

1 **Title: Quality of life, symptom burden and associated factors among lung cancer patients: baseline study of three public hospitals**
2 **across sub- Saharan Africa**

3 Mpho Ratshikana^{1,2,3} ^{¶*}, Kija Malale ^{¶4, 5}, Lawrence Atundo Murunga ^{¶6}, Abdul-Rauf Sayed ^{¶7}, Oluwatosin Ayeni ^{8,9}, Themba G
4 Ginindza ^{10,11}, Xolisile Dlamini ¹², Naftali Busakhala ¹³, Rofhiwa Mathiba ^{3, 14}, Charmaine Blanchard ⁹, Merika Tsitsi ^{1, 3, 14}, Sabelo
5 Msomi ^{2, 3}, Nestory Masalu ^{4,5}, Herry O. Dhudha ^{4,5}, Paul Ruff ¹⁴, Anita Graham^{15,16}, Daniel Osei-Fofie ^{¶17}

- 6 1. Department of Internal Medicine, Chris Hani Baragwanath Academic Hospital, Johannesburg, South Africa.
7 2. Wits Centre for Palliative Care, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.
8 3. Soweto comprehensive cancer center, Chris Hani Baragwanath hospital, Johannesburg, South Africa.
9 4. Bugando Medical Centre, Mwanza, Tanzania
10 5. Catholic University of Health and Allied Sciences-Bugando, Mwanza, Tanzania
11 6. Academic Model Providing Access to Healthcare, Moi Teaching and Referral Hospital, Oncology and Hematology
12 Department, Eldoret Kenya.
13 7. Bristol-Myers Squibb Foundation (BMSF), Technical Assistance Programme, Johannesburg, South Africa.
14 8. Department of Radiation Oncology, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South
15 Africa.

16 9. Strengthening Oncology Services Research Unit, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand,
17 Johannesburg, South Africa.

18 10. Discipline of Public Health Medicine, School of Nursing & Public Health, College of Health Science, University of KwaZulu-
19 Natal

20 11. Cancer & Infectious Diseases Epidemiology Research Unit (CIDERU), College of Health Science, University of KwaZulu-
21 Natal.

22 12. Ministry of Health, Eswatini.

23 13. Moi University School of Medicine, Kenya.

24 14. Division of Medical Oncology, University of Witwatersrand Faculty of Health Sciences, Johannesburg, South Africa.

25 15. Department of Internal Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg South Africa.

26 16. The Lung Laboratory Research and Intervention Unit Helen Joseph Hospital, Johannesburg

27 17. Oncology Department, Robert Mangaliso Sobukwe Hospital, Kimberly, South Africa.

28

29 Key words: cancer, lung, quality of life, symptoms

30

31

32 Abstract

33 Background: Cancer patients in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) are diagnosed late partly due to community lack of knowledge about the disease,
34 social and cultural factors, health system challenges, and inadequate health care worker knowledge. These delays in diagnosis as well as
35 inadequate treatment options contribute to the high mortality from lung cancer in SSA. Quality of life (QoL) is an important outcome measure for
36 cancer patients undergoing treatment.

37 Objective: To describe the quality of life among lung cancer patients in three teaching hospitals in SSA.

38 Methods: This is a prospective cross-sectional study of lung cancer patients at three teaching hospitals in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA- Kenya
39 (BMC), Tanzania (MTRH) and South Africa (The Lung Laboratory Research and Intervention Unit Helen Joseph Hospital). Trained interviewers
40 collected data on demographics, clinical information and performance status using the Eastern Cooperative Oncological Group Performance
41 Scale (ECOG-PS). Patients' QoL was assessed using the 30-item European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life
42 Questionnaire Core 30 (EORTC QLQ-C30).

43

44 Results: A total of 210 lung cancer patients consented and were enrolled across the three sites. Global Health Status in this cohort is low, the
45 median score was 41.7 (range: 0-100) and differed between sites. Wits Core patients had higher social functioning, while BMC and MTRH had
46 higher financial difficulty scores. Poor ECOG-PS score (3-4) was associated with poorer Global QoL (GqoL) score (aOR = 2.9; 95% CI: 1.4 - 5.9),
47 and patients with higher symptom burden had poorer GQoL.

