispanics were also more
389 likely to have family with cancer than have no family indicated (58.9% vs. 32.4%;
390 $p < 0.001$). Whites were more likely to provide More Intensive support compared to Black
391 and Other race (41.6% vs. 34.3%, 31.6%; $p = 0.05$). Blacks provided More Intensive
392 support than any other level of support (34.3% vs. 29.1%; $p = 0.05$).

393

394 **Provision of cancer support**

395 Patterns of provision of support were determined using descriptive statistics and cluster
396 analysis. Two groups were immediately apparent: 402 (28.1%) respondents indicated
397 that they had not provided support to a cancer patient, and 251 respondents (17.6%)
398 provided emotional support only. On the 12-item checklist, the remaining 777
399 participants indicated that they had provided several types of support. K-means cluster
400 analysis was used to determine how to best characterize this subsample. We divided
401 these caregivers into two groups- 260 (18.2%) who provided Less Intensive support and
402 517 (36.2%) who provided More Intensive support.

403

404 **Relationship to cancer patient(s)**

405 When stratified by the relationship to cancer patient(s), 527 (36.9%) indicated no family
406 member with cancer, 792 (55.4%) with family, and 111 (7.8%) with spouse with cancer.
407 Of those with spouse with cancer, 86 (78%) reported that they also had additional family
408 members with cancer.

409

410 **Personal history of cancer**

411 Participants with a past diagnosis of cancer were more likely to also have family with
412 cancer (60.6% vs. 55.0%; $p=0.03$) and to provide some form of support, whether it was
413 Emotional Support Only (18.2% vs. 17.3%; $p=0.003$), Less Intensive support (26.3% vs.
414 17.3%; $p=0.003$), or More Intensive support (39.4% vs. 36.0%; $p=0.003$).

415

416 **Barriers to care**

417 The most prevalent barriers to care were family disagreement about what to do (327)
418 and illness or fatigue (336). The mean number of barriers to care was highest for those
419 without family with cancer (1.04; $p=0.008$), followed by those with family with cancer
420 (0.93; $p=0.008$) and those with spouse and family with cancer (0.71; $p=0.008$).

421

422 **Main results – associations of caregiving to caregivers' own** 423 **cancer screening**

424

425 **Women breast cancer screening in the past two years.**

426 Among 653 women over age 40, 541 women (82.8%) were adherent while 112 (17.2%)
427 reported not having had a mammogram in the past two years. In unadjusted analysis,
428 adherence to breast screening was unrelated to women's caregiving roles ($\chi^2 = 4.19$,
429 ns). However, planned comparisons showed that individuals who provided Emotional
430 Support Only were less likely to be screened than those who provided additional forms
431 of support (OR = 0.60; 95% CI = 0.36, 0.99; $p=0.04$). Significant covariates in logistic
432 regression related to screening in the past two years included older age (adj OR = 1.06;

433 90% CI = 1.04, 1.08) and fewer reported barriers to care (adj OR = 0.83; 90% CI = 0.71,
434 0.97). After taking these covariates into account, we found that adherence to
435 mammography was no longer associated with cancer caregiving differences.
436 Examination of interaction effects demonstrated that the association of caregiving role
437 with mammography depended on respondents' relationships with cancer patients (Fig
438 1). Among the group that indicated having no family member or spouse with cancer
439 (blue line), rates of mammography were slightly higher among those who had provided
440 More Intensive support to non-family member. In the group that had provided support to
441 family members (orange line), mammography screening was markedly lower among
442 those who provided Emotional Support Only. In contrast, among those who had
443 provided care for spouses, screening was notably lower among those who provided
444 More Intensive levels of support (grey line).

445

446 I. Fig 1. Mammography in the past two years – relationship with cancer patient by level
447 of support.

448

449 **Women cervical cancer screening in the past two years.**

450 Among 1005 women, 737 (73%) were adherent while 268 (27%) report not having had
451 cervical cancer screening in the past two years. In unadjusted analysis, adherence to
452 pap testing was unrelated to women's caregiving roles ($\chi^2 = 2.53$, ns). Significant
453 covariates in logistic regression related to screening in the past two years included
454 younger age (adj OR= 0.96; 90% CI = 0.95, 0.97), being Hispanic (adj OR= 1.57; 90%
455 CI = 1.17, 2.12) and fewer barriers to care (adj OR= 0.82; 90% CI = 0.74, 0.91). Women

456 who described their race as either Black or White (versus Other) reported higher rates
457 of adherence (adj OR=1.51; 90% CI = 1.08, 2.12). Additionally, women who had pap
458 screening tended to believe that they were at lower risk for cancer (adj OR= 0.84; 90%
459 CI = 0.73, 0.98). After taking all these covariates into account, we found a trend that
460 women who reported providing Emotional Support Only to a cancer patient were less
461 likely to be screened, compared to those who had provided More Intensive support (adj
462 OR= 0.71; 90% CI = 0.51, 0.98, $p=0.08$).

