

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Socio-Economic Factors Associated with Cancer Stigma among Apparently Healthy Women in Semi-urban Nepal.

Bandana Paneru,^{1,2*} Aeron Karmacharya,¹ Soniya Makaju,¹ Diksha Kafle,³ Lisasha Poudel,² Sushmita Mali,¹ Priyanka Timsina,¹ Namuna Shrestha,¹ Dinesh Timalsena,¹ Kalpana Chaudhary,¹ Niroj Bhandari,^{2,4} Prasanna Rai,¹ Sunila Shakya,⁵ Donna Spiegelman,^{6,7} Sangini S Sheth,⁸ Anne Stangl,⁹ McKenna C. Eastment¹⁰ Archana Shrestha^{1,2,6}

¹Department of Public Health and Community Programs, Kathmandu University School of Medical Sciences, Dhulikhel, Nepal
² Institute for Implementation Science and Health, Kathmandu, Nepal
³ Canadian Red Cross, Country Office Nepal.
⁴ Authentic Leadership Institute Nepal, Kathmandu
⁵ Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Dhulikhel Hospital/Kathmandu University School of Medical Sciences, Dhulikhel, Nepal
⁶ Center of Methods for Implementation and Prevention Science, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA
⁷ Department of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA
⁸ Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA
⁹ International Center for Research on Women, Washington, DC, USA
¹⁰ Division of Allergy and Infectious Disease, Veterans Affairs Puget Sound Healthcare System and University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

***Corresponding author:** Bandana Paneru
Email ID: bandana.paneru@gmail.com
Phone number: +977 9843501984,

33 **Abstract**

34 Cancer is the primary cause of death globally, and despite the significant advancements in
35 treatment and survival rates, it is still stigmatized in many parts of the world. However, there is
36 limited public health research on cancer stigma among general population (non-patient) women
37 in Nepal. Therefore, this study aims to determine the prevalence of cancer stigma and its
38 associated factors in this group.

39 **Methods:** We conducted a cross-sectional study among 426 healthy women aged 30 – 60 years
40 who were residents of Dhulikhel and Banepa in central Nepal. We measured cancer stigma using
41 the Cancer Stigma Scale (CASS). CASS measures cancer stigma in six subdomains
42 (awkwardness, avoidance, severity, personal responsibility, policy opposition, financial
43 discrimination) on a 6-point Likert scale (strongly disagree to agree strongly) with higher mean
44 stigma scores correlating with higher levels of stigma. We used univariable and multivariable
45 linear regression to identify the socio-demographic factors associated with the CASS score.

46 **Results:** Overall, the level of cancer stigma was low (mean total stigma score: 2.6 ± 0.6) but still
47 present among participants. Stigma related to personal responsibility had the highest levels
48 (mean stigma score: 3.9 ± 1.3), followed by severity (mean stigma score: 3.2 ± 1.3) and financial
49 discrimination (mean stigma score: 2.9 ± 1.6). There was a significant association of mean CASS
50 score with older age (the mean difference is stigma score: 0.01 points; 95% CI: 0.01-0.02) and
51 lower education (difference -0.02 points; 95% CI: -0.03, -0.003) after adjusting for age,
52 ethnicity, education, marital status, religion, occupation, and parity.

53 **Conclusion:** While overall cancer stigma was low in Nepal, some subdomains were increased in
54 the general population of women in Nepal. Because stigma may impact engagement in cancer
55 screening efforts, programs should aim to counteract stigma, particularly among older and less
56 educated women.

57 **Keywords:** cancer stigma, prevention, women, Nepal, low- and middle-income countries

58

59

60 INTRODUCTION

61 Cancer is the leading cause of death worldwide, with age-standardized mortality of 100 per
62 100,000 population in 2020.¹ The majority of cancer deaths occur in low- and middle-income
63 countries.¹ In Nepal in 2020, the age-standardized cancer incidence rate was 80 per 100,000 with
64 a mortality rate of 54 per 100,000 in 2020.¹ Despite recent improvements in treatment and
65 survival, cancer is still a stigmatized disease,²⁻⁴ and one of the most feared illnesses.⁵

66 Health-related stigma subjects a person or group to exclusion, rejection, blame, or devaluation
67 due to the anticipation or experience of negative social judgment regarding their health
68 condition, making it a social phenomenon or personal experience.⁶ Public stigma may appear in
69 the form of stereotypes, for instance, viewing individuals who have survived cancer as either
70 incapable or contagious. These stereotypes result in behaviors like avoiding interactions with
71 cancer survivors due to a fear of contracting the disease. Discriminatory actions stemming from
72 these biases can lead to withholding job opportunities or rejecting social interactions.⁷⁻⁹ This
73 public stigma significantly hinders individuals' willingness to seek health care.^{6,10}