48 Conclusion: The QoL among lung cancer patients in the three sites is low. Poor QOL in the study is associated with level of education,

49 performance status, fatigue, pain, dyspnoea, insomnia, loss of appetite and constipation.

50 Introduction

51 Globocan estimates that over 19 million new cancer cases were reported worldwide in 2020, with half resulting in death. Lung cancer is the 2nd
52 most common cancer worldwide among both males and females at 11.4%, but remains the most common cause of death at 18%¹. Although
53 lung cancer incidence is lower in Africa, compared to more developed countries, it ranks in the top 5 common cancers in both genders and is
54 the 4th most common cause of death due to cancer. Southern Africa has the highest incidence of lung cancer on the continent¹. Cancer
55 patients in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) are diagnosed late partly due to community lack of knowledge about the disease². In addition, social and
56 cultural factors, health system challenges, and inadequate health care worker knowledge, further compromise timely diagnosis and optimal
57 cancer care^{3 4 5}. These delays in diagnosis as well as inadequate treatment options contribute to the high mortality from lung cancer in SSA⁶.
58 Common symptoms of lung cancer include fatigue, loss of appetite, dyspnoea, cough, pain, and haemoptysis. However, in SSA, common
59 presenting symptoms include neurological deficits due to brain metastases, pleural effusion, spinal cord compression and superior vena cava
60 obstruction syndrome, due to late presentation and diagnosis^{7 8}. Treatment is limited to palliative chemotherapy, radiation and other
61 interventions aimed at improving the quality of life (QoL).

62 Quality of life is an important outcome measure for cancer patients undergoing treatment^{9 10 11}. Lung cancer diagnosis is associated with high
63 morbidity which can be optimized by instituting measures to improve QoL. Deterioration in the health status, physical, social, spiritual and
64 emotional wellbeing among advanced lung cancer patients is well documented, with reports of an association between the QoL and common
65 symptoms, clinical characteristics, and sociodemographic factors^{12 13}. Assessing and improving the QoL among these patients is important,

66 because health related QoL is associated with health outcomes and survival^{9 14}. Cancer treatments including medical (chemotherapy, targeted
67 therapies and immunotherapy) and radiation therapy and palliative care are associated with improved lung function, physical function,
68 symptoms, and mood, leading to better QoL and survival^{10 15}. Research on the symptom burden and QoL of lung cancer patients originates
69 mostly from high income countries and is limited in SSA.

70 The aim of this study is to describe the common symptoms and QoL of lung cancer patients treated at three different hospitals in SSA: Cancer
71 and Chronic Disease Centre (Kenya), Helen Joseph Hospital (South Africa) and Bugando Medical Centre (Tanzania), and to investigate the
72 association with demographic and clinical characteristics. Our hypothesis is that the lung cancer patients in SSA will have high symptom
73 burden, poor QoL, and that there will be an association between the demographic factors, clinical characteristics and QoL of lung cancer
74 patients.

75 **Methods**

76 **Setting**

77 The study was conducted at three teaching hospitals in three countries, two Low to Middle Income Countries (LMIC); Kenya and Tanzania, and
78 South Africa, an Upper Middle-Income Country (UMIC). In Kenya the Chandaria Cancer and Chronic Diseases Centre (CCCCDC) is based at
79 the Moi Teaching and Referral Hospital (MTRH) in Eldoret. MTRH, an affiliate of the Moi University School of Medicine is the second-largest
80 National Teaching and Referral Hospital (level 6 Public Hospital) after the Kenyatta National Hospital. The CCCCCDC provides comprehensive
81 cancer care services to patients mainly from Western Kenya, which includes North-Rift, Western and Nyanza regions with over 15 counties. It

82 also serves populations from neighbouring East African countries such as, Tanzania, Rwanda, Uganda, and South Sudan. The Lung
83 Laboratory Research and Intervention Unit Helen Joseph Hospital (Lung Lab) is a specialized respiratory unit providing comprehensive lung
84 cancer services to patients in Johannesburg, South Africa. It is based at Helen Joseph Hospital, a teaching hospital affiliated with the University
85 of Witwatersrand (Wits). Bugando Medical Centre (BMC) is a consultant, teaching and referral hospital for the Lake and Western zone of the
86 United Republic of Tanzania (URT) linked to the Catholic University of Health and Allied Sciences in Mwanza, Tanzania. The hospital's
87 Oncology department is the only cancer centre in the Lake and Western zone of URT that provides comprehensive cancer care with outreach
88 services to urban and rural areas.

