

1 **Title: Perceptions of barriers and facilitators for cervical cancer screening from women and**  
2 **healthcare workers in Ghana: Applying the Dynamic Sustainability Framework**

3 **Short title: Barriers and facilitators for cervical cancer screening in Ghana.**

4 Adwoa Bemah Boamah Mensah<sup>1\*</sup>, Thomas Okpoti Konney<sup>2</sup>, Ernest Adankwah<sup>3, 4</sup>, John Amuasi<sup>4</sup>,  
5 <sup>5</sup>, Madalyn Nones<sup>6</sup>, Joshua Okyere<sup>1,7</sup>, Kwame Ofori Boadu<sup>8</sup>, Felicia Maame Efua Eduah<sup>9</sup>, Serena  
6 Xiong<sup>10</sup>, J. Robin Moon<sup>11</sup>, Beth Virnig<sup>12</sup>, Shalini Kulasingam<sup>6</sup>

7 <sup>1</sup>Department of Nursing, School of Nursing and Midwifery, Kwame Nkrumah University of  
8 Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

9 <sup>2</sup>School of Medical Sciences, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi,  
10 Ghana

11 <sup>3</sup>Department of Medical Diagnostics, Faculty of Allied Health Sciences, Kwame Nkrumah  
12 University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

13 <sup>4</sup>Global Health Department, School of Public Health. Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and  
14 Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

15 <sup>5</sup>Kumasi Center for Collaborative Research in Tropical Medicine, UPO PMB, KNUST- Kumasi-  
16 Ghana

17 <sup>6</sup>Division of Epidemiology and Community Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis,  
18 Minnesota, USA.

19 <sup>7</sup>Department of Population and Health, University of Cape Coast, University Post Office, Cape  
20 Coast, Ghana.

21 <sup>8</sup>Ghana Health Service, Kumasi South Regional Hospital, Ashanti Region, Ghana

22 <sup>9</sup>Ghana Health Service, Suntreso Government Hospital, Post Office Box 14775, Kumasi- Ashanti  
23 Region, Ghana.

24 <sup>10</sup>Division of Public Health Sciences, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO

25 <sup>11</sup>Department of Health Policy and Management, City University of New York, Graduate School  
26 of Public Health and Health Policy, USA

27 <sup>12</sup>College of Public Health and Health Professions, University of Florida, USA.

28 **Emails**

29 **ABBM: [bbemahc2000@gmail.com](mailto:bbemahc2000@gmail.com) (Corresponding author)**

30 **TOK: [tom.konney@yahoo.com](mailto:tom.konney@yahoo.com)**

31 **EA: [ernestadankwah@yahoo.com](mailto:ernestadankwah@yahoo.com)**

32 **JA: [amuas001@umn.edu](mailto:amuas001@umn.edu)**

33 **MN: [nones002@umn.edu](mailto:nones002@umn.edu)**

34 **JO: [joshuaokyere54@gmail.com](mailto:joshuaokyere54@gmail.com)**

35 **KOB: [kwame.boadu@ghs.gov.gh](mailto:kwame.boadu@ghs.gov.gh)**

36 **FME: [fmeeduah@gmail.com](mailto:fmeeduah@gmail.com)**

37 **SX: [xions@wustl.edu](mailto:xions@wustl.edu)**

38 **JRM: [Robin.Moon@sph.cuny.edu](mailto:Robin.Moon@sph.cuny.edu)**

39 **BV: [bvirnig@phhp.ufl.edu](mailto:bvirnig@phhp.ufl.edu)**

40 **SK: [kulas016@umn.edu](mailto:kulas016@umn.edu)**

## 41 **Abstract**

42 Cervical cancer screening has reduced cervical cancer-related mortality by over 70% in countries  
43 that have achieved high coverage. However, there are significant geographic disparities in access  
44 to screening. In Ghana, although cervical cancer is the second most common cancer in women,  
45 there is no national-level cervical cancer screening program, and only 2 to 4% of eligible Ghanaian  
46 women have ever been screened for cervical cancer. This study used an exploratory, sequential  
47 mixed-methods approach to examine barriers and facilitators to cervical cancer screening from  
48 women and healthcare workers perspectives, guided by the Dynamic Sustainability Framework.  
49 Two convenience samples of 215 women and 17 healthcare personnel were recruited for this study.  
50 All participants were from one of three selected clinics (Ejisu Government Hospital, Kumasi South  
51 Hospital, and the Suntreso Government Hospital) in the Ashanti region of Ghana. Descriptive  
52 analyses were used to group the data by practice setting and ecological system. Statistical  
53 differences in means and proportions were used to evaluate women's barriers to cervical cancer  
54 screening. Quantitative findings from the women's survey informed qualitative, in-depth  
55 interviews with the healthcare workers and analyzed using an inductive thematic analysis. The  
56 median age of women and healthcare workers was 37.0 years and 38.0 years respectively. Most  
57 women (n=194, 90.2%) reported never having been screened. Women who had not been screened  
58 were more likely to have no college or university education. Ecologic factors identified were lack  
59 of knowledge about available services, distance to a clinic and requiring a spouse's permission  
60 prior to scheduling. Practice setting barriers included long clinic wait times and culturally sensitive  
61 issue. The quantitative and qualitative data were integrated in the data collection stage, results, and  
62 subsequent discussion. These findings highlight the need for non-clinician-based culturally  
63 sensitive tool options for screening such as self-collected HPV tests to increase screening  
64 participation in Ghana.

65  
66 **Keywords:** Cervical cancer, Screening, Barriers, Facilitators, Women, Healthcare worker,  
67 Dynamic Sustainability Framework, Mixed-methods, Ghana.

68

## 69 **Introduction**

70 Cervical cancer is a leading cause of cancer death among women in low-and-middle-income  
71 countries (LMIC) primarily due to a lack of access to screening (1). Ghana has a population of  
72 10.6 million women (or approximately 63.2% of the female population) aged 15 years and older  
73 who are at risk of developing cervical cancer (2). Additionally, cervical cancer is the second most  
74 frequently diagnosed cancer in Ghanaian women with an age-standardized incidence rate of 27.4  
75 per 100,000 women and an age-standardized mortality rate of 17.8 per 100,000 women. In contrast,  
76 despite a similar population size, Spain has age standardized cervical cancer incidence and  
77 mortality rates of 8.2 and 1.7 per 100,000 women, respectively, due to the widespread availability  
78 of screening and treatment (3).