74 Prior research has predominantly examined stigma related to illnesses such as leprosy,^{11,12}
75 epilepsy, HIV/AIDS,^{13,14} and mental illness.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ Although people often stigmatize cancer, there
76 is a limited exploration of public stigma in healthy general non-patient populations.¹⁰ Examining
77 public stigma related to cancer is crucial for several reasons. First, stigma could dissuade
78 individuals from participating in cancer prevention and screening efforts, resulting in delayed
79 cancer diagnoses and, ultimately, higher mortality rates.^{10,18-20} Second, public health initiatives
80 aimed at educating people about the behavioral factors linked to cancer, including smoking,
81 obesity, and infection with the human papillomavirus, could create stigma by suggesting that
82 cancer is avoidable and depends on individual behavior and choices.²¹ Third, stigma can
83 contribute to health disparities,²²⁻²⁴ particularly among marginalized groups who may already
84 face barriers to accessing healthcare.

85 Few studies have actively investigated cancer-related stigma and associated socio-demographic
86 factors. Qualitative research delving into experienced and internalized stigma among cancer
87 patients reveals that young, single individuals encounter distinct stigma experiences influenced
88 by their age, gender, marital status, socio-economic position, and family living arrangements.^{25,26}
89 A quantitative exploration of stigma in England revealed a higher prevalence of cancer stigma
90 among men and individuals from ethnic minority backgrounds but no associations with age or
91 social status. Notably, these studies utilized only 18 of the 25 CASS available items, potentially
92 resulting in low internal reliability. Moreover, studies have yet to be conducted in low-income
93 countries, notably Nepal. This study aimed to determine the prevalence of cancer stigma and its
94 associated factors among women residing in semi-urban parts of Nepal. By identifying these
95 factors, we can develop interventions and policies that can help reduce stigma and its adverse
96 effects on individuals and society and ultimately improve the population's health, where cancer
97 screening and early treatment are lifesaving.

98

99

100

101 **METHODS**

102 **Study design and setting:**

103 We conducted a cross-sectional study in two municipalities of the Kavrepalanchow district of
104 Nepal, Dhulikhel and Banepa, approximately 30 kilometers east of Kathmandu. Dhulikhel is a
105 semi-urban location with a population of 32,162, while Banepa has a population of 55,628. The
106 dominant ethnic group in both municipalities is the Newar, and 70% of the population is literate.
107 The literacy rate among females is around 75% in both municipalities.²⁷

108

109 **Study Participants:**

110 Our study population included women aged 30 to 60 years who were residents of Dhulikhel or
111 Banepa. The exclusion criteria were: a) having a hearing impairment, b) having severe mental
112 health conditions so as being not able to provide informed consent, and c) not being a resident of
113 Dhulikhel or Banepa (i.e., visitors to the area).

114 **Recruitment:**

115 We enrolled the initial 426 women out of 1800 who underwent cervical cancer screening
116 organized by Dhulikhel Hospital from May 15 to September 15, 2021. We estimated the sample
117 size based on an expected proportion of cancer stigma among women of 51%,¹⁰ at a 5%
118 significance level, and a margin of error of 5%.²⁸

119

120 Our Research Assistants (RAs) contacted female community health volunteers (FCHV) and
121 oriented them to the study objective and expectations. These FCHVs have worked in Nepal since
122 the 1980s and play a pivotal role in the Nepali community health workforce, specializing in
123 health education, counseling, outreach, and resource distribution.²⁹ The FCHVs disseminated
124 information about the study to women in their network and shared the contact details of the
125 interested participants with the research assistants. Subsequently, the research assistants
126 contacted the women by phone, outlining the study's objectives and explaining their potential
127 role. Women expressing interest were then formally enrolled in the study after verbal informed
128 consent was obtained, ensuring the anonymity and confidentiality of their information. We
129 conducted the study amid the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, interviews were conducted over
130 the phone for infection prevention. Kathmandu University Institutional Review Committee
131 ethical board approved the study (KUIRC no: 35/2021).

132

133 **Data collection:**

134 Trained research assistants conducted telephonic interviews using a structured questionnaire
135 directly entered electronically (Kobo toolbox).³⁰ The questionnaire covered socio-demographic
136 factors and cancer stigma.

