

1                    **Understanding diagnostic delay for endometriosis: a scoping review**

2

3    **Ms Jodie Fryer<sup>a</sup>**

4

5    **Dr Amanda J. Mason-Jones<sup>b</sup>**

6    **ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4292-3183>**

7

8    **Dr Amie Woodward<sup>c</sup>**

9    **ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9579-4012>**

10

11    <sup>a</sup> **North Yorkshire County Council, Harrogate, UK.**

12

13    <sup>b</sup> **Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK.**

14    <sup>c</sup> **Institute for Health and Care Improvement, York St John University, UK.**

15    **Corresponding author: [amanda.mason-jones@york.ac.uk](mailto:amanda.mason-jones@york.ac.uk)**

16    **Room 233, Seebohm Rowntree Building, Department of Health Sciences, University of**

17    **York, Heslington, YO10 5DD, UK.**

18    **Tel: +44(0)1904321290**

19

20    **Acknowledgements**

21    We thank our employers for supporting this work. JF received support from Harrogate  
22    Borough Council, AMJ received support from the University of York and AW received  
23    support from York St John University.

24

25    **Abstract**

26    **Introduction**

27    Diagnostic delay for endometriosis is a well-established phenomenon. Despite this, little is  
28    known about where in the health care system these delays occur or why they occur. Our  
29    review is the first attempt to synthesise and analyse this evidence.

30    **Methods**

31    A systematic scoping review with a pre-specified protocol was used to incorporate the global  
32    mixed methods literature on diagnostic delay for endometriosis. Four databases (PubMed,

33 MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsychINFO) were searched from inception to September 2023 with a  
34 search strategy designed specifically for each.

### 35 **Results**

36 The search yielded 367 studies, 22 of which met the inclusion criteria. A third of studies has  
37 been published since 2020 and 65% were from high income countries. Six were qualitative  
38 and 16 were quantitative studies. The average age of onset of endometriosis was 14 years  
39 for adolescents and 20 for adults. On average, the diagnostic delay reported for  
40 endometriosis across the included studies was 6.6 years (range 1.5 to 11.3 years) but this  
41 masked the very wide differences reported between countries such as a 0.5-year delay in  
42 Brazil to a 27-year delay in the UK.

### 43 **Discussion**

44 Health system barriers included access to private healthcare for those with limited finance,  
45 physical access for those using public health systems and a general lack of knowledge  
46 amongst patients and health care professionals. Women often reported feeling unheard by  
47 health professionals. Considering the impact on individuals and the health system,  
48 addressing diagnostic delay for endometriosis must remain a priority for researchers, health  
49 care providers and policy makers.

50

### 51 **What is already known on this topic**

52 Endometriosis is currently difficult to diagnose. This results in delays in diagnosis which  
53 negatively impacts those suffering and increases the severity of pain and extent of the  
54 disease with increased costs to health systems.

### 55 **What this study adds**

56 The scoping review methodology included studies using a range of methods. The longest  
57 average delay occurs in secondary care. Those seeking public health care experienced

58 longer average delay in diagnosis compared to those seeking private health care. Improved  
59 clinical guidelines may reduce diagnostic delay.

60 **How this study might affect research, practice or policy**

61 This is the first known review to explore diagnostic delay for endometriosis and provides an  
62 overview of the current literature. Clearer definitions of diagnostic delay for endometriosis  
63 are needed to aid in comparisons across countries. Improving education, tracking outcomes  
64 through medical records and developing non-invasive diagnostic tools will be crucial to  
65 improve women's health.

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79 Introduction

80 Endometriosis is an oestrogen dependent gynaecological condition characterised by the  
81 presence of active endometrial tissue lying outside of the uterus, typically in the pelvic region  
82 (1). It is a chronic, progressive inflammatory disease which affects more than 170 million  
83 women worldwide (2). Endometriosis mainly affects women of reproductive age (15-49  
84 years), with up to 1 in 10 believed to have the condition, although it is estimated that as  
85 many as 60% of endometriosis cases remain undiagnosed (2, 3). Prevalence estimates of  
86 endometriosis are generally poor and highly varied, ranging from 4% to 50%; however the  
87 most consistent estimates suggest prevalence ranging from 6-10% (4). Despite the  
88 progressive nature of endometriosis, a correct diagnosis takes an average of 10 years and  
89 at least 7 visits to a health practitioner (5, 6). This lengthy delay is reflected in the disease  
90 burden in which gynaecological diseases are reported as the leading cause of Disability  
91 Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) and Years Lived with Disability (YLD) among the 15-49-year  
92 age group (7). This is despite clear clinical diagnostic indicators including chronic pelvic pain  
93 (CPP), dysmenorrhea (painful, heavy menstruation), dyspareunia (painful intercourse), that  
94 are known for 82.9% of women (1, 8). Apart from the YLD the economic impact includes  
95 increased costs to the individual, to healthcare providers, and to the wider economic  
96 infrastructure (9). The current 'gold standard' for diagnosis is a laparoscopy, although  
97 surgeons may be hesitant to perform this due to the invasive nature of the procedure (8, 10).  
98 There is also evidence that symptoms may be dismissed as 'normal' by health care  
99 practitioners (1, 11).

