

The Impact of Body Mass Index on Robotic Surgery Outcomes in Endometrial Cancer

Short Title: Impact of BMI on Robotic Surgery Outcomes

Eva Kadoch^{1,2}, Yoav Brezinov^{1,3}, Gabriel Levin¹, Florentin Racovitan^{1,3}, Susie Lau^{1,4}, Shannon
Salvador^{1,4}, Walter H. Gotlieb^{1,4}

¹Lady Davis Institute of Medical Research, Jewish General Hospital, Montreal, QC, Canada.

²Experimental Medicine, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada.

³Experimental Surgery, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada.

⁴Division of Gynecologic Oncology, Sir Mortimer B. Davis Jewish General Hospital, McGill
University, Montreal, QC, Canada.

Address for Correspondence:

Walter H. Gotlieb, MD, PhD

Lady Davis Institute of Medical Research, Jewish General Hospital

3755 Chemin de la Côte-Ste-Catherine

Montreal, QC, H3T 1E2, Canada

E-Mail: walter.gotlieb@mcgill.ca

Tel: (514) 340-8222 ext. 23144

Fax: 514-340-8619

STRUCTURED ABSTRACT

41
42
43 **OBJECTIVES:** To compare surgical outcomes of patients with endometrial cancer who underwent
44 robotic surgery across different BMI categories.

45 **METHODS:** A retrospective study including all consecutive patients with endometrial cancer who
46 underwent robotic surgery at a tertiary cancer center between December 2007 and December
47 2022. The study analyzed outcome measures, including blood loss, surgical times, length of
48 hospitalization, perioperative complications, and conversion rates with the Kruskal-Wallis test for
49 BMI group differences and the Chi-squared test for associations between categorical variables.

50 **RESULTS:** A total of 1,329 patients with endometrial cancer were included in the study. Patients
51 were stratified by BMI: <30.0 (n=576; 43.3%), 30.0-39.9 (n=449; 33.8%), and \geq 40.0 (n=304;
52 22.9%). There were no significant differences in post-anesthesia care unit (PACU) stay (p=0.105)
53 and hospital stay (p=0.497) between the groups. The rate of post-op complications was similar
54 across the groups, ranging from 8.0% to 9.5% (p=0.761). The rate of conversion to laparotomy
55 was also similar across the groups, ranging from 0.7% to 1.0% (p=0.885). Women with a BMI
56 \geq 40.0 had a non-clinically relevant but greater median estimated blood loss (30 mL vs. 20 mL;
57 p<0.001) and longer median operating room (OR) time (288 minutes vs. 270 minutes; p<0.001).
58 Within the OR time, the median set-up time was longer for those with a higher BMI (58 minutes
59 vs. 50 minutes; p<0.001). However, skin-to-skin time (209 minutes vs. 203 minutes; p=0.202) and
60 post-op time (14 minutes vs. 13 minutes; p=0.094) were comparable between groups.

61 **CONCLUSION:** BMI does not affect the peri-operative outcome of patients undergoing robotic
62 staging procedures for endometrial cancer.

63 **KEY WORDS:** Cohort study; endometrial cancer; obesity; robotics.

64

ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ASA	American Society of Anesthesiologists
BMI	Body Mass Index
EBL	Estimated Blood Loss
EIN	Endometrial Intraepithelial Neoplasia
ER	Emergency Room
IQR	Interquartile Range
OR	Operating Room
PACU	Post-Anesthesia Care Unit
SD	Standard Deviation

65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86

87

INTRODUCTION

88

89

90

91

92

93

The prevalence of endometrial cancer is on the rise, possibly due to aging populations and higher obesity rates (1). In 2023, endometrial cancer affected over 66,000 women in the United States, making it the most common gynecological malignancy (2). However, patients with endometrial cancer often face challenges as surgical candidates due to the risk factors associated with the disease, such as obesity and medical comorbidities, making them susceptible to surgical complications (3).

94

95

96

97

98

Obesity is a well-known underlying cause of cancer and is directly associated with more than half of cancer cases in the United States (4, 5). Endometrial cancer presents a notable correlation with obesity, with a risk ratio of 1.52 (6-8). Studies consistently show that a significant number of women with endometrial cancer are overweight or obese, underscoring the value to expand our understanding of this relationship (8).