137 **Measures:**

138 Cancer Stigma: We used Nepal's validated Cancer Stigma Scale (CASS).³¹ The CASS
139 demonstrated satisfactory internal reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.88 for the overall
140 scale and ranging from 0.70 to 0.89 for its six components.³¹ The CASS consists of 25 items that
141 assess six domains: (a) awkwardness, which measures how comfortable people feel around

142 someone with cancer; (b) severity, which evaluates the expected severity of cancer consequences
143 and the likelihood of recovery; (c) avoidance, which assesses the extent to which people avoid
144 cancer patients and maintain physical distance from them; (d) personal responsibility, which
145 determines how much a person's actions contribute to their cancer; (e) policy opposition, which
146 gauges the perceived responsibility of the government and the public in the care and treatment of
147 cancer patients; and (f) financial discrimination, which measures the anticipated deprivation of
148 benefits to cancer patients from banking and insurance services

149 Participants responded using a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 'disagree strongly' to 'agree
150 strongly.' We reversed the scores for five specific items, ensuring higher scores reflected more
151 stigma levels (refer to Table 2 for details on the reverse-scored items).^{10,17} The mean score for
152 each domain was then calculated.^{10,17}

153 Socio-demographic variables: Socio-demographic variables included age (in years), ethnicity
154 (Brahmin/ Chettri/Thakuri/Sanyasi, Newar, Magar/Tamang/Rai/Limbu, Sherpa/Bhote,
155 Kami/Damai/Sarki/Gaaine/Baadi, Other), education (number of years of formal education
156 completed), religion (Hindu, Buddhist, Christian), occupation (homemaker, farmer, business,
157 unemployed, others) and parity (number of children). We adopted the questions from previously
158 conducted national surveys in Nepal. Responses were self-reported.^{32,33}

159 **Data analysis:** We calculated summary statistics such as frequency and percentage for
160 categorical variables and mean (standard deviation) for continuous variables. We estimated
161 cancer stigma scores for six sub-domains and calculated mean scores for each subscale. We
162 performed multivariate linear regression analysis to determine the socio-demographic factors
163 associated with cancer stigma, selecting the variables in our model based on literature review^{10,20}
164 and prior knowledge. We reported crude and adjusted differences in stigma scores and their 95%
165 confidence intervals and p-values. We conducted all analyses using STATA-13.

166 RESULTS

167 Table 1 presents the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants. The mean age was 42
168 \pm 8 years. Most participants (43%) were Brahmin/Chhetri and Hindus (87.8%). About a third of
169 the participants (31%) had no formal education, and the majority (39.5%) were farmers. The
170 mean number of children was 2.3 (SD 1.0).

171 Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants (n=426)

Characteristics	Frequency (%)
Age (in years), Mean(SD)	42.4 (8.2)
Ethnicity	
Brahmin/Chettri/Thakuri/Sanyasi	182 (42.7)
Newar	175 (41.1)
Magar/Tamang/Rai/Limbu	13 (3.1)
Sherpa/Bhote	27 (6.3)
Kami/Damai/Sarki/Gaaine/Baadi	24 (5.6)
Others	5 (1.2)
Religion	
Hindu	374 (87.8)
Buddhist	28 (6.6)
Christian	24 (5.6)
Education	
No formal education	132 (31.0)
Primary	49 (11.5)
Secondary	150 (35.2)
Above secondary	95 (22.3)
Occupation	
Farmer	168 (39.5)
Home-maker	106 (24.9)
Business	63 (14.8)
Unemployed	7 (1.6)
Other	82 (19.2)
Parity (number), Mean (SD)	2.3 (1.0)

172 Table 2 presents the cancer stigma scale (CASS) mean score for each stigma domain. The overall
 173 mean total CASS score was 2.6 ± 0.6 . Within the six domains, the highest stigma level pertained
 174 to personal responsibility, reflecting the belief that patients are accountable for acquiring cancer
 175 (mean stigma score: 3.9 ± 1.3). Additionally, high stigma levels were observed in the severity
 176 domain, indicating that patients may struggle to return to everyday life, adversely affecting their
 177 overall life and relationships (mean stigma score: 3.2 ± 1.3). Financial discrimination, manifested
 178 by the denial of loans and mortgage applications for cancer patients, also exhibited a notable
 179 stigma level (mean stigma score: 2.9 ± 1.6). Policy opposition showed a low mean stigma score
 180 (1.3 ± 0.6), suggesting strong government and community support for cancer patient care.