100

101 The aim of this review was to explore the delay faced by those attempting to obtain a  
102 diagnosis of endometriosis and appropriate treatment.

103

104 Methods

105 The study protocol was registered on the Open Science Framework OSF:

106 [10.31219/osf.io/yzuvb](https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/yzuvb)

107 Patient and public involvement

108 Women who have experienced diagnostic delay for endometriosis were involved in  
109 designing the research. The research question was informed by their priorities, experiences  
110 and preferences. Dissemination of this research will be facilitated through charities focussed  
111 on endometriosis.

112 Data sources and search strategy

113 Development of the search strategy was guided by the SPIDER framework to ensure key  
114 concepts were captured in searches. Four databases were searched between from inception  
115 to September 2023. They included PubMed, MEDLINE, EMBASE and PsycINFO. No date  
116 limits were set on the searches. Search terms included key terms derived from search  
117 strings relating to 'endometriosis' and 'diagnostic delay' and were adapted for each  
118 database; For example, the search strategy for MEDLINE was: 'Endometriosis.mp. or (exp  
119 Pelvic Pain/ or exp Chronic Pain/)) and exp Delayed Diagnosis/'.

120 Eligibility criteria

121 Included studies were primary research in English involving the pelvic region or reproductive  
122 organs only, that mentioned pelvic pain with a suspicion of endometriosis, and diagnostic  
123 delay (in the context of endometriosis).

124 Screening and data extraction

125 All studies were screened by one reviewer (JF) with a 10 percent sample checked by a  
126 second reviewer (MS) and any disagreements resolved by a third reviewer (AW/AMJ).

127 Data were extracted on a predeveloped and piloted data extraction form and included study  
128 characteristics, methods and design, and demographic characteristics of the population.

129 Additionally, the most frequently reported symptoms, length of and reason for delay were  
130 recorded.

131 Analysis

132 Studies were grouped by themes that emerged from the individual included studies (12) and  
133 contextualised to form a public policy perspective using the socio-ecological model (13).

## 134 Results

### 135 Selection of studies

136 The searches yielded 367 studies following deduplication. Title and abstract screening, and  
137 full-text screening resulted in 23 studies that met the inclusion criteria (see figure 1).

138 [Figure 1]

139

140 No formal quality appraisal was undertaken in line with methodological guidance for scoping  
141 reviews (14).

142

### 143 Study characteristics

144 Table 1 provides an overview of the included studies and highlights the diversity of methods  
145 used. Six were qualitative and 16 were quantitative studies. Almost a third of studies (8/22)  
146 were published relatively recently (since 2020) from a range of countries. Fifteen were  
147 conducted in high income countries including the UK (15, 16), US (17-21), Netherlands (22,  
148 23), Norway (24, 25), Canada (26), Australia (27), New Zealand (28), and Italy (29). Three  
149 were conducted in middle income countries; Brazil (30, 31) and Iran (32) and four were  
150 conducted in multiple countries (33-36). The average age of participants across the studies  
151 was 32.7 but the age range of participants was between 12 and 74 years old.

### 152 Age of onset of endometriosis

153 The mean age at onset of endometriosis symptoms was 14.1 years old for adolescents  
154 (range 13-15.3 years), and 20.4 years old for adults (range 20-23.2 years). The average age  
155 at diagnosis was 16 for adolescents and 28.8 for adults (range 22-32). Average age of first  
156 GP visit was 14 for adolescents and 25.8 years for adults (range 20-32.6).

157 [Table 1]

158

159 Diagnostic delay

160 The definition of diagnostic delay was consistent across studies and was defined as the time  
161 between symptom onset and diagnosis. The average diagnostic delay was 6.6 years with an  
162 average of 1.5 years in Australia (27) and 11.3 years in the US (18). However, there was a  
163 wide range between the shortest and longest delay reported. The shortest delay was 0.5  
164 years in Brazil (30), and the longest delay was 27 years in the UK (15). Though the range  
165 was wider than previously reported by other studies i.e. 3.3 - 11.7 years, the average  
166 diagnostic delay was consistent with their finding of 6.7 years (35). Some studies reported  
167 specific points at which delays occurred, these were from symptom onset to primary care  
168 consultation (15, 17-19, 21-23, 25, 26, 28, 33), referral for gynaecology consultation (15, 16,  
169 22, 23, 33), and gynaecology referral to diagnosis (15, 16, 22, 23, 33). Mean delays through  
170 this pathway reported across the studies were 2.0 years, 2.5 years, and 2.8 years  
171 respectively. Time from primary care presentation to diagnosis was reported by some  
172 studies without mention of transition to secondary care (16, 19, 21, 25, 26). The average  
173 diagnostic delay between primary care presentation and diagnosis was 2.9 years (see figure  
174 2).