463

464 **Women colorectal cancer screening – lifetime.**

465 Among 596 women over age 50, 488 (82%) were adherent while 108 (18%) report
466 never having had colorectal screening. In unadjusted analysis, adherence to colorectal
467 screening was unrelated to women's caregiving roles ($\chi^2 = 4.34$, ns). In terms of
468 covariates in logistic regression, older age was positively associated with colorectal
469 screening (adj OR = 1.03; 90% CI = 1.08, 1.12). Alternatively, women who identified as
470 Hispanic (adj OR = 0.44; 90% CI = 0.26, 0.73) or who reported more barriers to care
471 (adj OR = 0.73; 90% CI = 0.57, 0.93) were less likely to be screened. Among those
472 women who identified as Other race, non-Hispanics were older than and significantly
473 more adherent to screening than Hispanics (63 years vs. 57 years, 100% vs. 66%).
474 After taking these variables into account, we found that colorectal screening was related
475 to active cancer caregiving. Women who reported carrying out More Intensive
476 involvement as a cancer caregiver were more likely to be screened than those who
477 performed fewer supportive functions (adj OR = 0.46; 95% CI = 0.21, 1.03).

478

479 **Men colorectal cancer screening – lifetime.**

480 Among 314 men over age 50, 278 (89%) were adherent while 36 (11%) reported never
481 having had colorectal screening through either endoscopy or stool sample. In
482 unadjusted analysis, adherence to colorectal screening was unrelated to men's role as
483 cancer caregivers ($\chi^2 = 4.91$, ns). Significant covariates predicting men's adherence to
484 CRC screening included older age (adj OR = 1.16; 90% CI = 1.08, 1.24) and fewer
485 barriers to care (adj OR = 0.70; 90% CI = 0.50, 0.98). Men with a prior history of any
486 cancer in our sample were less likely to report colorectal cancer screening (adj OR =
487 0.10; 90% CI = 0.25, 0.61). Greater pessimism about cancer prevention and treatment
488 was also associated with reduced likelihood of screening (adj OR = 0.38; 90% CI =
489 0.60, 0.96), while the belief that cancer is primarily caused by personal behavior or
490 lifestyle was associated with greater likelihood (adj OR = 1.64; 90% CI = 1.07, 2.52).
491 After adjusting for these covariates, men's role as cancer caregivers remained unrelated
492 to adherence to colorectal screening.

493

494 **Men prostate cancer PSA discussion and testing– lifetime.**

495 Among 342 men over age 40, 158 (46%) were had discussed PSA with a health care
496 provider while 184 (54%) had not. Of the men who had discussed PSA with a provider,
497 almost all (96%) had received the test. Unadjusted analysis revealed that men who had
498 provided the More Intensive support as a cancer caregiver were significantly more likely
499 than other men to have had a PSA screen ($\chi^2 = 8.23$, $p=0.016$). Significant covariates in
500 our logistic regression model to predict PSA screening included older age (adj OR =
501 1.10; 90% CI = 1.07, 1.13) and identifying as either Black or White (versus Other) (adj

502 OR = 2.01; 90% CI = 1.18, 3.42). There was also a U-shaped effect involving perceived
503 risk, with PSA testing being more likely among men who perceived that they were at
504 either a higher or lower risk of getting cancer compared to those with either average or
505 unknown risk (adj OR = 1.26; 90% CI = 1.06, 1.50). After adjusting for these covariates,
506 provision of More versus Less Intensive support was associated with a trend of greater
507 likelihood of PSA testing (adj OR =1.97; 90% CI =1.05, 3.70; $p=0.07$). Further analysis
508 suggested that the influence of experience as a family caregiver depended upon the
509 respondents' relationship to the cancer patient. After removing this main effect from the
510 model, the interaction between intensity of support provided to family versus non-family
511 was significant (adj OR = 9.44; 95% CI =1.39, 64.12). The plot of this interaction effect
512 demonstrates that PSA testing was greater for individuals who had a family member or
513 spouse with cancer (orange line) compared to those who did not (blue line), and that
514 this difference increased with the intensity of support provided (Fig 2).