181

182

183 Table 2 Cancer stigma scale (CASS) mean score in each domain among participants (n=426)

	Mean(sd)
<u>Awkwardness</u>	2.4 (1.2)
I would feel at ease around someone with cancer (R)	2.4 (1.7)
I would feel comfortable around someone with cancer (R)	2.4 (1.7)
I would find it difficult being around someone with cancer	2.3 (1.7)
I would find it hard to talk to someone with cancer	2.2 (1.6)
I would feel embarrassed discussing cancer with someone who had it	2.7 (1.8)
<u>Severity</u>	3.2 (1.3)
Once you've had cancer, you're never 'normal' again	3.2 (1.7)
Having cancer usually ruins a person's career	3.4 (1.7)
Getting cancer means having to mentally prepare oneself for death	3.4 (1.7)
Cancer usually ruins close personal relationships	3.1 (1.7)
Cancer devastates the lives of those it touches	2.8 (1.7)
<u>Avoidance</u>	1.7 (0.9)
If a colleague had cancer, I would try to avoid them	1.7 (1.2)
I would distance myself physically from someone with cancer	1.8 (1.4)
I would feel irritated by someone with cancer	1.3 (0.8)
I would feel angered by someone with cancer	1.2 (0.7)
I would try to avoid a person with cancer	2.1 (1.7)
<u>Policy Opposition</u>	1.3 (0.6)
More government funding should be spent on the care and treatment of those with cancer (R)	1.3 (0.8)
The needs of people with cancer should be given top priority (R)	1.2 (0.5)
We have a responsibility to provide the best possible care for people with cancer (R)	1.3 (0.6)
<u>Personal Responsibility</u>	3.9 (1.3)
A person with cancer is liable for their condition	4.2 (1.6)
A person with cancer is accountable for their condition	4.4 (1.5)
If a person has cancer, it's probably their fault	3.6 (1.6)
A person with cancer is to blame for their condition	3.2 (1.6)
<u>Financial discrimination</u>	2.9 (1.6)
It is acceptable for banks to refuse to make loans to people with cancer	2.4 (1.8)
Banks should be allowed to refuse mortgage applications for cancer-related reasons	2.6 (1.8)
It is acceptable for insurance companies to reconsider a policy if someone has cancer	3.7 (1.9)
<u>Overall stigma</u>	2.6 (0.6)

184 *Stigma score ranges from 1-6. Higher scores indicate a higher stigma level. (R) indicated
 185 reversed in scoring.

186

187

188

189

190 In the univariable regression model, the mean cancer stigma score showed associations with age,
191 with older women having a higher mean stigma score, education, with more highly educated
192 women having a lower mean stigma score, and occupation, with farmers having higher mean
193 stigma scores compared to businesswomen. However, after adjusting for socio-demographic
194 variables, the mean cancer stigma score was only associated with age and education. When
195 comparing two groups of individuals differing by ten years of age, the older group had a 0.18
196 unit higher cancer stigma score compared to the younger group after adjusting for education,
197 ethnicity, occupation, parity, and religion (95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.04-0.20; p-
198 value=0.04). There was a significant negative association between education and the mean
199 cancer stigma score (p-value=0.03). The mean cancer stigma score was 0.037 units lower with
200 one year more formal education among women (95% CI: -0.032- -0.001). Cancer stigma score
201 was not significantly associated with other socio-demographic variables such as ethnicity,
202 occupation, parity, and religion (p>0.05).

203

204 Table 3: Factors associated with cancer stigma score among participants (n=426)

Characteristics	Univariable Difference in CASS score (95% CI)	p-value	Multivariable Difference in CASS score (95% CI)	p-value
*Age (years), Mean (SD)	0.2 (0.1, 0.3)	0.002	0.18 (0.1, 0.2)	0.02
Education (years of formal education), Mean (SD)	0.04 (-0.05, -0.02)	<0.001	-0.02 (-0.03, -0.01)	0.02
Ethnicity				
Brahmin/Chhetri	Ref	0.67		0.54
Damai/Sarki/Gaaine/Baadi	0.03 (-0.39, 0.40)		-0.12 (-0.42, 0.17)	
Magar/Tamang/Rai/Limbu	0.19 (-0.70, 0.37)		-0.27 (- 0.56, 0.02)	
Newar	-0.08 (-0.29, 0.12)		0.04 (-0.10, 0.19)	
Sherpa/Bhote	0.09 (-0.31, 0.50)		0.03 (-0.33, 0.41)	
Others	0.78 (-0.12, 1.69)		0.03 (- 0.49, 0.56)	
Occupation				
Business	Ref	0.53		0.93
Farmer	0.37(0.08, 0.67)		-0.01 (-0.19, 0.18)	
Home-maker	0.02 (-0.29, 0.33)		-0.07 (-0.26, 0.11)	
Others	0.15 (-0.18, 0.48)		0.03 (-0.17, 0.23)	
Unemployed	0.59 (-0.20, 1.38)		0.07 (-0.27, 0.41)	
Parity, Mean (SD)	0.09 (-0.01, 0.18)		-0.01 (-0.08, 0.07)	
Religion				
Buddhist	Ref	0.04		0.15
Christian	-0.02 (-0.57, 0.63)		-0.14 (-0.63, 0.35)	
Hindu	-0.19 (-0.59, 0.19)		-0.20 (-0.50, 0.09)	