79  
80 Ghana faces many barriers in its effort to address the high incidence of cervical cancer. Currently,  
81 there is no national human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccination campaign to protect women from  
82 contracting HPV, the main cause of cervical cancer (4). As a result, both vaccination and screening  
83 rates remain low (2). The majority of women present to clinics with advanced stage cervical cancer  
84 (5). To address this, Ghana's National Reproductive Health Policy was revised in 2014 to integrate  
85 cervical cancer screening into existing reproductive health programs such as family planning and  
86 sexually transmitted infections management services (6,7). The policy includes recommendations  
87 for screening using Visual Inspection with Acetic Acid (VIA) and Papanicolaou tests for women  
88 ages 25–45 years and cryotherapy for the treatment of precancerous cervical lesions. Despite this  
89 policy, which has been in place for nine years, only 2.4 to 4% of eligible Ghanaian women are  
90 screened for cervical cancer annually (8–11). Interviews with women in Ghana who have been

91 diagnosed with late stage cervical cancer confirm that barriers to preventative care include high  
92 costs, a lack of knowledge, and lack of access to screening facilities (14).

93

94 Until recently, the World Health Organization (WHO) has recommended cervical cytology and  
95 VIA for cervical cancer screening in LMICs. Of the two, VIA has been more readily adopted  
96 across sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) due to the availability and low cost of acetic acid for visualizing  
97 abnormal regions, the low cost to train personnel to conduct VIA-based screening, and the ability  
98 to carry out immediate treatment if abnormal regions of the cervix are identified (referred to as  
99 ‘see and treat’). However, limitations of this approach include a low sensitivity, low  
100 reproducibility, and the need for trained personnel to conduct pelvic exams (15–18). Although  
101 cytology has an improved sensitivity compared to VIA, it also involves a pelvic exam by trained  
102 clinic staff for specimen collection, is more expensive than VIA, and requires training to interpret  
103 laboratory results (16). As a result, the WHO updated their cervical cancer screening guidelines in  
104 2022 to primarily recommend HPV testing in conjunction with self-collected samples for women  
105 ages 30 - 50 years (19).

106

107 HPV-based screening has a significantly higher sensitivity compared to VIA and cytology for the  
108 detection of high-grade cervical lesions (20,21). HPV testing can be performed with self-collected  
109 samples, which allows patients’ privacy and, importantly, reduces reliance on clinics with trained  
110 personnel. While this approach to cervical cancer screening is appealing, its implementation in  
111 countries in SSA is not straightforward. Hurdles include determining when and where to offer  
112 screening, how to best instruct women on self-collection methods, which collection device and  
113 HPV test to use, and how to triage HPV-positive women. Deciding how to address these hurdles

114 requires an understanding of the unique barriers faced by a population operating within a specific  
115 healthcare setting in a given country system. The Dynamic Sustainability Framework provides a  
116 structure for re-examining interventions that have already been implemented, such as cervical  
117 cancer screening in Ghana, and identifying key domains and constructs both within the practice  
118 setting itself as well as the wider ecological system that can be used to improve patient outcomes  
119 (22). To accomplish this, it's important to understand barriers to optimizing patient outcomes from  
120 the perspective of those utilizing healthcare services as well as those providing these services. This  
121 study used the general DSF framework in combination with a mixed-methods sequential approach  
122 to identify potential barriers to cervical cancer screening from the perspectives of both women and  
123 healthcare workers.

## 124 **Materials and Methods**

### 125 **Study design**

126  
127 Approval for this study was provided by the Committee on Human Research, Publication and  
128 Ethics, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana  
129 (CHRPE/AP/043/22) and the Cancer Center Protocol Review Committee, University of Minnesota  
130 (CPRC# 2022LS045). We used aspects of the Dynamic Sustainability Framework to better  
131 understand the factors that affect the uptake of the current cervical screening practices currently  
132 implemented in Ghana. In particular, we utilized two domains, “Practice settings” and “Ecological  
133 system”, from the DSF (Fig 1) to provide a general framework for our data collection and analysis  
134 (22). In addition, we adopted an exploratory, sequential mixed-methods study design to obtain  
135 detailed information on the constructs for each of these domains. In particular, we used an initial,  
136 quantitative phase to obtain information on “other practice setting constructs” and “population  
137 characteristics” in the Ecological System domain. For this phase, we focused on Ghanaian women,

138 overall and stratified by key characteristics. Analysis of the quantitative data informed the second,  
139 qualitative phase of the study. This second phase was designed to obtain in-depth information to  
140 better understand practice setting constraints such as staffing. In particular, we conducted key  
141 informant interviews with clinicians and laboratory workers who were directly involved in cervical  
142 cancer screening and testing at the same facilities as those used for recruitment of women eligible  
143 for screening for the quantitative data collection (Phase I). Our overall goal was to obtain  
144 information from each of these domains that could help us better understand why cervical cancer  
145 screening as an intervention may not be working well and how it can potentially be improved.

146

## 147 **Study setting**

148 Individuals were selected from three healthcare facilities: the Ejisu Government Hospital, Kumasi  
149 South Hospital, and the Suntreso Government Hospital. Kumasi South and Suntreso Government  
150 hospitals are urban facilities located in the city of Kumasi, Ghana's second largest city, which has  
151 a total population of 6,630,000 individuals (23). Ejisu Government Hospital is peri-urban and is  
152 located in the municipality of Ejisu, which has a smaller population of approximately 181,000  
153 individuals. Together, the selected facilities serve individuals from three metropolitan assemblies  
154 in the Ashanti region: Ejisu, Asokwa, and Kumasi. These areas were chosen because participation  
155 in screening is low and women served by health facilities in this region either have to wait for  
156 outreach services or travel to the few health facilities offering cervical cancer screening (24).  
157 Recruitment took place from 1<sup>st</sup> August 2022 and ended on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2022.

158

159

160 **Fig 1. Dynamic sustainability framework for cervical cancer**  
161 **screening in Ghana**

162

163 **Ecological System**

## 164 **Quantitative Data Collection (Survey)**

165 The quantitative portion of the study examined other practice setting and population characteristics  
166 that affect women’s abilities to obtain cervical cancer screening. A survey was adapted based on  
167 a published study that evaluated the knowledge about and attitudes towards cervical cancer and  
168 cervical cancer screening in a population of 900 women living in Uganda (25). The questionnaire  
169 was drafted in English, translated into Twi and back-translated into English to check for potential  
170 errors. The survey was divided into seven sections. The first section asked for demographic  
171 information including the participant’s age, education level, marital status, occupation, average  
172 income, number of dependents, and length of living in the current district. The second and third  
173 sections asked about the participant’s knowledge of cervical cancer, cervical cancer screening and  
174 vaccination. This section included questions regarding symptoms of cervical cancer, sources of  
175 information for patient knowledge about cervical cancer and when and how often individuals  
176 should be vaccinated and/or screened for cervical cancer. The fourth section was a knowledge  
177 scale on the risk factors of cervical cancer in which participants were asked to respond ‘Yes,’ ‘No’  
178 or ‘Don’t know’ (25). The fifth section was a belief scale that participants were asked to rank on a  
179 five-point Likert scale with ‘1’ indicating strong disagreement and ‘5’ indicating strong agreement  
180 with the statement (25). The sixth section asked about other practice setting characteristics, such  
181 as wait times and distance to clinic, that affect participation in cervical cancer screening and the  
182 final section asked about the woman’s sexual history and history of pregnancies. The questionnaire  
183 was programmed in REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) to allow real time data collection  
184 and uploading, and to also help with quality control and allow for efficient data processing (26,27).  
185 The cross-sectional survey was conducted at the three selected healthcare facilities as noted above.  
186 Eligible individuals were women 30 years of age and older who could undergo cervical cancer  
187 screening, lived in the catchment area of one of the three hospitals, could provide informed consent