515

516 II. Fig 2. Ever had PSA test– family versus non-family relationship with cancer patient by
517 level of support.

518

519

Discussion

520

521 A large proportion of the sample had cancer within their families (72%) and/or provided
522 support to cancer patients (79%). This is noteworthy as it signifies the broad impact of
523 cancer and the heavy burden of cancer caregiving within this community. Whether
524 providing only emotional support or a greater intensity of support, most people were

525 involved with people in their lives affected by cancer. In sum, cancer caregiving must be
526 viewed as a normative experience, at least in this low-income inner-city community. As
527 such, lifetime personal experiences with cancer have been largely overlooked as a key
528 factor in efforts to improve adherence and support health decisions. Understanding the
529 impact of caregiving on respondents' personal screening behavior may elucidate
530 strategies to increase screening for all groups.

531

532 **Demographics**

533

534 Our community sample was more likely to be older and female compared to the overall
535 Bronx population. Older age is a strong correlate of screening adherence as well as the
536 likelihood of knowing and caring for network members with cancer. Caregivers' age was
537 controlled in all analyses. Although caregiving is often understood to be a role more
538 commonly served by women, most of both women and men in our sample indicated
539 providing at least some support for cancer patients. In a descriptive analysis, we found
540 that older adults (≥ 50 years) provided more support than younger adults. In particular,
541 older women provided more personal care and help with household chores than older
542 men. Given these differences, we conducted separate analyses of factors influencing
543 colorectal screening for women and men, as we did for the other sex-specific screening
544 modalities.

545

546 **Choices in cancer screening measurement**

547

548 Measurement of each cancer screening modality was carefully specified. Due to lack of
549 information regarding family history of cancer, adherence measures were based on
550 recommendations for individuals at average risk. Completion of mammography within
551 the past two years reflected current USPSTF breast cancer screening guidelines, while
552 allowing for flexibility in physician recommendations by retaining the earliest-
553 recommended ages of 40 to 50. We lacked information to account for variability in Pap
554 testing taking women's HPV status, age, and prior testing into account, so we used an
555 intermediate measure adherence, Pap smear within the past two years. Colorectal
556 cancer screening for both men and women included ever having had an endoscopy or
557 stool test to encompass the varied approaches to screening per ACS. Survey limitations
558 in determining timing of tests led us to use ever having had colorectal screening as our
559 variable. Male prostate cancer screening included both ever having discussed PSA
560 testing with a provider and ever having had PSA testing. This method intended to
561 account for PSA discussion without a decision to have the test as acceptable adherence
562 to guidelines. However, only 4 men in the sample indicated that they had discussed
563 PSA with their provider without testing, so outcomes reported here focus on receipt of
564 the PSA test.

565

566 **Screening findings**

567

568 In this diverse, inner-city sample, people who provided intensive support to cancer
569 patients were most likely to adhere to age and sex-specific cancer and prevention
570 screening recommendations. However, there were variations in levels of adherence

571 within all groups. As expected, adherence to all modalities was greater by age except
572 Pap testing, which is initiated at an earlier age. Adherence to all modalities was
573 associated with having a personal history of cancer and fewer barriers to care.

574
575 For both breast cancer and cervical cancer screening, those women who provided
576 emotional support only were less likely to be screened than those who provided more
577 support. This was at odds with both our primary and alternative hypotheses. We had
578 expected that either more exposure to cancer would encourage screening, or that
579 fatalism associated with observation of poorer cancer outcomes in this lower-income
580 community would discourage screening. The pattern of results here suggests a more
581 nuanced process: individuals who provided only emotional support had only a limited
582 view of the prognosis and journey of a cancer patient. They likely were only present for
583 the particularly difficult, emotional aspects of the experience. This may have shaped
584 their perspective on the benefits of therapy and the potential for a favorable prognosis of
585 those with cancer. In short, limited contact when patients were particularly distressed
586 may have fueled more fatalistic beliefs, lessening screening adherence. Alternatively,
587 caregivers who provided more tangible support may have stepped into a partnership
588 with the cancer patient that led to a comprehensive understanding of the battle against
589 cancer. They may have seen more of the ups and downs and became more aware of
590 the resources available to support cancer treatment. They may also have gained a
591 greater understanding of the importance of early detection. Whatever the reason, these
592 hands-on caregivers were more likely to be screened than people who had no personal

593 experience with caregiving, indicating that exposure alone was not leading people to
594 forego screening.