89 **Design and participants**

90 This is a cross-sectional study of lung cancer patients at three teaching hospitals in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). Data was collected from 1st
91 June 2018 to 31 December 2020. Inclusion criteria were patients 18 years or older, confirmed primary lung cancer diagnosis, and physically
92 and mentally able to participate in the study. At all sites, once diagnosis was confirmed and before treatment began, patients were invited to
93 participate in the study. Formal consent was obtained, and those who consented were enrolled and sociodemographic and clinical information
94 was collected. Thereafter, the QLQ C30 questionnaire was administered in English and where needed translated into the vernacular.

95 **Study measures**

96 Trained nurses/interviewers conducted interviews to obtain demographics (age, gender, marital status, education level, employment status,
97 smoking, mining history), and clinical information (histology, clinical staging, ECOG, weight loss, active or current TB and other comorbidities).

98 The Eastern Cooperative Oncological Group Performance Scale (ECOG) was used to determine the performance status of patients¹⁶.
99 Patients' QoL was assessed using the 30-item European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire Core
100 30 (EORTC QLQ-C30)¹⁷.The questionnaire contains five multi-item function scales (physical, role, social, emotional and cognitive functions),
101 three multi-item symptom scales (fatigue, pain, nausea), and five single items (dyspnoea, insomnia, appetite loss, constipation, diarrhoea). The
102 final item evaluates patient perceived financial difficulties. Each item has four possible responses alternatives: (1) “not at all”, (2) “a little”, (3)
103 “quite a bit”, and (4) “very much”. The items are grouped to arrive at a global health status/QoL score. The responses to the scale items refer to
104 “last week,” with the exception of the patient's physical performance scale, where the timeframe is the present. The scores of all the Health
105 Related QoL (HRQoL) items were calculated in accordance with the EORTC QLQ- C 30 scoring manual¹¹.The sum of items in each category is
106 added and the total divided by the number of questions in the category. A linear transformation is then undertaken to convert this to a percentage
107 scale. All the scales and single-item measures range from 0 to 100. Higher scores on the functional and quality of life scales translated to better
108 HRQoL, whereas higher scores on the symptom scales translated to a higher level of symptoms/problems.

109 *Data analysis*

110 Study data were collected and managed using REDCap electronic data capture tools hosted at MTRH, (CCCCDC building) and Wits. Patient's
111 demographic, clinical and health related QoL data were extracted from the REDCap database and exported to Stata 13.1 for statistical
112 analysis^{18 19}. Categorical variables are presented as frequency tables, and continuous variables are presented as descriptive measures,
113 expressed as median and range. Non-parametric Kruskal Wallis and Wilcoxon Rank-Sum test was used to assess the differences in global
114 health status, functional and symptom scales. The association between Global Quality of Life (GQoL) and selected socio-demographic and
115 clinical variables (age, gender, education, occupation, smoking, MLCCP site, clinical staging, ECOG performance, comorbidity) was assessed

116 using bivariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis. The dependent variable (GQoL) was categorized as a binary variable; a score
117 greater than or equal to 50 was defined as “above average GQoL”. Odds ratios (OR) were used to test the association between binary
118 variables and 95% confidence intervals (CI) that did not span unity were considered as thresholds of statistical significance. Adjusted odds
119 ratios (aOR) were used in multivariate analysis.

120 **Ethics approval**

121 Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Witwatersrand Human Research Ethics Committee (Medical) (Ref: M180436), MTRH
122 Institutional Research and Ethics Committee IREC (0004048), BMC/CUHAS Ethics & Review Committee (Certificate number CREC/278/2018)
123 and National Institute for Medical Research (Certificate number MR/53/100/598).