205 CI: Confidence interval

206 Adjusting variables- age, education, ethnicity, occupation, parity and religion

207 *Age coefficients presented in 10 years difference

208

209 DISCUSSION

210 Our study found a low level of general cancer stigma that exists among apparently healthy
 211 women in semi-urban Nepal. We observed higher levels of cancer stigma for the domains of
 212 personal responsibility, severity, and financial discrimination. Regarding personal responsibility,
 213 participants believed that cancer patients bore responsibility for the onset of their illness.
 214 Likewise, in the severity domain, women conveyed perceptions of cancer as a terminal ailment,
 215 with individuals never regaining an everyday life. Furthermore, the financial discrimination
 216 domains underscored participants' endorsement of the idea that banks could justifiably refuse
 217 loans and mortgages based on cancer-related reasons. Cancer stigma scores were higher among
 218 older individuals and those with lower levels of formal education.

219 In previous studies exploring cancer stigma, consistently low levels of stigma have been
 220 reported.^{10,35} A cross-sectional study conducted in the UK reported an overall mean cancer
 221 stigma score higher than the one observed in our study.¹⁰ In contrast to women from the UK, our

222 study population exhibited a higher total mean cancer stigma score across five sub-domains:
223 severity, awkwardness, financial discrimination, personal responsibility, and avoidance.
224 Conversely, our study participants demonstrated a lower mean stigma score in the sub-domain of
225 policy opposition than English women, indicating less support for government funding toward
226 cancer care and treatment.^{10,17} Stigma varies across diseases, even among different types of
227 cancers. HIV patients encounter more significant stigma than cancer patients, leading to more
228 reported psychological dysfunctions.³⁴ In a study of 1205 non-patient participants in the UK
229 using the CASS tool, lung cancer showed higher stigma scores than breast, cervical, skin, and
230 colorectal cancers.³⁵

231 The low mean cancer stigma score observed in the policy opposition sub-domain suggests a
232 distinct perspective in our research. Unlike the findings from the English study,¹⁰ Nepali
233 participants did not anticipate receiving substantial support from the government or community
234 for cancer diagnosis and treatment. This difference can be attributed to Nepal and England's
235 different health financing mechanisms and community structures. In Nepal, out-of-pocket
236 healthcare expenditure is notably high (55%),³⁶ compared to England (12.5%).³⁷ Our study
237 participants may have experienced a greater need for government support for cancer treatment.
238 Moreover, Nepal's more cohesive community structure might have inclined our participants to
239 prioritize the shared responsibility of caring for cancer patients within their community. These
240 findings emphasize the significance of contextual factors in shaping attitudes and perceptions
241 related to cancer stigma across different settings.

242 The study revealed a significant inverse association between education and cancer stigma among
243 participants. Similar findings were reported in studies conducted in Ireland³⁸ and China³⁹ where
244 individuals with lower levels of education had higher cancer stigma scores. These findings imply
245 that the link between education and cancer stigma may exist across different cultural contexts
246 and regions. Those with lower levels of education may have limited access to health literacy and
247 information on health-related matters, potentially leading to misconceptions and
248 misinformation.⁵⁵

249 Our findings suggest a positive association between older age and cancer stigma among women
250 in Nepal, which is in contrast to studies conducted in England,¹⁰ China,⁴⁰ and Kenya.²⁰ This
251 difference might be explained by the comparatively lower exposure to social media platforms.
252 Specifically, 2.2% of Nepali women aged 50 and above use social media.⁴¹ In the UK, media
253 exposure is considerably higher, with 50% of individuals using social media at 50,⁴² while in
254 China, 41.5% of social media users are aged above 40 years.⁴³ Social media might reduce
255 stigma, fostering awareness, empathy, and community support by disseminating accurate
256 information, personal stories, and advocacy efforts.⁴⁴ This highlights the need for targeted
257 educational interventions to improve knowledge and awareness about cancer among older
258 women in Nepal.