99

100

101

102

103

104

The impact of obesity extends beyond disease incidence, as it may also influence surgical outcomes in gynecological malignancies. Women who are obese may experience larger tumor size, longer surgical times, and increased risk of postoperative complications (6, 9). Moreover, inducing anesthesia in patients with obesity poses challenges and often requires an experienced anesthesia team to consider the anatomic and physiologic changes associated with obesity, including cardiovascular disease and obstructive sleep apnea syndrome (10, 11).

105

106

107

108

Despite the growing body of research, there remains a lack of large cohort studies investigating the impact of obesity on surgical outcomes in gynecological malignancies. Our study aims to investigate how obesity affects the outcomes of patients undergoing robotic surgery. By conducting a large cohort study on this subject, we aim to provide a comprehensive and up-to-

109 date assessment of the effects of obesity on various aspects of surgical outcomes.

110 **METHODS**

111 **Study Design**

112 This is a retrospective cohort study of all consecutive women with a preoperative
113 diagnosis of endometrial cancer, who underwent robotic surgery between December 2007 and
114 December 2022, at the Jewish General Hospital in Montreal, Canada. The patients were stratified
115 into three BMI groups based on established criteria for obesity. The non-obese group included
116 patients with a BMI less than 30.0 kg/m², the obese group included patients with a BMI ranging
117 from 30.0 to 39.9 kg/m², and the morbidly obese group included patients with a BMI of 40.0
118 kg/m² or higher. These cutoffs were selected based on widely accepted classifications for obesity
119 in clinical practice (12-14).

120 **Ethical Approval**

121 The Research Ethics Committee of the Jewish General Hospital gave ethical approval for
122 this work (2019-1292, 03-041).

123 **Operative Procedure**

124 The Division of Gynecologic-Oncology at the Jewish General Hospital uses the da Vinci
125 Surgical System since December 2007 for performing robotic surgeries on patients with
126 endometrial cancer, including total hysterectomy, bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy, peritoneal
127 washings, and lymph node evaluation (9). Lymph node evaluation included standard
128 lymphadenectomy until 2010, followed by the sentinel lymph node protocol since. During
129 surgery, patients are continuously monitored with an arterial line, have pneumatic compression
130 stockings, receive antibioprophylaxis with cefazolin, and thromboprophylaxis with subcutaneous

131 heparin. Patients are maintained in a steep Trendelenburg position (25-30 degrees) with
132 insufflation pressures mostly between 10-15 mmHg.

133 **Data Collection**

134 All data was extracted from the Jewish General Hospital's electronic medical records
135 system. Baseline characteristics collected included age, BMI, and American Society of
136 Anesthesiologists (ASA) score. Pertinent surgical outcomes such as procedure time, operating
137 room (OR) time, estimated blood loss (EBL), rate of conversion to laparotomy, length of post-
138 anesthesia care unit (PACU) stay, length of hospitalization, and perioperative complications were
139 also collected up to 30 days postop.

140 **Statistical Analysis**

141 Statistical analyses were carried out using IBM SPSS Statistics, version 28.0 (IBM Corp,
142 Armonk, NY, USA). The normality of the data was assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test prior to
143 conducting the analyses. Nonparametric tests, specifically the Kruskal-Wallis test, as well as one-
144 way ANOVA followed by a Games-Howell post-hoc comparison test, were used as appropriate.
145 Pairwise comparisons were performed to examine specific differences between BMI groups. To
146 account for multiple comparisons, significance values were adjusted using the Bonferroni
147 correction method. The Pearson's chi-squared test was used to evaluate associations between
148 categorical variables. A p-value of 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Descriptive
149 parameters were presented as median and interquartile range (IQR). Frequencies were
150 presented as percentages.