175 [Figure 2]

176

177 Reasons for delay

178 Most studies focussed on the patients' perspective, two studies focussed on the health care  
179 provider (HCP) perspective, and one included both perspectives. There were 6 main themes  
180 that emerged. A summary of these can be seen in table 2.

181 [Table 2]

182

183 Access to care differed depending on the specific health system in place. While financial  
184 barriers were more prominent for those seeking private healthcare, physical access to care  
185 was more frequently noted for those seeking public healthcare services. Only one study  
186 compared wait times between those seeking public healthcare and insurance or self-funded

187 healthcare (35). They found that wait times for endometriosis care were significantly longer  
188 for those seeking public rather than private healthcare (8.3 years vs. 5.5 years).

189 Both HCPs and patients shared similar views on the reasons for diagnostic delay although  
190 they expressed the delays differently. Where HCP thought frequently presenting patients  
191 were somatising, patients stated they presented frequently because they felt unheard by  
192 HCPs. This was reflected by the number of doctors seen, which averaged 2.0 for  
193 adolescents (19) and 4.1 for adults (range 2.5-7) (19, 26, 28, 33, 35) and the number of  
194 times symptoms were discussed before diagnosis, with more than a quarter of women  
195 saying they discussed symptoms more than 20 times (34). Interestingly, none of the studies  
196 evaluated the number of consultations prior to referral, nor the effect of diagnostic delay  
197 qualitatively or quantitatively based on the type (doctor, nurse, etc.) or gender of the HCP.

198 The emerging themes identified increased diagnostic delay at each point along the  
199 diagnostic pathway, from symptom onset to diagnosis. This resulted in prolonging diagnosis  
200 which led to increases in both the severity of pain and the extent of disease (20, 21) (see  
201 figure 3). Both patients and HCPs appeared to demonstrate an overall lack of understanding  
202 and education about endometriosis.

203 [Figure 3]

204

205 Diagnostic delay: evidence of delays being addressed

206 Overall, four studies reported interventions implemented to tackle diagnostic delay. Of these,  
207 two studies reported reduced time to diagnosis following the introduction of clinical  
208 guidelines (27, 28) and one study that found diagnostic delays were reduced by the  
209 introduction of specialist endometriosis centres in the US, but not in the UK (16). Only one  
210 study quantified the reduction in delay (8.4 years), while the others reported a 'downward  
211 trend' in diagnostic delays (16, 27, 28). Becoming a member of an endometriosis society had  
212 no effect on diagnostic delay (35).



213 The discrepancy in effectiveness of the introduction of specialist endometriosis centres may  
214 be due to differences in health care systems including access to care, service use, service  
215 cost, referral pathways and diagnostic guidelines.

216

217 A range of interventions to reduce diagnostic delay for endometriosis were suggested  
218 including education and awareness campaigns, collaboration, and multidisciplinary working  
219 between HCPs, promoting health-seeking behaviour for patients, the use of screening tools,  
220 increased research into endometriosis, improving access to medical records, clinical  
221 guidelines written in the native language, the use of reliable diagnostic indicators and early  
222 intervention.

223 [Figure 4]

224 The interventions suggested span the entirety of the socio-ecological framework (see figure  
225 5). This multi-level approach to intervention allows for the introduction of all encompassing,  
226 yet targeted and effective interventions tailored according to individual factors and  
227 behaviours (13) and the wider health care system. Using this framework for diagnostic delay  
228 in endometriosis is useful to visualise the complexity involved whilst providing a range of  
229 options for intervention.

230 [Figure 5]

231 The breadth of interventions identified was aided by the diversity of participants included in  
232 the studies and was enhanced by the inclusion of views from a range of HCPs (17, 24, 32).

233

234 Discussion

235 Diagnostic delay associated with endometriosis is a well-established phenomenon. Prior to  
236 our review it was not clear where in the health care system these delays occurred or why  
237 they occurred. Our review is the first attempt to synthesise and analyse this evidence. On  
238 average, the diagnostic delay for endometriosis was 6.6 years across the studies and  
239 ranged from 1.5 years to 11.3 years. Delays were identified at all stages from symptom

240 onset to receiving a diagnosis. The longest average delay was the time from gynaecology  
241 referral to diagnosis (2.8 years), followed by primary care presentation to diagnosis (2.5  
242 years), and finally, from symptom onset to primary care presentation (2.0 years). Only 2  
243 studies used a CPP comparator group, while 2 used healthy controls, no other studies used  
244 a comparator or control, and none provided information on women with negative findings at  
245 laparoscopy.