124 **Socio-demographic characteristics**

125 A total of 210 lung cancer patients consented and were enrolled across the three sites: 35 at BMC, 32 at MTRH and 143 at the Lung Lab. Table
126 1 depicts the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants. Most patients were male (62.9%), unemployed or retired (80%), with a
127 mean (SD) age of 61.5 (11.9) years. There were significant differences in the demographic characteristics between the patients in the three
128 MLCCP sites. More Lung Lab patients were males (69.2%) compared to the patients in BMC (51.4%) and MTRH (46.9%) ($p=0.019$). Over two-
129 thirds of the lung cancer patients at The Lung Laboratory Research and Intervention Unit Helen Joseph Hospital had high school or higher level
130 of education compared to BMC (22.9%) and MTRH (40.6%) ($p<0.001$). A significant proportion of the Lung Lab patients (76.9%) were current
131 or ex-smokers compared to patients at BMC (22.9%) and MTRH (18.7%) ($p<0.001$).

132

Table 1 Socio-demographic characteristics of lung cancer patients									
	MLCCP site								
	BMC		MTRH		Lung Lab		Total		p-value
Socio-demographic variables	N=35		N=32		N=143		N=210		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Age-group									
<40	4	11.4	1	3.1	5	3.5	10	4.8	
40-49	4	11.4	5	15.6	10	7.0	19	9.1	
50-59	10	28.6	10	31.3	35	24.5	55	26.2	
60-69	11	31.4	6	18.8	56	39.2	73	34.8	
70+	6	17.1	10	31.3	37	25.9	53	25.2	
Mean (SD) age in years	58 (13.4)		61.5 (13.2)		62.4 (11.1)		61.5 (11.9)		0.203
Sex									
Female	17	48.6	17	53.1	44	30.8	78	37.1	

Male	18	51.4	15	46.9	99	69.2	132	62.9	0.019
Educational level									
≤ Primary education	27	77.1	19	59.4	43	30.1	89	42.4	
≥ High school	8	22.9	13	40.6	100	69.9	121	57.6	<0.001
Marital status†									
Married or in Partnership	29	82.9	25	78.1	53	45.7	107	58.5	
Single/divorced/widowed	6	17.1	7	21.9	63	54.3	76	41.5	<0.001
Occupation									
Employed	10	28.6	3	9.4	29	20.3	42	20.0	
Unemployed/retired	25	71.4	29	90.6	114	79.7	168	80.0	0.144
Smoking									
Never smoked	27	77.1	26	81.3	33	23.1	86	41.0	
Current or ex-smoker	8	22.9	6	18.7	110	76.9	124	59.0	<0.001

Ever a miner									
Yes‡					19	13.3	19	9.1	
No	35	100.0	32	100.0	124	86.7	191	91.0	
† Marital status was unknown in 27 Lung Lab patients									
‡ None of the BMC and MTRH patients ever worked in a mine									

133

134 **Clinical characteristics**

135 The majority of patients (90%) were diagnosed with non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). Most presented with late stage (III-IV) diseases;
 136 97.3% of the NSCLC (n=188) and 86.4% of the Small Cell Lung Cancer (SCLC) (n=22). Only 5 of The Lung Laboratory Research and
 137 Intervention Unit Helen Joseph Hospital patients (3.9%) with NSCLC presented with early stage (I-II) (Table 2). The majority of patients at BMC
 138 (85.7%) presented with weight loss compared to patients at MTRH (53.1%) and the Lung Lab (67.1%) (p=0.015). Similarly, a significant
 139 proportion of BMC patients had current TB (34.3%) compared to the patients in MTHR (9.4%) and the Lung Lab (3.5%) (p<0.001). Almost all
 140 MTRH patients (96.9%) reported a near normal performance status (ECOG 0-2) compared to the patients at BMC (65.7%) and the Lung Lab
 141 (72.7%) (p=0.006). A higher proportion of the Lung Lab patients presented with one or more comorbidity (58%) compared to patients in BMC
 142 (40%) and MTRH (25%) (P<0.01).