188 and could comprehend the survey questions either verbally or in written form. A convenience  
189 sampling approach was used to enroll women; women presenting at one of the three facilities were  
190 approached by a research assistant regarding possible interest in the study. If a woman was  
191 interested, she was invited to a private room where the research assistant provided further  
192 information and assessed participant's eligibility. If the woman was eligible and willing to  
193 participate after disclosure of the study details, the assistant asked for consent and administered  
194 the questionnaire. All women received a compensation of GHC 30.00 for their participation in the  
195 study.

196  
197 **Analysis of quantitative data**  
198 All analyses were performed using R Statistical Software (v4.1.3; R Core Team 2021) (28). Data  
199 cleaning included evaluating missingness and non-response rates for various questions. All  
200 variables used for analysis had less than 1% of missing responses. Descriptive statistics were used  
201 to characterize population characteristics and evaluate other practice setting constraints that affect  
202 participation in cervical cancer screening. Continuous variables were assessed for median and IQR  
203 while frequencies were assessed for all categorical variables. Additionally, other practice setting  
204 constraints were stratified by education level (some college or university versus no college or  
205 university), marital status (married or living together versus single, divorced or widowed) and rural  
206 versus urban. Categorical variables were created based on prior studies examining socio-  
207 demographic variables that predict Pap-smear uptake in Ghanaian women (29). For marital status,  
208 women who were married or living with a partner were compared to women who were single,  
209 divorced, widowed, or separated. For educational status, women who had some college or  
210 university education were compared to women with secondary school education or less. Women  
211 living in rural areas were also compared to those living in urban areas, which has previously been



212 shown to influence uptake of cervical cancer screening (30). After stratifying by demographic  
213 variables, prevalence ratios were used to assess differences in response frequency by demographic  
214 category, and two-sided t-tests were used to analyze a difference in means and differences in  
215 proportions for continuous variables. All statistical tests were deemed significant at the  $\alpha=0.05$   
216 level.

## 217 **From quantitative to qualitative methods**

218 For the second phase, a semi-structured interview guide was developed that incorporated findings  
219 that emerged as important and were related to the Practice Setting during the first phase. Based on  
220 women's reporting of limited accessibility to clinics, needing permission to schedule a doctor  
221 appointment, and clinic wait times of one hour or greater, interview questions explored the views  
222 of healthcare workers on health system hurdles faced by women accessing preventive care.  
223

## 224 **Practice Setting**

### 225 **Qualitative section (Interviews)**

#### 226 **Understanding barriers to cervical cancer screening from a health system perspective**

227 To better understand how healthcare settings, affect cervical cancer screening, we interviewed  
228 healthcare workers from each of the three hospitals (the Ejisu Government Hospital, Kumasi South  
229 Hospital, and the Suntreso Government Hospital). Healthcare workers were defined as  
230 nurses/midwives, doctors or laboratory personnel who were involved in cervical cancer screening  
231 (nurses/midwives and doctors) or testing (laboratory personnel). Individuals were eligible for the  
232 study if they were 21 years of age or older, involved in cervical cancer screening, could  
233 comprehend the questionnaire verbally, and could provide informed consent. Possible participants  
234 were identified by administrators at each selected facility. Research assistants contacted each of  
235 the possible participants to review the study details and eligibility criteria. Eligible participants  
236  
237

238 decided on the date, time and venue for the interview. All of the interviews were conducted in a  
239 private office within the health facility to guarantee participant comfort and privacy. Eligible  
240 individuals interested in participating were asked for consent prior to administering the interview.  
241 Total sample size was 17 and this was based on the principle of theoretical saturation, which was  
242 determined from the interviews (31). We determined we had reached data saturation when  
243 additional interviews were redundant to previously collected data (31). By the 15<sup>th</sup> interview, there  
244 was no new information. We carried out two more interviews to confirm that we had reached data  
245 saturation. In total, 17 interviews were conducted. The healthcare workers' questionnaire was split  
246 into two sections with the first section asking for demographic information such as age, gender,  
247 education level and length of employment at the current location. The second section asked about  
248 current cervical cancer screening procedures at their respective clinic and potential constraints and  
249 facilitators to accessing screening by women. This section used semi-structured interview  
250 questions and data was collected through face-to-face in-depth interviews that were audio  
251 recorded. On average, the interviews lasted 40 minutes.

252

### 253 **Qualitative data analysis**

254 Qualitative data analysis followed an inductive thematic analysis framework. The process of  
255 analysis began with verbatim transcription of both the English (n=4) and local language (Twi,  
256 n=13) audio-recorded data. For the interviews conducted in Twi, two expert translators were used  
257 in a back-back translation process. A random selection of audio data was evaluated by a bilingual  
258 research assistant to ensure accuracy in interviewing, transcribing and translation. Transcripts were  
259 imported into QSR NVivo-12 Plus for data management and coding. The 'nodes' function in QSR  
260 NVivo-12 was used for preliminary inductive coding (32). Intercoder agreement was 95% for  
261 codes on questions regarding barriers to cervical cancer screening and 90% agreement was

262 observed on questions about factors that would facilitate a woman to seek cervical cancer  
263 screening. To enhance trustworthiness of the data, strategies such as prolonged engagement, peer  
264 debriefing, member checking (n=2), audit trail, reflexivity, detailed and appropriate descriptions  
265 of the methodological processes and context were employed (33) The inductive coding results  
266 were categorized according to emerging patterns and major themes around barriers to cervical  
267 cancer screening and testing. Key quotes were extracted to reflect the various themes to support  
268 the barriers.

269  
270 **Integration of the mixed-methods data**  
271 Following the structure of an exploratory, sequential mixed-methods design, the quantitative and  
272 qualitative data were integrated in the data collection stage, results and subsequent discussion.  
273 Themes and key quotes from the in-depth interviews were used to provide additional insight into  
274 health system barriers women might face in accessing cervical cancer screening.