246

247 We acknowledge the limitation of the scoping review methodology. The exclusion criteria  
248 meant that some papers were not included, such as those focussing on specific biomarkers.  
249 All included studies relied on patients recalling the start of their symptoms rather than  
250 tracking patients throughout their diagnostic journey or using medical records for verification  
251 which could reduce recall bias. The strength of our study was a clear focus following a pre-  
252 published protocol, including a wide range of papers from all over the world and locating the  
253 problem within the socio-ecological framework.

254

255 An area in critical need of further research is closer tracking of patients throughout their  
256 diagnostic journey. This should include the time from presentation to diagnosis, including  
257 cases where patients have met all criteria to be considered for surgery but do not have  
258 endometriosis, what their differential diagnoses are and what the differences are between  
259 women with a positive and negative laparoscopy. This may be improved by using reporting  
260 endometriosis as a differential diagnosis earlier along the diagnostic journey, and by  
261 ensuring primary and secondary care are better connected so the diagnostic journey can be  
262 properly followed. Additionally, it may be useful to have the details of the HCP available and  
263 their role e.g. primary care practitioner, gynaecologist, and their gender, age, and length of  
264 service, all of which may affect diagnostic delay.

265

266 The definition and calculation of diagnostic delay is also an area that requires urgent  
267 attention. Rather than studies describing the time from symptom onset to diagnosis, the  
268 current definition of diagnostic delay used across studies, it would be more beneficial to  
269 determine *excess delay*. This could provide regional and national estimates of the true  
270 diagnostic delay or excess delay based on regional and national average wait times for  
271 primary care appointments, referral to gynaecology, and for surgery. This measure could  
272 allow direct comparisons of care and delays between public and private provision of services  
273 for endometriosis care.

274

275 Secondly, the length of delay matters in terms of cost and severity for women and the wider  
276 health system. Accurate calculation of diagnostic delay for endometriosis may be the first  
277 step to improving guidelines, diagnostic measures, and diagnosis more broadly. Additionally,  
278 it is important to establish and address barriers to diagnosis. More investigation is needed on  
279 the effect of diagnostic delay to determine the cost-benefit of reducing diagnostic delay (37).

280 Though there remains much to be done, the results of this study can provide a platform for  
281 further future research to prevent the unnecessary and extended suffering resulting from  
282 diagnostic delays of endometriosis. The socio-ecological framework can be used to assess  
283 where improved policies may be effective, how widespread the effects might be and to  
284 provide a benchmark for their perceived benefit (financial and otherwise). Further research  
285 studies would benefit from utilising medical records to track the number of consultations,  
286 range of HCPs, and time elapsed from initial referral to a final diagnosis and treatment. Our  
287 review provides a starting point for others to improve our understanding of where changes  
288 need to be made to reduce the delay in diagnosis of endometriosis.

## 289 **References**

- 290 1. Olšarová K, Mishra GD. Early life factors for endometriosis: a systematic review.  
291 Hum Reprod Update. 2020;26(3):412-22.

- 292 2. Della Corte L, Di Filippo C, Gabrielli O, Reppuccia S, La Rosa VL, Ragusa R, et al.  
293 The Burden of Endometriosis on Women's Lifespan: A Narrative Overview on Quality of Life  
294 and Psychosocial Wellbeing. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(13).
- 295 3. Agarwal SK, Chapron C, Giudice LC, Laufer MR, Leyland N, Missmer SA, et al.  
296 Clinical diagnosis of endometriosis: a call to action. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*.  
297 2019;220(4):354.e1-.e12.
- 298 4. Zhang S, Gong TT, Wang HY, Zhao YH, Wu QJ. Global, regional, and national  
299 endometriosis trends from 1990 to 2017. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2021;1484(1):90-101.
- 300 5. Bach AM, Risoer MB, Forman A, Seibaek L. Practices and Attitudes Concerning  
301 Endometriosis Among Nurses Specializing in Gynecology. *Glob Qual Nurs Res*.  
302 2016;3:2333393616651351.
- 303 6. Eisenberg VH, Decter DH, Chodick G, Shalev V, Weil C. Burden of Endometriosis:  
304 Infertility, Comorbidities, and Healthcare Resource Utilization. *J Clin Med*. 2022;11(4).
- 305 7. GBD Compare. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. [Available from:  
306 <http://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare>.
- 307 8. Becker K, Heinemann K, Imthurn B, Marions L, Moehner S, Gerlinger C, et al. Real  
308 world data on symptomology and diagnostic approaches of 27,840 women living with  
309 endometriosis. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):20404.
- 310 9. Surrey E, Soliman AM, Trenz H, Blauer-Peterson C, Sluis A. Impact of Endometriosis  
311 Diagnostic Delays on Healthcare Resource Utilization and Costs. *Adv Ther*.  
312 2020;37(3):1087-99.
- 313 10. NICE. Recommendations | Endometriosis: diagnosis and  
314 management 2017 [Available from:  
315 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng73/chapter/Recommendations>.
- 316 11. Bullo S. "I feel like I'm being stabbed by a thousand tiny men": The challenges of  
317 communicating endometriosis pain. *Health (London)*. 2020;24(5):476-92.
- 318 12. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*  
319 *Psychology*. 2006;3(2):77-101.