259 This is the first quantitative study conducted in Nepal among healthy adult women to identify the
260 factors associated with cancer stigma. A previous qualitative study in Nepal focused on a limited
261 pool of people with cancer, exploring only a few dimensions of stigma.⁴⁵ The current research's
262 strength lies in applying a quantitative approach that introduces objectivity to measure diverse
263 stigma domains among healthy women who have not experienced cancer themselves. In
264 addition, we used CASS, a standardized tool validated in Nepal, to collect our data to estimate

265 the factors associated with cancer stigma.³¹ We utilized multivariate linear regression models,
266 adjusting for potential confounders, including age, education, ethnicity, occupation, parity, and
267 religion, which helps to eliminate alternative explanations of our findings.

268 This study has a few limitations. First, response bias is possible due to the interviewer-
269 administered nature of the surveys. Respondents might have downplayed negative emotions in
270 their responses, possibly causing an underreporting of their experiences and, consequently, our
271 stigma score.⁴⁶ Second, convenience sampling techniques may introduce selection bias, limiting
272 our findings' generalizability to the Nepalese female population. Future research with a random
273 sample of women is needed to confirm our findings. Third, the study's cross-sectional design
274 provides a snapshot of cancer stigma at a specific time. It cannot determine changes in stigma
275 over time. Fourth, this study employed CASS items to evaluate cancer stigma in general.
276 Nevertheless, stigma may vary across different cancer types.³⁵ Consequently, future research
277 should strive to explore the stigma associated with specific cancer types and their determinants.

278 In conclusion, this study revealed that the overall cancer stigma was low but still exists among
279 women in a suburban area in central Nepal. Stigma may impact engagement in cancer screening
280 efforts, so stigma reduction intervention focusing an older and less educated women is
281 recommended.

282

283

284 **References:**

285

- 286 1. Global cancer data by country [Internet]. WCRF International. 2022 [cited 2023 Jul 11].
287 Available from: <https://www.wcrf.org/cancer-trends/global-cancer-data-by-country/>
- 288 2. Holland JC, Kelly BJ, Weinberger MI. Why psychosocial care is difficult to integrate into
289 routine cancer care: stigma is the elephant in the room. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw*. 2010
290 Apr;8(4):362–6.
- 291 3. Peters-Golden H. Breast cancer: varied perceptions of social support in the illness
292 experience. *Soc Sci Med*. 1982;16(4):483–91.
- 293 4. Phelan SM, Griffin JM, Jackson GL, Zafar SY, Hellerstedt W, Stahre M, et al. Stigma,
294 perceived blame, self-blame, and depressive symptoms in men with colorectal cancer.
295 *Psychooncology*. 2013 Jan;22(1):65–73.
- 296 5. Else-Quest NM, Jackson TL, Corrigan P. *The Stigma of Disease and Disability*. 2014;
- 297 6. Weiss MG, Ramakrishna J. Stigma interventions and research for international health.
298 *Lancet*. 2006 Feb 11;367(9509):536–8.
- 299 7. Blay SL, Toledo Pisa Peluso E. Public stigma: the community’s tolerance of Alzheimer
300 disease. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2010 Feb;18(2):163–71.
- 301 8. Nieweglowski K, Corrigan PW, Tyas T, Tooley A, Dubke R, Lara J, et al. Exploring the
302 public stigma of substance use disorder through community-based participatory research.
303 *Addict Res Theory*. 2018 Jul 4;26(4):323–9.
- 304 9. Yang LH, Anglin DM, Wonpat-Borja AJ, Opler MG, Greenspoon M, Corcoran CM. Public
305 stigma associated with psychosis risk syndrome in a college population: implications for
306 peer intervention. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2013 Mar 1;64(3):284–8.
- 307 10. Vrinten C, Gallagher A, Waller J, Marlow LAV. Cancer stigma and cancer screening
308 attendance: a population based survey in England. *BMC Cancer*. 2019 Jun 11;19(1):566.
- 309 11. Tsutsumi A, Izutsu T, Islam AM, Maksuda AN, Kato H, Wakai S. The quality of life,
310 mental health, and perceived stigma of leprosy patients in Bangladesh. *Soc Sci Med*. 2007
311 Jun;64(12):2443–53.
- 312 12. Adhikari B, Kaehler N, Chapman RS, Raut S, Roche P. Factors affecting perceived stigma
313 in leprosy affected persons in western Nepal. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2014 Jun;8(6):e2940.
- 314 13. Duffy L. Suffering, shame, and silence: the stigma of HIV/AIDS. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS*
315 *Care*. 2005 Jan-Feb;16(1):13–20.
- 316 14. Campbell C, Foulis CA, Maimane S, Sibiyi Z. “I have an evil child at my house”: stigma
317 and HIV/AIDS management in a South African community. *Am J Public Health*. 2005