595

596 Even among more active caregivers, we found that both cervical cancer screening and
597 prostate cancer screening were greater among those who provided more (versus less)
598 intensive support to a cancer patient. Again, we hypothesized that those who had more
599 intensive involvement were more likely to be screened due to their close-up and
600 intimate understanding of the cancer journey. Heightened involvement may have made
601 them more acutely aware of the benefits of being screened. Our findings are consistent
602 with Song's study, which suggested that higher rates of spousal caregivers' screening
603 and use of preventive services may be associated with shared marital or family context
604 [27]. By living together and eating meals together, caregivers may be inclined to shift
605 their own health behavior to be consistent with that of their family members. More
606 involved caregivers may also be presented more chances to reflect upon their own
607 lifestyles and mortality. The additional exposure to providers and hospitals may promote
608 greater knowledge, easier access, and more motivation to pursue preventive care.

609

610 Cancer attitudes also played a significant role in rates of male colorectal screening.
611 Greater pessimism about cancer prevention and treatment, an underlying foundation of
612 fatalism, drove down screening. A large contributor to these attitudes towards cancer is
613 the fatalistic belief that events are controlled by external forces, and humans are
614 powerless to influence them. The associated helplessness can be tied to reduced
615 motivation and self-efficacy and overall poor health behavior [15,22]. Consequently,

616 these individuals become less likely to perceive willpower as crucial in shifting their
617 health behavior and health outcomes.

618

619 **Incidental findings**

620

621 The high proportion of men who did not receive prostate cancer screening compared to
622 other screenings likely reflects mixed and unfavorable recommendation for this testing
623 from the USPSTF. This suggests that physician counseling in initiating the PSA
624 conversation is a pivotal step to effective screening. Prior studies have found that strong
625 family history also predicts prostate cancer screening [32]. This suggests that
626 individuals who perceived that they were at greater risk of developing cancer, by
627 lifestyle or family history, were more aware of recommended guidelines and more
628 motivated to be screened. Conversely, the group that felt themselves to be at low risk
629 also received PSA testing, perhaps due to decreased fatalism, lack of concern about
630 potential harms of testing, or overall high receptivity to preventive care.

631

632 **Limitations**

633

634 The results of this study had limitations. The survey did not characterize the type of
635 cancer affecting the patient relationally connected to the participants. With lack of
636 knowledge on the survivability and prognosis of the cancer, it is difficult to ascertain the
637 attitudes toward cancer and screening that may have been shaped by the caregiving
638 experience. Additionally, participants were not asked about their familial risk or genetic

639 syndromes, which would heighten perceived personal risk and explain screening shifts.

640 The exact relationship of caregiver to familial cancer patient was also not determined.

641 Future studies can focus on the degree of relationship.

642

643 The subset of participants who had a spouse with cancer to whom they provided no

644 support or only emotional support was very small. This limited the analyses possible for

645 this subgroup.

646

647 Colorectal screening data was also restricted to screening within the last five years.

648 Without a ten-year frame to include ACS colonoscopy guidelines, full analysis was

649 limited.

650

651 Overall, this survey was collected from volunteers, and the non-random process and

652 self-reported data may lead to selection bias within the sample. However, of note, a full

653 range of behaviors and attitudes were discovered within the survey.

654

655 **Conclusions**

656

657 Having a family member with cancer is a normative experience. Being involved with

658 someone with cancer, whether friend, family, or spouse, affects one's own preventive

659 care. Importantly, those with a family member or spouse with cancer typically have

660 increased personal screening. And as involvement in cancer caregiving deepens, one's

661 own screening typically rises as well. Providing only emotional support is the sole
662 exception, by limiting perspective on the cancer experience and contributing to fatalism.

663

664 Our findings suggest that health professionals would do well to ask their patients about
665 the prevalence of cancer within the family and their provision of cancer support to their
666 social circles. Education can shift to target the patient. The focus can particularly be on
667 the discrepancies in screening in those who provide only emotional support, addressing
668 their fatalistic beliefs by providing accurate and individualized knowledge about
669 screening.

670

671 The study provides a strong rationale for creating standardized tools for primary care,
672 preventive medicine, and public health interventions to elicit the extent of cancer
673 caregiving in their communities, then provide targeted counseling and resources to
674 individuals and groups to promote cancer screening.