- 320 13. Lee BC, Bendixsen C, Liebman AK, Gallagher SS. Using the Socio-Ecological Model  
321 to Frame Agricultural Safety and Health Interventions. *J Agromedicine*. 2017;22(4):298-303.
- 322 14. Grant MJ, Booth A. A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and  
323 associated methodologies. *Health Info Libr J*. 2009;26(2):91-108.
- 324 15. Ballard K, Lowton K, Wright J. What's the delay? A qualitative study of women's  
325 experiences of reaching a diagnosis of endometriosis. *Fertil Steril*. 2006;86(5):1296-301.
- 326 16. Ghai V, Jan H, Shakir F, Haines P, Kent A. Diagnostic delay for superficial and deep  
327 endometriosis in the United Kingdom. *J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2020;40(1):83-9.
- 328 17. As-Sanie S, Black R, Giudice LC, Gray Valbrun T, Gupta J, Jones B, et al. Assessing  
329 research gaps and unmet needs in endometriosis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2019;221(2):86-94.
- 330 18. DiBenedetti DB, Soliman AM, Ervin C, Evans E, Coddington CC, Agarwal SK, et al.  
331 Development of the Painful Periods Screening Tool for endometriosis. *Postgrad Med*.  
332 2018;130(8):694-702.
- 333 19. DiVasta AD, Vitonis AF, Laufer MR, Missmer SA. Spectrum of symptoms in women  
334 diagnosed with endometriosis during adolescence vs adulthood. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*.  
335 2018;218(3):324.e1-.e11.
- 336 20. Dmowski WP, Lesniewicz R, Rana N, Pepping P, Noursalehi M. Changing trends in  
337 the diagnosis of endometriosis: a comparative study of women with pelvic endometriosis  
338 presenting with chronic pelvic pain or infertility. *Fertil Steril*. 1997;67(2):238-43.
- 339 21. Soliman AM, Fuldeore M, Snabes MC. Factors Associated with Time to  
340 Endometriosis Diagnosis in the United States. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)*. 2017;26(7):788-  
341 97.
- 342 22. Staal AH, van der Zanden M, Nap AW. Diagnostic Delay of Endometriosis in the  
343 Netherlands. *Gynecol Obstet Invest*. 2016;81(4):321-4.
- 344 23. van der Zanden M, de Kok L, Nelen WLDM, Braat DDM, Nap AW. Strengths and  
345 weaknesses in the diagnostic process of endometriosis from the patients' perspective: a  
346 focus group study. *Diagnosis (Berl)*. 2021;8(3):333-9.

- 347 24. Fernandes A, Skotnes LL, Major M, Falcão PF. Clinicians' Perceptions of Norwegian  
348 Women's Experiences of Infertility Diseases. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(3).
- 349 25. Husby GK, Haugen RS, Moen MH. Diagnostic delay in women with pain and  
350 endometriosis. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2003;82(7):649-53.
- 351 26. Singh S, Soliman AM, Rahal Y, Robert C, Defoy I, Nisbet P, et al. Prevalence,  
352 Symptomatic Burden, and Diagnosis of Endometriosis in Canada: Cross-Sectional Survey of  
353 30 000 Women. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can*. 2020;42(7):829-38.
- 354 27. Armour M, Sinclair J, Ng CHM, Hyman MS, Lawson K, Smith CA, et al.  
355 Endometriosis and chronic pelvic pain have similar impact on women, but time to diagnosis  
356 is decreasing: an Australian survey. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10(1):16253.
- 357 28. Tewhaiti-Smith J, Semprini A, Bush D, Anderson A, Eathorne A, Johnson N, et al. An  
358 Aotearoa New Zealand survey of the impact and diagnostic delay for endometriosis and  
359 chronic pelvic pain. *Sci Rep*. 2022;12(1):4425.
- 360 29. Lukic A, Di Properzio M, De Carlo S, Nobili F, Schimberni M, Bianchi P, et al. Quality  
361 of sex life in endometriosis patients with deep dyspareunia before and after laparoscopic  
362 treatment. *Arch Gynecol Obstet*. 2016;293(3):583-90.
- 363 30. Andres MeP, Podgaec S, Carreiro KB, Baracat EC. Endometriosis is an important  
364 cause of pelvic pain in adolescence. *Rev Assoc Med Bras (1992)*. 2014;60(6):560-4.
- 365 31. Santos TM, Pereira AM, Lopes RG, Depes DeB. Lag time between onset of  
366 symptoms and diagnosis of endometriosis. *Einstein (Sao Paulo)*. 2012;10(1):39-43.
- 367 32. Riazi H, Tehranian N, Ziaei S, Mohammadi E, Hajizadeh E, Montazeri A. Patients'  
368 and physicians' descriptions of occurrence and diagnosis of endometriosis: a qualitative  
369 study from Iran. *BMC Womens Health*. 2014;14:103.
- 370 33. Hudelist G, Fritzer N, Thomas A, Niehues C, Oppelt P, Haas D, et al. Diagnostic  
371 delay for endometriosis in Austria and Germany: causes and possible consequences. *Hum  
372 Reprod*. 2012;27(12):3412-6.
- 373 34. Lamvu G, Antunez-Flores O, Orady M, Schneider B. Path to diagnosis and women's  
374 perspectives on