- 318 May;95(5):808–15.
- 319 15. Pedersen ER, Paves AP. Comparing perceived public stigma and personal stigma of mental
320 health treatment seeking in a young adult sample. *Psychiatry Res.* 2014 Sep 30;219(1):143–
321 50.
- 322 16. Golberstein E, Eisenberg D, Gollust SE. Perceived stigma and mental health care seeking.
323 *Psychiatr Serv.* 2008 Apr;59(4):392–9.
- 324 17. Marlow LAV, Wardle J. Development of a scale to assess cancer stigma in the non-patient
325 population. *BMC Cancer.* 2014 Apr 23;14:285.
- 326 18. Azaiza F, Cohen M. Between traditional and modern perceptions of breast and cervical
327 cancer screenings: a qualitative study of Arab women in Israel. *Psychooncology.* 2008
328 Jan;17(1):34–41.
- 329 19. Tod AM, Craven J, Allmark P. Diagnostic delay in lung cancer: a qualitative study. *J Adv
330 Nurs.* 2008 Feb;61(3):336–43.
- 331 20. Rosser JI, Njoroge B, Huchko MJ. Cervical Cancer Stigma in Rural Kenya: What Does
332 HIV Have to Do with It? *J Cancer Educ.* 2016 Jun;31(2):413–8.
- 333 21. Lebel S, Devins GM. Stigma in cancer patients whose behavior may have contributed to
334 their disease. *Future Oncol.* 2008 Oct;4(5):717–33.
- 335 22. Rivera LM. Ethnic-Racial Stigma and Health Disparities: From Psychological Theory and
336 Evidence to Public Policy Solutions. *J Soc Issues.* 2014 Jun;70(2):198–205.
- 337 23. Walters SM, Kerr J, Cano M, Earnshaw V, Link B. Intersectional stigma as a fundamental
338 cause of health disparities: A case study of how drug use stigma intersecting with racism
339 and xenophobia creates health inequities for Black and Hispanic persons who use drugs
340 over time. *Stigma and Health* [Internet]. 2023 Mar 2; Available from:
341 <https://psycnet.apa.org/fulltext/2023-50842-001.pdf>
- 342 24. Hatzenbuehler ML, Phelan JC, Link BG. Stigma as a fundamental cause of population
343 health inequalities. *Am J Public Health.* 2013 May;103(5):813–21.
- 344 25. Eiser C, Aura K. Psychological Support. In: Bleyer WA, Barr RD, editors. *Cancer in
345 Adolescents and Young Adults.* Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2007. p.
346 365–73.
- 347 26. Mandizadza E, Moyo S. A phenomenological study on experiences of cancer stigma
348 amongst selected people living with cancer in rural and urban Zimbabwe. *AAS Open Res.*
349 2021 Oct 7;4:48.
- 350 27. Nepal Census 2011 District Profiles (Demography) [Internet]. [cited 2022 Oct 21].
351 Available from: [https://data.humdata.org/dataset/nepal-census-2011-district-profiles-](https://data.humdata.org/dataset/nepal-census-2011-district-profiles-demography)
352 [demography](https://data.humdata.org/dataset/nepal-census-2011-district-profiles-demography)