## 275 **Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate**

276 Approval for this study was provided by Committee on Human Research, Publication and Ethics,  
277 Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (CHRPE/AP/043/22) and the Cancer  
278 Center Protocol Review Committee, University of Minnesota (CPRC# 2022LS045). The  
279 participants received written information about the study. Formal consent was obtained by writing  
280 and participation was voluntary and anonymous.

## 281 **Results**

282 Population characteristics for the women's sample are presented in Table 1a and characteristics  
283 for the healthcare worker's sample are presented in Table 1b. The median age of women was 37.0  
284 (IQR: 32.0 - 45.5). Overall, women had varying levels of educational attainment. The majority of

285 women were married (69.3%, n=149) and self-employed (62.8%, n=135). The median number of  
 286 dependents was four. The median age of healthcare workers was 38.0 (IQR: 36.5 - 43.5). The  
 287 majority of healthcare workers identified as female (78.9%, n=15) and had received a university  
 288 degree (63.2%, n=12). The median length of time that healthcare workers had worked within their  
 289 profession was 12.0 years (IQR: 10.0 - 15.5).

290  
 291

**Table 1a: Demographics for women participants**

<b>Participant Characteristic (n=215)</b>	
Age*	37.0 (32.0–45.5)
<b>Education, n (%)</b>	
No primary school	12 (5.6)
Primary school	22 (10.2)
Junior high school	78 (36.3)
Senior high school	53 (24.7)
Some college or university	50 (23.2)
<b>Marital Status, n (%)</b>	
Single	23 (10.7)
Married	149 (69.3)
Widowed	18 (8.4)
Divorced/Separated	12 (5.6)
Living with a partner	13 (6.0)
<b>Occupation, n (%)</b>	
Agriculture/Farming	12 (5.6)
Self-employed	135 (62.8)
Housewife	12 (5.6)
Civil/Government/Private Sector Employee	40 (18.6)
Other	16 (7.4)
<b>Dependent</b>	
<b>Number of Dependents*</b>	4.0 (3.0–5.5)

Length Living in District, n (%)	
All of my life	19 (8.8)
Less than 1 year	22 (10.2)
Between 1 and 5 years	74 (34.4)
More than 5 years	100 (46.5)

292 \*Age and number of dependents are reported as median (IQR)  
 293  
 294

**Table 1b: Demographics of healthcare workers**

Participant Characteristic	All healthcare workers (n=19)
Age*	38.0 (36.5–43.5)
Gender, n (%)	
Female	15 (78.9)
Male	4 (21.1)
Education, n (%)	
Some college	7 (36.8)
A college/university degree	12 (63.2)
Employment	
Length of employment in years*	12.0 (10.0–15.5)

295 \*Age and length of employment are presented in median (IQR)  
 296  
 297

298 Quantitative data describing other practice setting issues that women face when accessing cervical  
 299 cancer screening are presented in Table 2. The median distance that women reported traveling to  
 300 get to the closest healthcare facility was 5.5 kilometers (IQR: 3.1 - 10.1) and the median travel  
 301 time to the clinic was 25.0 minutes (IQR: 15.0 - 30.0). One hundred and twenty-four women  
 302 (57.7%) reported that they had to wait longer than one hour before being seen at the clinic. The  
 303 majority of women took public transportation to get to the healthcare facility (58.1% or n=125).  
 304 Aside from public transportation, women usually took either their own vehicle or a ridesharing  
 305 vehicle (31.6% of n=68). Seventy-three women (34.0%) responded that they needed permission  
 prior to scheduling a doctor’s appointment. One hundred and thirty-five women (62.3%) reported

306 that they knew of healthcare facilities that provided cervical cancer screening; however, most  
 307 women (90.2% or n=194) reported that they had never been screened for cervical cancer.

308  
 309 **Table 2: Other practice setting constraints for accessing cervical cancer screening for all**  
 310 **women (n=215)**

Factor	All Women
How far is it, in kilometers, to the local healthcare facility/ clinic from your home?*	5.5 (3.1 - 10.1)
How much time, in minutes, does it take you to get to the clinic?*	25.0 (15.0 - 30.0)
Wait longer than 60 minutes to be seen at the clinic n (%)	124 (57.7)
<b>Primary mode of transportation, n (%)</b>	
Car (either own or rideshare)	68 (31.6)
Bicycle	1 (.004)
Walking	18 (8.4)
Public Transportation	125 (58.1)
Needs permission to schedule a healthcare visit n (%)	73 (34.0)
Knows of clinics/hospitals that offer cervical cancer screening n (%)	80 (37.2)
Has never been screened for cervical cancer n (%)	194 (90.2)
Has access to a mobile phone n (%)	203 (94.4)

311 \*\*Distance to the local healthcare facility and time to clinic are reported as median (IQR)

312  
 313 Potential constraints stratified by highest level of educational attainment, marital status and rural  
 314 versus urban are presented in Table 3. When stratified by education level, women with no college  
 315 or university were significantly more likely to have to wait >1 hour to be seen at a local clinic  
 316 versus women with some college or university-level education ( $p = 0.001$ ), and were significantly  
 317 less likely to be aware of local clinics offering screening services ( $p = 0.05$ ). When stratified by  
 318 marital status, single, widowed, and divorced women were significantly more likely to walk to the  
 319 clinic versus women who were married or living with their partners ( $p = 0.03$ ). Married women  
 320 were more likely to require permission to schedule a doctor appointment versus single women ( $p$

321 < 0.001). When comparing women living in an urban versus rural area, women living in an urban  
 322 area spent, on average, a longer duration of time traveling to their local clinic.

323  
 324  
 325 **Table 3: Individual-level constraints stratified by education level, marital status, and rural**  
 326 **versus urban for all women (n = 215)**

			Prevalence Ratio	Test Statistic	p-value
<b>Facility-level barrier</b>	<b>No College/University (n = 165), %(n)</b>	<b>Some College/University (n = 50), %(n)</b>			
Distance (km) to local healthcare facility, mean (SD)	8.7 (11.4)	6.5 (6.5)		1.7	0.09
Time (minutes) to local healthcare facility, mean (SD)	30.8 (23.2)	27.0 (23.3)		1	0.32
>1 hour wait time at clinic %(n)	64.8 (107)	34.0 (17)		13.7	<0.001
<b>Primary mode of transportation %(n)</b>					
Car (own or rideshare)	24.8 (41)	54.0 (27)	Referent		
Bicycle	0.6 (1)	0	NA		
Walking	9.7 (16)	4.0 (2)	0.54		0.41
Public transportation	63.6 (105)	40.0 (20)	0.78		0.49
Needs permission to schedule visit %(n)	32.7 (54)	38.0 (19)		0.27	0.6
Knows of clinics with screening %(n)	33.3(55)	50.0 (25)		3.88	0.05
Never been screened for cervical cancer %(n)	90.3 (149)	90.0 (45)		<0.001	1
			Prevalence Ratio	Test Statistic	p-value
<b>Facility-level barrier</b>	<b>Married/Living Together (n=162), n(%)</b>	<b>Single/Divorced/Widowed (n=53), n(%)</b>			
Distance (km) to local healthcare facility, mean (SD)	8.4 (11.1)	7.6 (8.2)		0.56	0.58
Time (minutes) to local healthcare facility, mean (SD)	30.0 (23.3)	30.0 (23.4)		0.002	1