375 the impact of endometriosis pain. *Journal of Endometriosis and Pelvic Pain*  
376 *Disorders*. 2020;12(1):16-25.

377 35. Nnoaham KE, Hummelshoj L, Webster P, d'Hooghe T, de Cicco Nardone F, de Cicco  
378 Nardone C, et al. Impact of endometriosis on quality of life and work productivity: a  
379 multicenter study across ten countries. *Fertil Steril*. 2011;96(2):366-73.e8.

380 36. Van Niekerk L, Johnstone L, Matthewson M. Predictors of self-compassion in  
381 endometriosis: the role of psychological health and endometriosis symptom burden. *Hum*  
382 *Reprod*. 2022;37(2):264-73.


383 37. Cromeens MG, Carey ET, Robinson WR, Knafk K, Thoyre S. Timing, delays and  
384 pathways to diagnosis of endometriosis: a scoping review protocol. *BMJ Open*.  
385 2021;11(6):e049390.

386

387

388 **Figure 1 PRISMA flow diagram**

PRISMA flow diagram



389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405

\* PubMed = 204, MEDLINE = 70, EMBASE = 63, PsycINFO = 58.



406 **Table 1: Table of included studies**

First author, year, country	Study design	Participants and methods	Main finding(s)
Quantitative			
Andres, 2014, Brazil	Retrospective study	21 patients (aged 13-20) with histologically confirmed endometriosis after undergoing surgery.	Need for increased awareness of adolescent onset of endometriosis. Current imaging techniques are inadequate. Gynaecologists fail to recognise symptoms.
Armour, 2020, Australia	Cross-sectional study	409 participants (aged 18-45), 340 with endometriosis, 69 without. Recruited via survey link.	ESHRE guidelines reduced diagnostic delay from 9.9 years before 2005 to 1.5 years as of 2013 onwards. Year medical attention is sought, number of doctors seen and delayed health seeking all increase diagnostic delay.
DiVasta, 2018, United States	Cross-sectional longitudinal cohort study	670 participants (aged 12-49), 402 with self-reported endometriosis,	Need to understand changing symptom patterns and symptom base more – particularly how this may differ between an adult and

		268 controls. Recruited from 2 tertiary centres.	adolescent population. Acyclic pain appears to increase with age – potentially due to increased severity of endometriosis at surgery.
Dmowski, 1997, United States	Retrospective study	693 patients (aged 15-40), 377 with CPP symptoms, 336 infertility +/- pain. Evaluated at the Institute for the Study and Treatment of Endometriosis.	Diagnostic delays were found to be longer in women who were symptomatic earlier in life. Longer delays led to more advanced disease at laparoscopy. These findings were only significant in the pain group. Diagnostic delay steadily decreased between 1979 and 1995. Delays were longer in the pelvic pain group than the infertility group.
Ghai, 2020, United Kingdom	Retrospective cross- sectional study	101 women with surgically confirmed endometriosis recruited via written postal questionnaire.	Women often have their pain normalised and do not feel their pain is taken seriously. Misdiagnosis, menstrual cramps during adolescence, earlier symptom onset and delays between presenting with symptoms and onward referral all increased diagnostic delays. Shorter

			delays were found when women changed to a more understanding gynaecologist.
Hudelist, 2012 Austria and Germany	Cross-sectional study	171 patients (aged >18) with histologically confirmed endometriosis recruited from tertiary referral centres for diagnosis and treatment of endometriosis.	Increasing number of misdiagnoses, patient impression of not been taken seriously, normalisation of symptoms, women with cramps during adolescence, and whose mothers viewed menstruation as a negative event all experienced increased diagnostic delays. Medication use, extent of disease and main symptomatic complaint were all non-significant factors.
Husby, 2003, Norway	Cross-sectional study	261 patients with pain and endometriosis, 223 members of the Norwegian Endometriosis Association, 38 non-members.	There were no statistically significant differences in the mean diagnostic delay between 1978-2001. Delays did not differ between those with pain only and pain and infertility, additionally, there was no difference in diagnostic delay between members and non-members.