143

144

145

Table 2 Clinical characteristics of lung cancer patients									
MLCCP site									
Clinical variables	BMC		MTRH		Lung Lab		Total		p-value
	N=35		N=32		N=143		N=210		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Clinical staging									
NSCLC	<i>n=27</i>		<i>n=31</i>		<i>n=130</i>		<i>n=188</i>		
I-II	0	0	0	0	5	3.9	5	2.7	
III-IV	27	100.0	31	100.0	125	96.2	183	97.3	0.318
SCLC	<i>n=8</i>		<i>n=1</i>		<i>n=13</i>		<i>n=22</i>		
Limited	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	23.1	3	13.6	
Extensive	8	100.0	1	100.0	10	76.9	19	86.4	0.300
ECOG performance									
0-2	23	65.7	31	96.9	104	72.7	158	75.2	
3-4	12	34.3	1	3.1	39	27.3	52	24.8	0.006

Weight loss									
No	5	14.3	15	46.9	47	32.9	67	31.9	
Yes	30	85.7	17	53.1	96	67.1	143	68.1	0.015
Current TB									
No	23	65.7	29	90.6	138	96.5	190	90.5	
Yes	12	34.3	3	9.4	5	3.5	20	9.5	<0.001
HIV status									
HIV negative	35	100.0	0		120	83.9	155	73.8	
HIV positive	0		0		23	16.1	23	11.0	
Unknown †	0		32	100.0	0	0.0	32	15.2	
Comorbidity									
No	21	60.0	24	75.0	60	42.0	105	50.0	
Yes	14	40.0	8	25.0	83	58.0	105	50.0	0.001

146

147 **Quality of life assessment (EORTC QLQ-C30)**

148 Overall, the EORTC QLQ-C30 Global Health Status (GHS) was low (Table 3); the median score was 41.7 (range 0-100). The GHS score was
 149 significantly higher among patients in MTRH (50.0) compared to BMC (33.3) and the Lung Lab (41.7) ($p < 0.001$). Lung Lab patients had higher
 150 social functioning scores compared to patients in BMC and MTRH ($p < 0.001$). Financial difficulty was significantly higher among BMC and
 151 MTRH patients compared to Lung Lab ($p < 0.001$). Both Lung Lab and BMC cohorts had higher cognitive functioning scores compared to MTRH
 152 ($p = 0.0182$). Overall, the highest symptom scores reported were pain (66.7) and fatigue (55.6). Pain and insomnia scores were significantly
 153 higher among patients in BMC, with median scores 83.3 ($p = 0.0028$) and 66.7 ($p = 0.0024$) respectively compared to Lung Lab and MTRH.

154

155 **Table 3: Global health status, functional scales, and symptom scales of lung cancer patients²⁰.**

Assessment of quality- of-life scale (QLQ-C30)	Reference N= 3,332		Total N=210		BMC N=35		MTRH N=32		Lung Lab N=143		P-value
	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	
Global health status-QL	58.3	41.7- 75	41.7	33.3 - 58.3	33.3	16.7 - 50.0	50.0	41.7 - 66.7	41.7	33.3 - 58.3	0.0001*
Functional scales											

Physical functioning- PF	80	60-86.7	53.3	26.7 - 73.3	66.7	6.7 - 86.7	53.3	30 - 66.7	46.7	33.3 - 73.3	0.7156
Role functioning- RF	66.7	33.3-100	33.3	16.7 - 66.7	50.0	0.0 - 83.3	25.0	0 - 66.7	33.3	16.7 - 66.7	0.3197
Emotional functioning- EF	75	50-91.7	66.7	50.0 - 83.3	75.0	41.7 - 100	66.7	37.5 - 83.3	66.7	50 - 83.3	0.5347
Cognitive functioning- CF	83.3	50-100	66.7	50.0 - 83.3	83.3	50.0 - 100	58.3	25 - 83.3	83.3	50 - 83.3	0.0182*
Social functioning- SF	83.3	50-100	33.3	0.0 - 66.7	0.0	0 - 0	33.3	0 - 33.3	50.0	33.3 - 83.3	0.0001*
Symptoms scale											
Fatigue- FA	33.3	22.2-55.6	55.6	33.3 - 77.8	55.6	33.3 - 100	55.6	22.2 - 66.7	55.6	44.4 - 77.8	0.1153
Nausea and vomiting- NV	0	0-16.7	0.0	0.0 - 16.7	16.7	0 - 66.7	0.0	0 - 16.7	0.0	0 - 16.7	0.0544