>1 hour wait time at clinic %(n)	60.5 (98)	49.1 (26)		1.7	0.19
<b>Primary mode of transportation %(n)</b>					
Car (own or rideshare)	32.7 (53)	28.3 (15)	Referent		
Bicycle	0	1.9 (1)	NA		
Walking	5.6 (9)	17.0 (9)	2.3 (1.2 - 4.3)		0.03
Public transportation	59.9 (97)	52.8 (28)	1.0 (0.58 - 1.8)		0.96
Needs permission to schedule visit %(n)	42.6 (69)	7.5 (4)		20.3	<0.001
Knows of clinics with screening %(n)	40.1 (65)	28.3 (15)		1.9	0.17
Never been screened for cervical cancer %(n)	88.3 (143)	96.2 (51)		2.0	0.15
			<b>Prevalence Ratio</b>	<b>Test Statistic</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Facility-level barrier</b>	<b>Rural (n=70)</b>	<b>Urban (n=145)</b>			
Distance (km) to local healthcare facility, mean (SD)	9.2 (6.9)	7.8 (11.8)		-1.1	0.26
Time (minutes) to local healthcare facility, mean (SD)	24.2 (18.2)	32.7 (24.9)		2.8	0.005
>1 hour wait time at clinic %(n)	61.4 (43)	55.9 (81)		0.39	0.53
<b>Primary mode of transportation %(n)</b>					
Car (own or rideshare)	32.9 (23)	31.0 (45)	Referent		
Bicycle	0	0.7 (1)	NA		
Walking	5.7 (4)	9.7 (14)	1.18 (0.87 - 1.59)		0.37
Public transportation	57.1 (40)	58.6 (85)	1.03 (0.83 - 1.27)		0.8
Needs permission to schedule visit %(n)	31.4 (22)	35.2 (51)		0.15	0.7
Knows of clinics with screening %(n)	27.1 (19)	42.1 (61)		3.9	0.05
Never been screened for cervical cancer %(n)	87.1 (61)	91.7 (133)		0.66	0.42

327

328

## Qualitative Results



329 Based on the results of the quantitative analysis, two main themes related to the practice setting  
330 were further explored in these interviews: client-level constraints and health system challenges.  
331 The sub-themes that emerged through thematic analysis are presented in Table 4.

332  
333 **Table 4: Emerging practice setting relevant themes from healthcare worker interviews**

Themes	Sub-themes
Client level barriers	Financial constraints and cost of treatment
	Clients' non-compliance due to shyness and feelings of discomfort
	Fatalistic views about the outcome of cervical cancer screening
Health system challenges	Infrastructural inadequacies
	Logistical constraints
	Low staff strength

334  
335 Healthcare workers reported that women perceived financial constraints to cervical cancer  
336 screening either through the direct cost of screening services, or the indirect cost associated with  
337 transportation to the clinic. Healthcare workers also noted that women often do not think the  
338 financial burden of screening services is worth the benefit it provides in detecting cervical cancer:

339 *“Most of them complain about finances. They think that why should I use my money to go and do screening*  
340 *while I can use it for other pressing matters. So, it is not seen as a priority.” (P00 2, laboratory personnel)*

341 Healthcare workers also discussed non-compliance with screening due to feelings of discomfort  
342 around the VIA procedure. Women experienced shyness for several reasons, including fear of  
343 judgment on personal hygiene or discomfort from healthcare workers seeing them naked:

344 *“Some women are shy of themselves for their fellow women to see their nakedness...this makes them non-*  
345 *compliant and difficult to handle. At the end of the day, you will not be able to do the screening because they*  
346 *will be reluctant to follow the screening procedures.” (P006, midwife)*

347 Fears about the results from the screening process was another theme that emerged from healthcare  
348 worker interviews. According to the key informants, their clients feared that the screening would  
349 reveal that they had the disease (cervical cancer). This fear about a positive screening result was  
350 attributed to fatalistic views held by the clients. That is, healthcare workers thought that clients

351 feared that once they had been diagnosed as having cervical cancer, it would mean that they were  
352 going to die. Consequently, this fear made the clients non-compliant and unwilling to get screened.

353 *“Fear of the unknown. You know after educating the women and giving them counseling, they will still not*  
354 *feel comfortable for you to screen them because of fear of the unknown. She doesn’t know what the outcome*  
355 *will be. The fear being diagnosed of cervical cancer and dying from the disease.” (P00 14, midwife)*

356 The overarching theme of practice setting constraints was further broken into three sub-themes:  
357 infrastructural inadequacies, logical constraints, and lack of staff. Healthcare workers noted that  
358 the infrastructural capacity of healthcare facilities was not adequate for providing women's health  
359 services. For example, clinics lacked beds necessary for cervical cancer screening, or the clinic  
360 set-up did not allow for patient privacy. In clinics with a proper examination room, patients often  
361 experienced long wait times due to the availability of only one or a few rooms:

362 *“We don’t have a specific room with a special bed. The room that we use is not ideal...it does not support*  
363 *the privacy of the client in any way. Because of that, the clients don’t feel comfortable getting screened.”*  
364 *(P001, midwife)*

365 Lastly, healthcare workers noted that inadequate staffing of clinics resulted in longer wait times.  
366 This prevents patients from returning for future visits, and patients may also advise against others  
367 wanting to use the clinic’s services:

368 *“Inadequate staffing is the big issue. We are few, hence, the women wait for a long time to be attended to.*  
369 *They go and do not come back. Sharing such experience with other women also discourage screening*  
370 *uptake.” (P0016, midwife)*

## 371 **Discussion**

372 This study illustrates the constraints that different subgroups of women in Ghana face when  
373 accessing cervical cancer screening services and highlights areas in both the ecological system and  
374 practice setting that need to be addressed to increase uptake of screening. In terms of ecological  
375 factors affecting uptake, a key constraint is lack of knowledge about facilities offering cervical  
376 cancer screening. This finding is consistent with studies conducted in Uganda (34) and Tanzania

377 (35). The 2016 study in Uganda found that less than half of surveyed participants were aware of  
378 cervical cancer screening services (34), and the 2012 study in Tanzania found that women with a  
379 higher level of cervical cancer prevention knowledge were significantly more likely to partake in  
380 screening services (35). The implication of this finding is that individuals who intend to get  
381 screened may miss opportunities for screening due to their lack of awareness about facilities that  
382 offer screening. We also found that women with lower educational attainment were less likely to  
383 be aware of facilities that provide cervical cancer screening services. This is not surprising as  
384 higher educational attainment tends to empower women to access information including health  
385 information such as where to access cervical cancer screening services (36,37).