- 353 28. Brooks S. [No title] [Internet]. [cited 2022 Jul 31]. Available from: [https://select-](https://select-statistics.co.uk/calculators/sample-size-calculator-two-proportions/)
354 [statistics.co.uk/calculators/sample-size-calculator-two-proportions/](https://select-statistics.co.uk/calculators/sample-size-calculator-two-proportions/)
- 355 29. Public Health Update. Female Community Health Volunteer (FCHV) Programme, Nepal
356 [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jul 10]. Available from: [https://publichealthupdate.com/female-](https://publichealthupdate.com/female-community-health-volunteer-fchv-programme-nepal/)
357 [community-health-volunteer-fchv-programme-nepal/](https://publichealthupdate.com/female-community-health-volunteer-fchv-programme-nepal/)
- 358 30. KoboToolbox [Internet]. KoboToolbox. [cited 2023 May 18]. Available from:
359 <https://www.kobotoolbox.org/about-us/>
- 360 31. Shrestha A, Stangl AL, Paneru B, Poudel L, Karmacharya A, Makaju S, et al. Validation of
361 the Cancer Stigma Scale in Nepalese Women. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2023 Jan
362 1;24(1):207–14.
- 363 32. Ministry of Health (MOH). Demographic and Health Survey 2016 - Nepal [Internet]. 2017
364 [cited 2022 Nov 2]. Available from:
365 <https://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/2929/study-description>
- 366 33. Dhimal M, Bista B, Bhattarai B, Dixit L, Hyder M, Agrawal M, et al. Report of Non
367 Communicable Diseases Risk Factors: STEPS Survey Nepal 2019. Nepal Health Research
368 Council; 2020.
- 369 34. Idemudia ES, Matamela NA. The role of stigmas in mental health: A comparative study.
370 *Curationis.* 2012 Jun 26;35(1):30.
- 371 35. Marlow LAV, Waller J, Wardle J. Does lung cancer attract greater stigma than other cancer
372 types? *Lung Cancer.* 2015 Apr;88(1):104–7.
- 373 36. Ministry of Health and Population [Internet]. [cited 2023 May 18]. Available from:
374 <https://mohp.gov.np/en/>
- 375 37. Prendergast T. Healthcare expenditure, UK Health Accounts - Office for National Statistics
376 [Internet]. Office for National Statistics; 2022 [cited 2023 Sep 1]. Available from:
377 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthcaresyst](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthcaresystem/bulletins/ukhealthaccounts/2020)
378 [em/bulletins/ukhealthaccounts/2020](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthcaresystem/bulletins/ukhealthaccounts/2020)
- 379 38. O'Connor M, O'Leary E, Waller J, Gallagher P, Martin CM, O'Leary JJ, et al. Socio-
380 economic variations in anticipated adverse reactions to testing HPV positive: Implications
381 for the introduction of primary HPV-based cervical screening. *Prev Med.* 2018 Oct;115:90–
382 6.
- 383 39. Kwan TTC, Tam KF, Lee PWH, Lo SST, Chan KKL, Ngan HYS. De-stigmatising human
384 papillomavirus in the context of cervical cancer: a randomised controlled trial.
385 *Psychooncology.* 2010 Dec;19(12):1329–39.
- 386 40. Ye X, Liu HY, Lu SR, Zhai Q, Yu B. Translation and validation of the Chinese version of
387 the Cancer Stigma Scale. *J Oncol Pharm Pract.* 2019 Oct;25(7):1622–30.

- 388 41. SocialMediaSurvey_Nepal_2021_CMV.pdf. Available from:
389 [https://research.butmedia.org/wp-](https://research.butmedia.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/SocialMediaSurvey_Nepal_2021_CMV.pdf)
390 [content/uploads/2022/06/SocialMediaSurvey_Nepal_2021_CMV.pdf](https://research.butmedia.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/SocialMediaSurvey_Nepal_2021_CMV.pdf)
- 391 42. UK: looking at social media sites & apps by age 2020 [Internet]. Statista. [cited 2023 Sep
392 1]. Available from: [https://www.statista.com/statistics/506329/looking-at-social-media-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/506329/looking-at-social-media-sites-or-apps-in-the-united-kingdom-uk-by-age-group/)
393 [sites-or-apps-in-the-united-kingdom-uk-by-age-group/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/506329/looking-at-social-media-sites-or-apps-in-the-united-kingdom-uk-by-age-group/)
- 394 43. China: social media user age distribution 2021 [Internet]. Statista. [cited 2023 Sep 1].
395 Available from: [https://www.statista.com/statistics/1208542/china-social-media-user-age-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1208542/china-social-media-user-age-distribution/)
396 [distribution/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1208542/china-social-media-user-age-distribution/)
- 397 44. Betton V, Borschmann R, Docherty M, Coleman S, Brown M, Henderson C. The role of
398 social media in reducing stigma and discrimination. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2015 Jun;206(6):443–
399 4.
- 400 45. Shrestha G, Mulmi R, Phuyal P, Thakur RK, Siwakoti B. Experiences of cervical cancer
401 survivors in Chitwan, Nepal: A qualitative study. *PLoS One*. 2020 Nov 5;15(11):e0234834.
- 402 46. Knapik M. The Qualitative Research Interview: Participants' Responsive Participation in
403 Knowledge Making. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 2006 Sep 1;5(3):77–93.

404 Supporting Information

405

406 **S1 Dataset**

407 **S2 Data collection tool**

408