675

676 **Acknowledgments**

677 We would like to acknowledge the support of Nicole Harris-Hollingsworth, EdD
678 (Hackensack Meridian Health) and Howard Strickler, MD, MPH (MECC) for their
679 assistance with this study; Mindy Ginsberg, Director of the Epidemiology and Clinical
680 Research Informatics Shared Resource, for assistance with obtaining our sample; Rita
681 Rivera for assistance with Spanish language interviews.

682

683 **References**

- 684
- 685 1. Wang T, Molassiotis A, Chung BPM, Tan J-Y. Unmet care needs of advanced cancer
686 patients and their informal caregivers: a systematic review. *BMC Palliat Care*. 2018 Jul
687 23;17:96.
- 688 2. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2019. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2019
689 Jan;69(1):7–34.
- 690 3. Ochoa CY, Buchanan Lunsford N, Lee Smith J. Impact of informal cancer caregiving
691 across the cancer experience: A systematic literature review of quality of life. *Palliat*
692 *Support Care*. 2020 Apr;18(2):220–40.
- 693 4. Hudson P, Morrison RS, Schulz R, Brody AA, Dahlin C, Kelly K, et al. Improving
694 Support for Family Caregivers of People with a Serious Illness in the United States:
695 Strategic Agenda and Call to Action. *Palliat Med Rep*. 2020 Apr 30;1(1):6–17.
- 696 5. LeSeure P, Chongkham-ang S. The Experience of Caregivers Living with Cancer
697 Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Synthesis. *J Pers Med*. 2015 Nov
698 19;5(4):406–39.
- 699 6. Lee C-J, Niederdeppe J, Freres D. Socioeconomic Disparities in Fatalistic Beliefs
700 About Cancer Prevention and the Internet. *J Commun*. 2012 Dec;62(6):972–90.
- 701 7. Xiao H, Bertwistle D, Khela K, Middleton-Dalby C, Hall J. Patient and caregiver
702 socioeconomic burden of first-line systemic therapy for advanced gastroesophageal
703 adenocarcinoma. *Future Oncology*. 2022 Mar;18(10):1199–210.
- 704 8. Ross A, Sundaramurthi T, Bevans M. A Labor of Love. *Cancer Nurs*.
705 2013;36(6):474–83.

- 706 9. Rha SY, Park Y, Song SK, Lee CE, Lee J. Caregiving burden and health-promoting
707 behaviors among the family caregivers of cancer patients. *European Journal of*
708 *Oncology Nursing*. 2015 Apr 1;19(2):174–81.
- 709 10. Rohleder N, Marin TJ, Ma R, Miller GE. Biologic Cost of Caring for a Cancer Patient:
710 Dysregulation of Pro- and Anti-Inflammatory Signaling Pathways. *JCO*. 2009 Jun
711 20;27(18):2909–15.
- 712 11. Wu KK, Bos T, Mausbach BT, Milic M, Ziegler MG, von Känel R, et al. Long-term
713 caregiving is associated with impaired cardiovagal baroreflex. *J Psychosom Res*. 2017
714 Dec;103:29–33.
- 715 12. Nijboer C, Triemstra M, Tempelaar R, Sanderman R, Bos GAM van den.
716 Determinants of caregiving experiences and mental health of partners of cancer
717 patients. *Cancer*. 1999;86(4):577–88.
- 718 13. Gérard P, Zech E. Informal Caregiver Burnout? Development of a Theoretical
719 Framework to Understand the Impact of Caregiving. *Front Psychol*. 2019 Jul
720 31;10:1748.
- 721 14. Northouse L, Williams A, Given B, McCorkle R. Psychosocial Care for Family
722 Caregivers of Patients with Cancer. *JCO*. 2012 Mar 12;30(11):1227–34.
- 723 15. DePasquale N, Sliwinski MJ, Zarit SH, Buxton OM, Almeida DM. Unpaid Caregiving
724 Roles and Sleep Among Women Working in Nursing Homes: A Longitudinal Study.
725 *Gerontologist*. 2019 May;59(3):474–85.
- 726 16. Kowalkowski MA, Hart SL, Du XL, Baraniuk S, Latini DM. Cancer perceptions:
727 implications from the 2007 Health Information National Trends Survey. *J Cancer Surviv*.
728 2012 Sep 1;6(3):287–95.