386  
387 Contrary to previous studies that have found long travel time for cervical cancer screening among  
388 women in rural areas (38,39), we found that long travel times were more likely to be experienced  
389 by those living in urban areas. This is possibly due to higher population density, traffic congestion,  
390 or longer distances between residences and healthcare facilities in urban areas compared to rural  
391 areas. Further research is required to fully comprehend why urban dwelling women in Ghana spend  
392 long travel time in accessing cervical cancer screening services. Another key consideration is long  
393 wait times, which are a major barrier to accessing cervical cancer screening with more than half  
394 of participants (57.7%) waiting over 60 minutes to be seen at the clinic. This result is consistent  
395 with a study in which 86% of a sample of 200 Kenyan women reported long wait times as a barrier  
396 to cervical cancer screening participation (40). Similar findings were also reported in a qualitative  
397 study of 48 women conducted in Accra, Ghana (41).

398

399 In terms of population characteristics, our study also highlights the fact that women with lower  
400 educational attainment were more likely to experience longer wait times at local clinics. A  
401 plausible explanation for this finding could be that women with higher education are more likely  
402 to access cervical cancer screening services in private healthcare facilities where there is less  
403 congestion and faster service delivery. This study did find that women with higher educational  
404 attainment received, on average, higher monthly incomes, which increases access to more  
405 expensive, private clinics. Women with lower educational attainment may be more likely to access  
406 cervical cancer screening services at public healthcare facilities where there is a high volume of  
407 patients, long queues, and fewer staff available for screening (42). These factors slow service  
408 delivery consistent with our qualitative results from interviews with healthcare workers who  
409 asserted that the low staffing in their facilities resulted in longer waiting times that discouraged  
410 women from accessing cervical cancer screening services. Another perspective is that lower  
411 educational attainment may be a proxy for socioeconomic status and lower information attainment.  
412 This is in the sense that women with lower levels of education often face limited access to  
413 economic opportunities, resulting in lower income levels and financial resources. This economic  
414 disadvantage can directly impact their ability to access healthcare services, including cervical  
415 cancer screening, due to financial constraints such as transportation costs or inability to afford  
416 screening fees.

417

418 Consistent with another study conducted in Pakistan (36), we found that needing permission to  
419 schedule appointments was a barrier to women's access to cervical cancer screening. The study  
420 revealed that married women were more likely to face the challenge of needing permission before  
421 they could schedule a visit. This finding may be explained by existing patriarchal and gender norms

422 that place the male as the decision-maker in the household (43,44). Consequently, the autonomy  
423 of women to make decisions regarding their healthcare is significantly reduced, especially among  
424 married women. Ghanaian traditional culture also encourages women to ensure that their  
425 nakedness is only seen by their husbands or partners. Given that the cervix is examined during  
426 cervical cancer screening, married women may feel uncomfortable undergoing this process (12).  
427 Those willing to undergo screening would then require their partners to consent and grant  
428 permission before they can allow another person to see their ‘nakedness.’ This assertion was  
429 corroborated by the accounts of the healthcare workers regarding shyness and discomfort women  
430 feel in relation to cervical cancer screening. These results suggest that other forms of screening  
431 such as HPV test-based screening through self-collected samples could increase screening uptake  
432 by mitigating patient shyness and the need for permission. Self-collection does not require the  
433 assistance of healthcare providers, which increases the privacy of the screening procedure.  
434 Previous studies have shown that women feel comfortable and confident with this type of  
435 screening (45). Further, this type of screening may also increase screening by circumventing the  
436 need for clinic-based screening.

437

438 In conclusion, this study finds that a large proportion of Ghanaian women have never been  
439 screened for cervical cancer. Both the quantitative and qualitative data highlight major barriers  
440 that women face in access to cervical cancer screening. The women’s survey found that long clinic  
441 wait times may impact screening uptake. This was especially true for women with lower  
442 educational attainment (i.e. those with no college or university education). Additionally, there was  
443 an overall lack of knowledge regarding where to obtain screening services, consistent with other  
444 studies previous findings. In-depth interviews with healthcare workers confirmed that healthcare

445 facilities are not adequately staffed, resulting in longer patient wait times. Healthcare workers also  
446 noted culturally sensitive issue as a barrier to screening uptake. This expanded upon the  
447 quantitative data, which found that over one-third of surveyed women (and over two-thirds of  
448 surveyed married women) needed permission prior to scheduling a doctor appointment. Moving  
449 forward, the use of self-collected samples for HPV testing could mitigate barriers such as time  
450 spent traveling to and waiting at a healthcare clinic. It might also provide a more culturally  
451 sensitive tool to address issues of cultural norms because HPV sample self-collection does not  
452 require the assistance of healthcare providers. Future studies should assess the feasibility of  
453 implementing self-collected HPV samples as a possible method for cervical cancer screening.

## 454 **Declarations**

### 455 **Author's Contributions**

- 456 • ABBM: Conceptualization, methodology, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, project  
457 administration, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing
- 458 • TOK: Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, data curation, writing – review & editing
- 459 • EA: Methodology, investigation, writing – review & editing
- 460 • JA: Methodology, investigation, writing – review & editing
- 461 • MN: Methodology, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, writing – original draft, writing –  
462 review & editing
- 463 • JO: Data curation, formal analysis, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing
- 464 • KOB: Methodology, investigation, writing – review & editing
- 465 • FMEE: Methodology, investigation, writing – review & editing
- 466 • SX: Methodology, writing – review & editing
- 467 • RM: Methodology, writing – review & editing
- 468 • BV: Conceptualization, methodology, data curation, investigation, writing – review & editing
- 469 • SK: Conceptualization, methodology, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, project  
470 administration, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing

### 471 **Availability of data**

472 The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due to  
473 ethical reasons but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

## 474 **Funding**

475 The study was funded by the Institute of Global Cancer Prevention Research (IGCPR). Masonic  
476 Cancer Center, University of Minnesota.

## 477 **Conflict of Interest**

478 The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship,  
479 and/or publication of this article.

## 480 **Acknowledgments**

481 We are grateful to all participants who shared their experiences in this study and funder-Institute  
482 of Global Cancer Prevention Research (IGCPR). Masonic Cancer Center, University of  
483 Minnesota.