151 **Definitions**

152 Non-obese is defined as a BMI <30.0 kg/m², obese is defined as a BMI of 30.0-39.9 kg/m²,

153 and morbidly obese is defined as a BMI of 40 kg/m² or greater (15). We defined OR time as the
154 interval from the patient's arrival in the OR to their exit. Set-up time was defined as the interval
155 from the patient's arrival in the OR to the first incision, and skin-to-skin time (also referred to as
156 procedure time) as the interval from the first incision to skin closure. Post-op time refers to the
157 interval from skin closure to the patient's exit from OR. PACU time denotes the interval from OR
158 exit to discharge from the PACU unit, while in-patient time refers to the interval from PACU unit
159 discharge to hospital discharge.

160 RESULTS

161 Participant Demographics and BMI Stratification

162 The studied cohort consisted of 1,329 women with BMI ranging from 16.5 to 85.6 kg/m².
163 BMI were classified into three categories: <30.0 (n=576; 43.3%), 30.0-39.9 (n=449; 33.8%), and
164 ≥40.0 (n=304; 22.9%). The participants had an overall median (IQR) BMI of 31.3 (12.8) kg/m² and
165 overall age of 64.0 (16.0) years (Table 1). Basic patient demographics are presented in Table 1,
166 and the BMI distribution is illustrated in Figure 1.

	BMI <30.0 (n=576)	BMI 30.0-39.9 (n=449)	BMI ≥40.0 (n=304)	Overall (n=1329)	p-value
BMI, median (IQR), kg/m²	24.9 (4.6)	33.0 (4.1)	45.6 (8.3)	31.3 (12.8)	---
Age, mean (SD), years	65.5 (24.3)	63.0 (20.5)	60.0 (18.0)	64.0 (16.0)	<0.001
ASA score, n (%):					<0.001
1	120 (20.8%)	32 (7.1%)	0 (0%)	152 (11.4%)	
2	343 (59.5%)	256 (57.0%)	99 (32.6%)	698 (52.5%)	
3	110 (19.1%)	159 (35.4%)	198 (65.1%)	467 (35.1%)	
4	3 (0.52%)	2 (0.45%)	7 (2.3%)	12 (0.90%)	

167 Abbreviations: BMI=Body Mass Index; IQR=Interquartile Range; kg/m²=Kilograms per meter²; ASA=American Society of
168 Anesthesiologists.

169 **Table 1:** Baseline Demographics and Clinical Characteristics of Endometrial Cancer Patients
170 Undergoing Robotic Surgery.

171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192




Figure 1. Distribution of BMI in a population of 1,329 endometrial cancer patients.

Comparison of Surgical Times and Outcomes Among BMI Categories


Women with a BMI ≥ 40.0 had a longer OR time compared to the other groups (288 minutes vs. 270 minutes: $p < 0.001$) (Figure 3). Within the OR time, the median set-up time was comparable between nonobese and obese groups (50 minutes vs. 51 minutes, respectively), whereas in the morbidly obese group, it was significantly longer (58 minutes; $p < 0.001$) (Figure 2). Median skin-to-skin and post-op times were similar across the groups, ranging between 195 and 209 minutes for skin-to-skin ($p = 0.202$) and 13 and 14 minutes for post-op ($p = 0.094$) (Figure 2). Patients in the morbidly obese group had significantly greater but clinically not relevant EBL (30.0 mL) compared to the non-obese and obese groups (20.0 mL; $p < 0.001$) (Table 2). The median length of hospitalization remained unchanged across the three different groups, with a duration of 1 day in the nonobese group, in the obese group, and in the morbidly obese group ($p = 0.497$) (Table 2). As for the PACU stay, the median was 178 minutes for the nonobese group, 173

193 minutes for the obese group, and 192 minutes for the morbidly obese group (p=0.105) (Figure
 194 3).


	BMI <30.0 (n=576)	BMI 30.0-39.9 (n=449)	BMI ≥40.0 (n=304)	p-value
EBL, median (IQR), mL	20 (40)	20 (37.5)	30 (35)	<0.001
Hospitalization, median (range), d	1 (0-12)	1 (0-6)	1 (0-7)	0.497
Conversion to laparotomy, (%)	0.9	0.7	1.0	0.885
Intra-op complication, (%)	13.6	17.0	18.6	0.179
ER Presentation, (%)	8.9	8.0	9.5	0.761

195 Abbreviations: BMI=Body Mass Index; IQR=Interquartile Range; EBL=Estimated Blood Loss; mL=millimeter; ER=Emergency Room.