			Most of the delays were from seeing a GP to diagnosis.
Lamvu, 2020, United States, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, and the United Kingdom	Cross-sectional study	451 respondents (aged 19-60) with or without endometriosis. Recruited through 'My Endometriosis Team'.	Respondents described discussing their symptoms more than 20 times and were commonly misdiagnosed with both mental and physical conditions. About half of respondents waited over 6 years for a diagnosis while almost a quarter waited 11 or more years. Longer delay was associated with more pelvic symptoms. Many women felt doctors did not listen and that their recommendations were inconsistent with what they wanted.
Lukic, 2015, Italy	Cohort study	67 patients with deep dyspareunia diagnosed with pelvic endometriosis attending an endometriosis unit.	Women often suffer from pathology for a long time before presenting to health services. Both signs and symptoms of endometriosis need to be better recognised or women need to be clearer in describing signs and symptoms to allow diagnosis.

			Roughly two-thirds of women don't consult their GP for sexual dysfunction.
Nnoaham, 2011 (Belgium, Brazil, China, Ireland, Italy, Nigeria, United Kingdom, United States and Spain)	Multicentre cross-sectional study with prospective recruitment	1,418 premenopausal women (aged 18-45) without previous surgical diagnosis of endometriosis. 745 with endometriosis, 587 symptomatic, 86 sterilised. Recruited in hospital before surgery.	Delays were increased when state funded care was sought when compared to self-funded care or through insurance. Patients with longer delays had more pelvic symptoms and a higher Body Mass Index (BMI), even when adjusting for potential confounders. Most of the delay was due to length of time between referral from primary care to a gynaecologist. Women with endometriosis had a longer delay than symptomatic controls without endometriosis at surgery. Diagnostic delays ranged from 3.3 years to 10.7 years.
Santos, 2012, Brazil	Retrospective analytical study	262 women (aged 17-49) with surgically confirmed	Diagnostic delay differed between different age categories; however, the difference was found to be

		<p>endometriosis. Recruited through an outpatient clinic for endometriosis and CPP.</p>	<p>non-significant. Women with dysmenorrhea and deep dyspareunia had a longer delay, which those with dyspareunia (not deep) and acyclic pain had a shorter delay. Women experiencing infertility experienced a longer delay than their fertile counterparts. Site and severity of disease were not significant factors.</p>
<p>Singh, 2020, Canada</p>	<p>Cross-sectional survey</p>	<p>2004 women (aged 18-49) were recruited via email using 3 independent survey sampling panels.</p>	<p>Delays in health seeking were longer than physician-related delays. On average women saw 3 different physicians before receiving a diagnosis. The odds of receiving a diagnosis of endometriosis were highest when women experienced infertility, cyclic pelvic pain or cramping, and pelvic pressure.</p>
<p>Soliman, 2017, United States</p>	<p>Cross-sectional study</p>	<p>683 respondents (aged 18-29) recruited from 3</p>	<p>Younger age at symptom onset and white ethnicity were associated with a longer diagnostic delay. Patients with</p>

		market research panels.	constipation, bloating or diarrhoea were diagnosed sooner than those with pain during sex. Delays were also shorter among women having a diagnostic procedure, women seen by a gynaecologist and women diagnosed via non-surgical methods.
Staal, 2016, Netherlands	Retrospective cross-sectional study	47 patients (aged 14-29) diagnosed with endometriosis by surgery or MRI.	Diagnostic delay was shorter for patients who consulted their GP due to subfertility rather than pain. A longer delay from presenting to a GP to referral was experienced by patients who were a young age when they developed symptoms, misdiagnosed or their symptoms were normalised – the same delays were not experienced between referral to a gynaecologist and diagnosis.
Tewhaiti-Smith 2022, New Zealand	Cross-sectional study	800 respondents (aged 18-74),	Diagnostic delay was longer in patients with endometriosis than those experiencing CPP.