## 484 **References**

- 485 1. Bray F, Colombet M, Aitken J, Bardot A, Eser S, Galceran J, et al. Cancer Incidence in Five  
486 Continents, Vol. XII (IARC CancerBase No. 19). [Internet]. Lyon: International Agency for  
487 Research on Cancer; 2023. Available from: <https://ci5.iarc.who.int>
- 488 2. Ghana: Human Papillomavirus and Related Cancers, Fact Sheet 2023. Fact Sheet. 2023;
- 489 3. Spain: Human Papillomavirus and Related Cancers, Fact Sheet 2023. Fact Sheet. 2023;
- 490 4. Effah K, Mawusi Wormenor C, Atuguba BH, Gedzah I, Amuah JE, Akakpo PK. A  
491 revolution in cervical cancer prevention in Ghana. *ecancer* [Internet]. 2022 Aug 9 [cited  
492 2024 Jan 30];16. Available from: [https://ecancer.org/en/journal/editorial/123-a-revolution-in-](https://ecancer.org/en/journal/editorial/123-a-revolution-in-cervical-cancer-prevention-in-ghana)  
493 [cervical-cancer-prevention-in-ghana](https://ecancer.org/en/journal/editorial/123-a-revolution-in-cervical-cancer-prevention-in-ghana)
- 494 5. Dunyo P, Effah K, Udofia EA. Factors associated with late presentation of cervical cancer  
495 cases at a district hospital: a retrospective study. *BMC Public Health*. 2018 Dec;18(1):1156.
- 496 6. Cancer Plan Ghana Ministry of Health.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jan 30]. Available from:  
497 [https://www.iccp-](https://www.iccp-portal.org/system/files/plans/Cancer%20Plan%20Ghana%20Ministry%20of%20Health.pdf)  
498 [portal.org/system/files/plans/Cancer%20Plan%20Ghana%20Ministry%20of%20Health.pdf](https://www.iccp-portal.org/system/files/plans/Cancer%20Plan%20Ghana%20Ministry%20of%20Health.pdf)


- 499 7. Mensah KB, Mensah ABB. Cancer control in Ghana: A narrative review in global context.  
500 Heliyon. 2020 Aug;6(8):e04564.
- 501 8. 2021-Holistic-Assessment-Report\_v1.7.3.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jan 30]. Available from:  
502 [https://www.moh.gov.gh/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/2021-Holistic-Assessment-](https://www.moh.gov.gh/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/2021-Holistic-Assessment-Report_v1.7.3.pdf)  
503 [Report\\_v1.7.3.pdf](https://www.moh.gov.gh/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/2021-Holistic-Assessment-Report_v1.7.3.pdf)
- 504 9. Calys-Tagoe BNL, Aheto JMK, Mensah G, Biritwum RB, Yawson AE. Cervical cancer  
505 screening practices among women in Ghana: evidence from wave 2 of the WHO study on  
506 global AGEing and adult health. BMC Women's Health. 2020 Dec;20(1):49.
- 507 10. Handlogten KS, Molitor RJ, Roeker LE, Narla NP, Bachman MJ, Quayson S, et al. Cervical  
508 Cancer Screening in Ghana, West Africa: Prevalence of Abnormal Cytology and Challenges  
509 for Expanding Screening. International Journal of Gynecological Pathology. 2014  
510 Mar;33(2):197–202.
- 511 11. Bruni L, Albero G, Mena M, Collado JJ, Gómez D, Muñoz J, et al. Human Papillomavirus  
512 and Related Diseases in the World. Summary Report [Internet]. ICO/IARC Information  
513 Centre on HPV and Cancer (HPV Information Centre); 2023 Mar. Available from:  
514 <https://hpvcentre.net/statistics/reports/XWX.pdf>
- 515 12. Binka C, Nyarko SH, Awusabo-Asare K, Doku DT. Barriers to the Uptake of Cervical  
516 Cancer Screening and Treatment among Rural Women in Ghana. BioMed Research  
517 International. 2019 Nov 3;2019:1–8.
- 518 13. Tawiah A, Konney TO, Dassah ET, Visser LE, Amo-Antwi K, Appiah-Kubi A, et al.  
519 Determinants of cervical cancer screening uptake among women with access to free  
520 screening: A community-based study in peri-urban Ghana. Intl J Gynecology & Obste. 2022  
521 Nov;159(2):513–21.
- 522 14. Appiah-Kubi A, O. Konney T, Amo-Antwi K, Tawiah A, K. Nti M, Ankobea-Kokroe F, et  
523 al. Factors associated with late-stage presentation of cervical cancer in Ghana. gmj. 2022  
524 May 31;56(2):86–94.
- 525 15. Omenge Orang'o E, Liu T, Christoffersen-Deb A, Itsura P, Oguda J, Washington S, et al.  
526 Use of visual inspection with acetic acid, Pap smear, or high-risk human papillomavirus  
527 testing in women living with HIV/AIDS for posttreatment cervical cancer screening: same  
528 tests, different priorities. AIDS. 2017 Jan 14;31(2):233–40.
- 529 16. Orang'o EO, Were E, Rode O, Muthoka K, Byczkowski M, Sartor H, et al. Novel concepts  
530 in cervical cancer screening: a comparison of VIA, HPV DNA test and p16INK4a/Ki-67  
531 dual stain cytology in Western Kenya. Infect Agents Cancer. 2020 Dec;15(1):57.
- 532 17. De Vuyst H, Claeys P, Njiru S, Muchiri L, Steyaert S, De Sutter P, et al. Comparison of pap  
533 smear, visual inspection with acetic acid, human papillomavirus DNA-PCR testing and  
534 cervicography. Intl J Gynecology & Obste. 2005 May;89(2):120–6.