196 **Table 2:** Surgical Outcomes of Endometrial Cancer Patients Who Underwent Robotic Surgery.




197 **Figure 2.** Comparison of OR time components across BMI categories. Abbreviations: Post-
 198 op=Post Operation.
 199



200
 201 **Figure 3.** Comparison of post-OR time components across BMI categories. Abbreviations:
 202 OR=Operating Room; PACU=Post-Anesthesia Care Unit.


203 **Complications Rates Among BMI Categories**

204 Intra-operative complications occurred at a similar rate across BMI categories, ranging
 205 from 13.6% to 18.6% ($p=0.179$) (Table 2), with vaginal laceration being the most common intra-
 206 operative complication among all BMI groups (Figure 4). In terms of post-operative
 207 complications, the BMI ≥ 40.0 group had the highest rate of emergency room (ER) presentations
 208 within 30-days post-op at 9.5%, compared to 8.9% and 8.0% in the other BMI groups ($p=0.761$)
 209 (Table 2). Up to 5% of ER presentations across all BMI groups were for pain and discomfort
 210 (Figure 5). Table 1 also shows that conversion rates to laparotomy were low across all BMI groups,
 211 remaining below 1.0% ($p=0.885$).



212

213 **Figure 4.** Intra-operative complications.



214

215 **Figure 5.** Emergency room presentations 30 days post-op. Abbreviations: GI=Gastrointestinal.

216 **Descriptive Analysis of Surgical Outcomes in Patients with BMI ≥50.0 kg/m²**

217 In addition to the main results described above, a descriptive analysis focusing on patients

218 with a BMI ≥ 50.0 kg/m² (n=69; 5.2%) was conducted ad hoc, as it was not part of the original
219 study design. We found that patients with a BMI ≥ 50.0 had median OR times of 297 minutes,
220 median PACU times of 180 minutes, median EBL of 50 mL, and median length of hospitalization
221 of 1 day. The prevalence of intraoperative complications was 30% in this subgroup with vaginal
222 laceration remaining as the most common complication (17.4%). Two patients (2.9%) underwent
223 a conversion to laparotomy due to intolerable Trendelenburg positioning, and six patients (8.7%)
224 presented to the ER, primarily for wound checks.

225 **DISCUSSION**

226 In this retrospective study, we examined the relationship between obesity and surgical
227 outcomes in a cohort of 1,329 women with endometrial cancer, with the goal of assessing the
228 safety of robotic surgery among patients who are obese. Despite the increased risk profile
229 associated with obesity, our main findings indicate that surgical outcomes were comparable
230 across the BMI groups.

231 Understanding how obesity influences surgical outcomes is crucial for patient risk
232 stratification and preoperative planning. Metabolic syndrome, which includes hypertension,
233 dyslipidemia, and type 2 diabetes, is common in women with endometrial cancer and increases
234 the risk of surgical complications (11). Our findings showed that the obese and morbidly obese
235 groups reported significantly higher percentages of individuals with an ASA score ≥ 2 , with 79%
236 of patients for non-obese, 93% for obese, and 100% for morbidly obese (Table 1). Interestingly,
237 surgical outcomes, including length of hospitalization, and PACU stay, peri-operative
238 complication rates, and conversion rates were found to be comparable across the three BMI
239 groups despite this elevated risk profile.

240 We observed an increase in overall operating room (OR) time in patients with higher BMI,
241 with the morbidly obese group experiencing the most significant difference. This finding is
242 consistent with previous studies that have reported longer surgical times in obese patients
243 undergoing robotic surgery (18, 19). A further analysis of the OR time components revealed that
244 set-up time was significantly longer in the morbidly obese group, whereas skin-to-skin time and
245 post-op times were consistent across BMI categories (Figure 2). This difference in set-up time
246 may be attributed to the challenges associated with patient positioning, anesthesia induction, or
247 trocar placement in patients who are morbidly obese. By identifying specific challenges
248 associated with obesity, the surgical team can implement tailored strategies to mitigate these
249 risks. For instance, optimizing anesthesia protocols can help address the physiological changes
250 associated with obesity, ultimately improving patient safety and minimizing adverse events (10).