		<p>620 with endometriosis, 180 with CPP. Recruited using social media, flyers, and through targeted dissemination.</p>	<p>On average women saw 4.8 doctors before they were diagnosed with endometriosis. Year of first doctors visit was negatively correlated with the number of doctors consulted suggesting health-seeking delays are reducing over time. Overall diagnostic delay was reduced by 6.5 years by the introduction of guidelines.</p>
<p>Van Niekerk, 2022, Australia, Oceania, United Kingdom and North America</p>	<p>Cross-sectional study</p>	<p>318 women (23 of whom with symptoms of perimenopause, 35 in medical menopause and 7 in surgical menopause). Recruited via online advertising on social media.</p>	<p>Longer diagnostic delays, number of endometriosis-related symptoms, depression, anxiety, pain after sexual intercourse and during urination were all negative predictors of self-compassion. Women with longer diagnostic delays were found to have higher levels of endometriosis-related distress are likely to report lower levels of self-compassion and would benefit from early engagement in psychological</p>



			interventions.
Qualitative			
As-Sanie, 2019, United States	Qualitative study – interactive discussion	Interdisciplinary group of expert researchers, clinicians, and patients put together the The Society for Women's Health Research.	Identified themes impacting diagnostic delay through guided interactive discussion. These included diagnostics, barriers to diagnosis, the future of diagnostics, treatment, barriers to treatment and the future of treatment – with several subthemes including stigma and understanding.
Ballard, 2006, United Kingdom	Qualitative, interview-based study	32 women (aged 16-47) attending a pelvic pain clinic. 28 diagnosed with endometriosis.	Delays occur at every stage of the diagnostic pathway. Delays occur at both the patient-level and medical-level, with normalisation being a common factor. Others include stigma, non-specific testing, and improper use of treatments.
DiBenedetti, 2018, United States	Qualitative cross-sectional study with an interview	16 women (aged 24-48), 11 with endometriosis and 5 healthy	A painful periods screening tool was developed to aid in the recognition of pathological symptoms of endometriosis. The tool was found have face


	element	controls. Recruited via 2 qualitative research facilities.	validity and content validity, clearly and concisely able to assess core symptoms and distinguish between normal and pathological symptoms.
Fernandes 2020, Norway	Qualitative interview-based study	13 doctors- 8 gynaecologists and 5 General Practitioners (GP's) identified via google search.	Patients attending clinic often feel embarrassed and disbelieved regarding symptoms. Doctors do not like to take responsibility for diagnosis due to not being specialised in women's health issues. Diagnosis is often delayed due to multiple misdiagnoses.
Riazi, 2014, Iran	Qualitative interview-based study	12 endometriosis patients (aged 22-37) and 6 gynaecologists	Dyspareunia was noted as one of the most important symptoms of the disease. Women's recognition of this symptom is often delayed due to delayed marriage (and so delayed intercourse). Beliefs around dysmenorrhoea being normal and common during virginity also delay diagnosis. From a medical viewpoint, unreliability of diagnostic

			markers, misdiagnosis and mismanagement all increase diagnostic delay.
Van der Zanden, 2022, Netherlands	Qualitative focus group-based study	23 women (aged 29-45) placed in 6 focus groups. Recruited by social media, through a patient interest group and through a centre of expertise in endometriosis	Health-seeking behaviour is often influenced by peers, normalisation leads to delays. Non-discriminatory tests, being referred to the wrong specialist and given pain medication without proper indication for use were all attributed to diagnostic delays. Referral was faster in women with menstruation specific complaints. Not all doctors have equal knowledge and some women received incomplete examination.

407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420

**Figure 2: Schematic representation of global average diagnostic delay**

421



422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456


Table 2: The main themes and sub-themes relating to diagnostic delay

	<b>Main theme</b>	<b>Contributing factors (sub-themes)</b>
1	Access to healthcare	Physical access to care, financial barriers, stigma, embarrassment, not being aware of endometriosis, religious beliefs, and normalisation of symptoms.
2	Knowledge limitations	Poor recognition of symptoms (patients and HCP), HCP thinking endometriosis is a 'rare' disease, inability to define between normal and pathological symptoms (patients and HCP), lack of awareness and lack of training and evidence available to HCP.
3	Misdiagnosis	Differential presentation of symptoms between women, atypical symptoms, comorbidities, communication challenges between different HCP, lack of specificity of testing, lack of definitive diagnostic testing, and use of non-definitive tests.
4	Stigmatisation	Stigma, normalisation, dismissal, patient unable to properly verbalise pain and/or symptoms causing communication challenges between patient and HCP, and lack of patient assertiveness.
5	Method of diagnosis	Hesitation to refer for more invasive, definitive tests, age, HCP uncomfortable with requirement to perform physical exam (particularly adolescents), and perceived need for surgical over clinical diagnosis in some health systems.
6	Lack of guidelines	No screening tools available, inconsistency in available PROMs and guidelines, poor interdisciplinary handling of patients, and need for involvement of multiple HCP.

457

458

459 **Figure 3: Pathways to diagnostic delay**



460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469


470

471

472

473

474 **Figure 4: Thematic map of interactions between themes and subthemes**



475

476

477

478

479

480

481


482

483

484

485 **Figure 4: The socio-ecological model of endometriosis**

How each 'theme' relates to the Socio-Ecological Model



486

487

488

489

490

491

492