- 535 18. Quao Y, Zhao Y. Experience with careHPV implementation in China. HPV World [Internet].  
536 2017 Feb;(1). Available from: [https://www.whri.org/wp-](https://www.whri.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/HPVWORLD_FEBRUARY_2017.pdf)  
537 [content/uploads/2016/11/HPVWORLD\\_FEBRUARY\\_2017.pdf](https://www.whri.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/HPVWORLD_FEBRUARY_2017.pdf)
- 538 19. World Health Organization. WHO guideline for screening and treatment of cervical pre-  
539 cancer lesions for cervical cancer prevention, second edition: use of mRNA tests for human  
540 papillomavirus (HPV) [Internet]. Geneva; 2021. Available from:  
541 <https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/350652/9789240040434-eng.pdf?sequence=1>
- 542 20. Dartell MA, Rasch V, Iftner T, Kahesa C, Mwaiselage JD, Junge J, et al. Performance of  
543 visual inspection with acetic acid and human papillomavirus testing for detection of  
544 high-grade cervical lesions in HIV positive and HIV negative Tanzanian women. Intl Journal  
545 of Cancer. 2014 Aug 15;135(4):896–904.
- 546 21. Katanga JJ, Rasch V, Manongi R, Pembe AB, Mwaiselage JD, Kjaer SK. Concordance in  
547 HPV Detection Between Self-Collected and Health Provider–Collected Cervicovaginal  
548 Samples Using careHPV in Tanzanian Women. JCO Global Oncology. 2021 Dec;(7):985–  
549 91.
- 550 22. Chambers DA, Glasgow RE, Stange KC. The dynamic sustainability framework: addressing  
551 the paradox of sustainment amid ongoing change. Implementation Sci. 2013 Dec;8(1):117.
- 552 23. Ghana Statistical Service. Ghana - Population and Housing Census 2000 [Internet]. Office of  
553 the President; 2013 Feb. Available from:  
554 <https://www2.statsghana.gov.gh/nada/index.php/catalog/3/study-description>
- 555 24. Nartey Y, Hill PC, Amo-Antwi K, Nyarko KM, Yarney J, Cox B. Cervical Cancer in the  
556 Greater Accra and Ashanti Regions of Ghana. JGO. 2017 Dec;3(6):782–90.
- 557 25. Ma'som M, Bhoo-Pathy N, Nasir NH, Bellinson J, Subramaniam S, Ma Y, et al. Attitudes  
558 and factors affecting acceptability of self-administered cervicovaginal sampling for human  
559 papillomavirus (HPV) genotyping as an alternative to Pap testing among multiethnic  
560 Malaysian women. BMJ Open. 2016 Aug;6(8):e011022.
- 561 26. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data  
562 capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing  
563 translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform. 2009 Apr;42(2):377–81.
- 564 27. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap  
565 consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. J Biomed  
566 Inform. 2019 Jul;95:103208.
- 567 28. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Internet]. R  
568 Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021. Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 569 29. Mensah KB, Boamah Mensah AB, Yamoah P, Manfo J, Amo R, Wiafe E, et al. Socio-  
570 Demographic Factors and Other Predictors of Pap Test Uptake Among Women: A  
571 Retrospective Study in Ghana. CMAR. 2023 Jun;Volume 15:489–99.

- 572 30. Cunningham MS, Skrastins E, Fitzpatrick R, Jindal P, Oneko O, Yeates K, et al. Cervical  
573 cancer screening and HPV vaccine acceptability among rural and urban women in  
574 Kilimanjaro Region, Tanzania. *BMJ Open*. 2015 Mar 10;5(3):e005828–e005828.
- 575 31. Doody O, Noonan M. Preparing and conducting interviews to collect data. *Nurse Res*. 2013  
576 May;20(5):28–32.
- 577 32. NVivo [Internet]. Lumivero; 2017. Available from: [www.lumivero.com](http://www.lumivero.com)
- 578 33. Guba EG, Lincoln YS. *Effective evaluation*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers;  
579 1981. 423 p. (A Joint publication in the Jossey-Bass higher education and Social and  
580 behavioral sciences series).
- 581 34. Ndejjo R, Mukama T, Musabyimana A, Musoke D. Uptake of Cervical Cancer Screening  
582 and Associated Factors among Women in Rural Uganda: A Cross Sectional Study.  
583 Tornesello ML, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2016 Feb 19;11(2):e0149696.
- 584 35. Lyimo FS, Beran TN. Demographic, knowledge, attitudinal, and accessibility factors  
585 associated with uptake of cervical cancer screening among women in a rural district of  
586 Tanzania: Three public policy implications. *BMC Public Health*. 2012 Dec;12(1):22.
- 587 36. Habib K, Shafiq M, Afshan G, Qamar F. Impact of Education and Employment on Women  
588 Empowerment. *European Online Journal of Natural Social Sciences*. 8(3):1–13.
- 589 37. Okyere J, Aboagye RG, Seidu AA, Asare BYA, Mwamba B, Ahinkorah BO. Towards a  
590 cervical cancer-free future: women’s healthcare decision making and cervical cancer  
591 screening uptake in sub-Saharan Africa. *BMJ Open*. 2022 Jul;12(7):e058026.
- 592 38. Allen-Leigh B, Uribe-Zúñiga P, León-Maldonado L, Brown BJ, Lörincz A, Salmeron J, et al.  
593 Barriers to HPV self-sampling and cytology among low-income indigenous women in rural  
594 areas of a middle-income setting: a qualitative study. *BMC Cancer*. 2017 Dec;17(1):734.
- 595 39. Rosser JI, Njoroge B, Huchko MJ. Knowledge about cervical cancer screening and  
596 perception of risk among women attending outpatient clinics in rural Kenya. *Intl J*  
597 *Gynecology & Obste*. 2015 Mar;128(3):211–5.
- 598 40. Ampofo AG, Adumatta AD, Owusu E, Awuviry-Newton K. A cross-sectional study of  
599 barriers to cervical cancer screening uptake in Ghana: An application of the health belief  
600 model. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(4):e0231459.
- 601 41. Osei EA, Appiah S, Oti-Boadi E, Hammond D, Awuah DB, Menlah A, et al. Experiences of  
602 women awaiting cervical CANCER screening results from selected hospitals in Accra,  
603 Ghana. *BMC Public Health*. 2022 Dec;22(1):1467.
- 604 42. Adongo AA, Azumah FD, Nachinaab JO. A comparative study of quality of health care  
605 services of public and private hospitals in Ghana. *J Public Health (Berl)*. 2022  
606 Jul;30(7):1809–15.

- 607 43. Chen Z, Fiske ST, Lee TL. Ambivalent Sexism and Power-Related Gender-role Ideology in  
608 Marriage. *Sex Roles*. 2009 Jun;60(11–12):765–78.
- 609 44. Olubodun T, Balogun MR, Odeyemi AK, Odukoya OO, Ogunyemi AO, Kanma-Okafor OJ,  
610 et al. Barriers and recommendations for a cervical cancer screening program among women  
611 in low-resource settings in Lagos Nigeria: a qualitative study. *BMC Public Health*. 2022 Oct  
612 12;22(1):1906.
- 613 45. Bakiewicz A, Rasch V, Mwaiselage J, Linde DS. “The best thing is that you are doing it for  
614 yourself” – perspectives on acceptability and feasibility of HPV self-sampling among  
615 cervical cancer screening clients in Tanzania: a qualitative pilot study. *BMC Women’s*  
616 *Health*. 2020 Dec;20(1):65.
- 617



Figure