- 729 17. Kaphingst KA, Lachance CR, Condit CM. Beliefs About Heritability of Cancer and
730 Health Information Seeking and Preventive Behaviors. *J Cancer Educ.* 2009;24(4):351–
731 6.
- 732 18. Ham Y, Oh HY, Seo S-S, Kim MK. Association between Health Behaviors and a
733 Family History of Cancer among Korean Women. *Cancer Res Treat.* 2016
734 Apr;48(2):806–14.
- 735 19. Odedina FT, Dagne G, Pressey S, Odedina O, Emanuel F, Scrivens J, et al.
736 Prostate cancer health and cultural beliefs of black men: The Florida Prostate Cancer
737 Disparity Project. *Infect Agent Cancer.* 2011 Sep 23;6(Suppl 2):S10.
- 738 20. Fleary SA, Paasche-Orlow MK, Joseph P, Freund KM. The Relationship Between
739 Health Literacy, Cancer Prevention Beliefs, and Cancer Prevention Behaviors. *J Cancer*
740 *Educ.* 2019 Oct;34(5):958–65.
- 741 21. Niederdeppe J, Levy AG. Fatalistic Beliefs about Cancer Prevention and Three
742 Prevention Behaviors. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2007 May 1;16(5):998–
743 1003.
- 744 22. Sinky TH, Faith J, Lindly O, Thorburn S. Cancer Fatalism and Preferred Sources of
745 Cancer Information: an Assessment Using 2012 HINTS Data. *J Cancer Educ.* 2018
746 Feb;33(1):231–7.
- 747 23. Mazanec SR, Flocke SA, Daly BJ. Health Behaviors in Family Members of Patients
748 Completing Cancer Treatment. *Oncol Nurs Forum.* 2015 Jan;42(1):54–62.
- 749 24. Patterson F, Wileyto EP, Segal J, Kurz J, Glanz K, Hanlon A. Intention to quit
750 smoking: role of personal and family member cancer diagnosis. *Health Educ Res.* 2010
751 Oct 1;25(5):792–802.

- 752 25. Lerman C, Rimer B, Trock B, Balshem A, Engstrom PF. Factors associated with
753 repeat adherence to breast cancer screening. *Prev Med.* 1990 May;19(3):279–90.
- 754 26. Bostean G, Crespi CM, McCarthy WJ. Associations among family history of
755 cancer, cancer screening and lifestyle behaviors: a population-based study. *Cancer*
756 *Causes Control.* 2013 Aug 1;24(8):1491–503.
- 757 27. Song L, Guan T, Guo P, Keyserling TC, Van Houtven C, Tan X. Prevalence of
758 cardiovascular disease and risk factors, quality of life, and health behaviors of cancer
759 survivors and their spouses: findings from MEPS. *J Cancer Surviv.* 2019 Oct;13(5):739–
760 48.
- 761 28. Reeves KW, Bacon K, Fredman L. Caregiving associated with selected cancer risk
762 behaviors and screening utilization among women: cross-sectional results of the 2009
763 BRFSS. *BMC Public Health.* 2012 Aug 21;12(1):685.
- 764 29. Humpel N, Magee C, Jones SC. The impact of a cancer diagnosis on the health
765 behaviors of cancer survivors and their family and friends. *Support Care Cancer.* 2007
766 Jun 1;15(6):621–30.
- 767 30. Takeuchi E, Kim Y, Shaffer KM, Cannady RS, Carver CS. Fear of cancer recurrence
768 promotes cancer screening behaviors among family caregivers of cancer survivors.
769 *Cancer.* 2020;126(8):1784–92.
- 770 31. Oldenkamp M, Wittek RPM, Hagedoorn M, Stolk RP, Smidt N. Survey nonresponse
771 among informal caregivers: effects on the presence and magnitude of associations with
772 caregiver burden and satisfaction. *BMC Public Health.* 2016 Jun 8;16:480.

- 773 32. Blake, Kelly D., Henry P. Ciolino, and Robert T. Croyle. "Population health
774 assessment in NCI-designated cancer center catchment areas." *Cancer Epidemiology
775 and Prevention Biomarkers* 28, no. 3 (2019): 428-430.
- 776 33. Meiser B, Cowan R, Costello A, Giles GG, Lindeman GJ, Gaff CL. Prostate cancer
777 screening in men with a family history of prostate cancer: the role of partners in
778 influencing men's screening uptake. *Urology*. 2007 Oct;70(4):738-42.

WITHDRAWN
see manuscript DOI for details