251 Overall, intra-operative complications were low, but somewhat higher with increasing
252 BMI, although no significant differences were observed. Minor vaginal lacerations were by far
253 the most common complication, occurring in all BMI groups (Figure 4). This complication is often
254 attributed to the technical challenges of removing larger specimens through the vaginal route.
255 ER presentations were low, with pain and discomfort being the most common reason in all BMI
256 groups (Figure 5). The findings of our study show that patients with elevated BMI can successfully
257 benefit from minimally invasive surgery without significantly increasing their risk.

258 The primary focus of our study was to examine the relationship between obesity and
259 robotic surgery outcomes within the standard BMI categories: <30, 30.0-39.9, and ≥ 40.0 kg/m².
260 In addition, we conducted an ad-hoc descriptive analysis on patients with a BMI ≥ 50.0 kg/m². In
261 this small subgroup of patients, we noted that OR times and EBL were in line with the trends

262 observed in the three original BMI groups. Despite an increased prevalence of complications,
263 mainly vaginal lacerations, the study suggests that patients with a BMI ≥ 50.0 kg/m² benefit from
264 minimally invasive surgery.

265 Our study is not without limitations. First, the retrospective nature of this analysis
266 inherently presents a risk for confounding. Second, this study was conducted at a single center,
267 specifically a university hospital which could have resulted in longer surgical times, especially in
268 the non-obese group due to trainees being assigned the less complex cases. Third, the study
269 focuses primarily on short-term surgical outcomes, with limited analysis of long-term outcomes
270 and quality of life. Further research is needed to evaluate the impact of obesity on long-term
271 oncologic outcomes in a large cohort of patients.

272 In conclusion, the comparable surgical outcomes and complication rates across BMI
273 groups associated with the use of robotic surgery which provides several technological
274 advantages over traditional surgical approaches. Our results support robotic surgery as a feasible
275 option for patients with obesity who were diagnosed with endometrial cancer and can help
276 overcome the difficulties associated with patient obesity during surgery.

277 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

278 WH.G., S.L., S.S. designed the study. E.K., Y.B., G.L. participated in the primary analysis. F.R. and
279 E.K. participated in data collection. E.K. analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript. All authors
280 discussed the results, provided critical input, edited the manuscript, and provided final approval
281 of the version to be published. All authors agree to assuming accountability for all aspects of the
282 study, thereby ensuring thorough investigation and resolution of any inquiries concerning the
283 accuracy or integrity of the work.

284 **Funding Statement:** No funding was obtained for this study.

285

286 **Data Availability Statement:** All data produced in the present study are available upon
287 reasonable request to the authors.

288

289 **Approvals:** The study was approved by the Research Ethics Board of the Jewish General Hospital
290 (2019-1292, 03-041).

291

292 **Declaration of Interests:** The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

293

294 **Declaration of AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process:** During the preparation of this
295 work, the authors used ChatGPT in order to improve language and sparingly assist in the
296 translation of text to English. After using this tool, the authors reviewed and edited the content
297 as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

298

299 **Disclosure Statement:**

300

- 301 • EK has nothing to disclose regarding this study.
- 302 • YB has nothing to disclose regarding this study.
- 303 • GL has nothing to disclose regarding this study.
- 304 • FR has nothing to disclose regarding this study.
- 305 • SL has received support for proctoring robotic surgery.
- 306 • SS has received support for proctoring robotic surgery.
- 307 • WHG has received support for proctoring robotic surgery.

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337

REFERENCES

1. Crosbie EJ, Kitson SJ, McAlpine JN, Mukhopadhyay A, Powell ME, Singh N. Endometrial cancer. *Lancet*. 2022;399(10333):1412-28.
2. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Wagle NS, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2023. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2023;73(1):17-48.
3. Nick AM, Ramirez PT. The impact of robotic surgery on gynecologic oncology. *J Gynecol Oncol*. 2011;22(3):196-202.
4. Calle EE, Kaaks R. Overweight, obesity and cancer: epidemiological evidence and proposed mechanisms. *Nat Rev Cancer*. 2004;4(8):579-91.
5. Onstad MA, Schmandt RE, Lu KH. Addressing the Role of Obesity in Endometrial Cancer Risk, Prevention, and Treatment. *J Clin Oncol*. 2016;34(35):4225-30.
6. McDonald ME, Bender DP. Endometrial Cancer: Obesity, Genetics, and Targeted Agents. *Obstet Gynecol Clin North Am*. 2019;46(1):89-105.
7. Calle EE, Rodriguez C, Walker-Thurmond K, Thun MJ. Overweight, obesity, and mortality from cancer in a prospectively studied cohort of U.S. adults. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;348(17):1625-38.
8. Kitson SJ, Crosbie EJ. Endometrial cancer and obesity. *The Obstetrician & Gynaecologist*. 2019;21(4):237-45.
9. Lau S, Buzaglo K, Vaknin Z, Brin S, Kaufer R, Drummond N, et al. Relationship between body mass index and robotic surgery outcomes of women diagnosed with endometrial cancer. *Int J Gynecol Cancer*. 2011;21(4):722-9.

- 338 10. Zengin SU, Orhon Ergün M. Retrospective assessment of the association between
339 inhalation anesthesia and post-operative complications in morbidly obese patients
340 undergoing bariatric surgery. *Journal of Surgery and Medicine*. 2022.
- 341 11. Pouwels S, Buise MP, Twardowski P, Stepaniak PS, Proczko M. Obesity Surgery and
342 Anesthesiology Risks: a Review of Key Concepts and Related Physiology. *Obes Surg*.
343 2019;29(8):2670-7.
- 344 12. James PT, Leach R, Kalamara E, Shayeghi M. The worldwide obesity epidemic. *Obes Res*.
345 2001;9 Suppl 4:228s-33s.
- 346 13. Clinical Guidelines on the Identification, Evaluation, and Treatment of Overweight and
347 Obesity in Adults--The Evidence Report. National Institutes of Health. *Obes Res*. 1998;6
348 Suppl 2:51s-209s.
- 349 14. Obesity: preventing and managing the global epidemic. Report of a WHO consultation.
350 World Health Organ Tech Rep Ser. 2000;894:i-xii, 1-253.
- 351 15. Weir CB, Jan A. BMI Classification Percentile And Cut Off Points. StatPearls. Treasure
352 Island (FL) ineligible companies. Disclosure: Arif Jan declares no relevant financial
353 relationships with ineligible companies.: StatPearls Publishing.
- 354 16. Doyle DJ, Hendrix JM, Garmon EH. American Society of Anesthesiologists Classification.
355 StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing
- 356 17. Zeng XZ, Lavoue V, Lau S, Press JZ, Abitbol J, Gotlieb R, et al. Outcome of robotic surgery
357 for endometrial cancer as a function of patient age. *Int J Gynecol Cancer*. 2015;25(4):637-
358 44.

- 359 18. King LJ, Young AJ, Nagar PM, McDowell JL, Smith AL. Outcomes of robotic surgery in
360 morbidly obese patients with endometrial cancer: a retrospective study. *J Robot Surg.*
361 2022;16(3):569-73.
- 362 19. Zhao Y, Liu Z, Yu L, Liu S, Yan H, Zhang Y, et al. Robotic surgery in obese patients with early-
363 stage endometrial cancer. *Wideochir Inne Tech Maloinwazyjne.* 2020;15(1):171-5.
- 364 20. Cao G, Yang X, Yue C, Tan H, Xu H, Huang Z, et al. The effect of body mass index on blood
365 loss and complications in simultaneous bilateral total hip arthroplasty: A multicenter
366 retrospective study. *J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong).* 2021;29(3):23094990211061209.
- 367 21. Chang SS, Jacobs B, Wells N, Smith JA, Jr., Cookson MS. Increased body mass index
368 predicts increased blood loss during radical cystectomy. *J Urol.* 2004;171(3):1077-9.
- 369 22. Gokal N, Gopalan PD, Moodley Y. Is Obesity a risk factor for increased Perioperative Blood
370 loss following Laparotomy? A Matched Cohort Study from South Africa. *Student's Journal*
371 *of Health Research Africa.* 2022;3(6):8.

372