Pain- PA	16.7	0-50	66.7	33.3 - 83.3	83.3	50 - 100	66.7	33.3 - 83.3	50.0	33.3 - 66.7	0.0028*
Dyspnoea- DY	33.3	0- 66.7	33.3	33.3 - 66.7	33.3	0 - 100	66.7	33.3 - 66.7	33.3	33.3 66.7	0.6227
Insomnia- SL	33.3	0- 66.7	33.3	0.0 - 66.7	66.7	33 - 100	33.3	0 - 66.7	33.3	0 - 66.7	0.0024*
Appetite loss- AP	0	0- 66.7	33.3	0.0 - 66.7	33.3	0 - 100	33.3	0 - 66.7	33.3	0 - 66.7	0.4228
Constipation- CO	0	0- 33.3	0.0	0.0 - 33.3	0.0	0 - 0	0.0	0 - 0	0.0	0 - 33.3	0.0001*
Diarrhoea- DI	0	0-0	0.0	0 - 0	0.0	0 - 33.3	0.0	0 - 0	0.0	0 - 0	0.0041*
Financial difficulties - FI	0	0- 33.3	66.7	33.3 - 100	100.0	100 - 100	100.0	100 - 100	66.7	33.3 - 66.7	0.0001*

156 *Significant at $p < 0.05$. Abbreviations: BMC (Bugando Medical Centre), MTRH (Moi Teaching and Referral Hospital), Lung Lab (Helen Joseph Hospital)

157

158 The results of the multiple logistic regression analysis using the dependent variable (GQoL) as a binary outcome (GQoL score < 50 and GQoL
159 score ≥ 50) are shown in Table 4. A significantly higher proportion of lung cancer patients at BMC and The Lung Lab had below average GQoL
160 compared to patients at MTRH (aOR = 5.0; 95% CI: 1.6 - 15.6) and (aOR = 2.9; 95% CI: 1.0 - 8.0) respectively. Poor ECOG score (3-4) was

161 associated with poorer GQoL score (aOR = 2.9; 95% CI: 1.4 - 5.9). The bivariate analysis showed a significant association between GQoL and
 162 educational level. Patients with below secondary level of education were more likely to have below average GQoL, however the multivariate
 163 analysis showed no significant associations when adjusted for all demographic variables (age, gender, education, occupation and smoking).

Table 4: Associations between socio-demographic, clinical characteristics, and global quality of life

Variables	Global quality of life				OR (95% CI)	p-value	aOR (95% CI)
	Below average (<50)		Above average (≥50)				
	N=110	N=100	N=110	N=100			
	n	%	n	%			
Age-group							
<60	43	39.1	41	41	Reference		Reference
60+	67	60.9	59	59	1.1 (0.6-1.9)	0.778	0.9 (0.5-1.8)
Gender							
Male	68	61.8	64	64	Reference		Reference
Female	42	38.2	36	36	1.1 (0.6-1.9)	0.744	1.1 (0.6-2.1)
Education							
≤ Primary education	54	49.1	35	35	1.8 (1.0-3.1)	0.039	1.6 (0.8-3.1)
≥ Secondary education	56	50.9	65	65	Reference		Reference

Occupation							
Employed	19	17.3	23	23	Reference		Reference
Unemployed/Retired	91	82.7	77	77	1.4 (0.7-2.8)	0.3	1.5 (0.7-3.3)
Smoking							
Never smoked	47	42.7	39	39	Reference		Reference
Current or ex-smoker	63	57.3	61	61	0.9 (0.5-1.5)	0.583	0.8 (0.4-1.6)
Study sites							
MTRH	10	27.8	22	71	Reference		Reference
BMC	26	72.2	9	29	6.4 (2.2-18.4)	<0.001	5.0 (1.6-15.6)*
MTRH	10	11.9	22	24.2	Reference		Reference
WITS-CORE	74	88.1	69	75.8	2.4 (1.0-5.3)	0.036	2.9 (1.0-8.0)*
Clinical staging							
I-II	4	3.6	4	4	Reference		Reference
III-IV	10	96.4	96	96	1.1 (0.3-4.5)	0.891	1.1 (0.2-5.0)
ECOG performance							
0-2	72	65.5	86	86	Reference		Reference
	04-Mar	38	34.6	14	3.2 (1.6-6.5)	0.001	2.9 (1.4-5.9)*

Comorbidity							
No	52	47.3	53	53	Reference		Reference
Yes	58	52.7	47	47	1.3 (0.7-2.2)	0.407	1.2 (0.7-2.2)

* Statistically significant. Abbreviations: OR (odds ratio), aOR (adjusted odds ratio), BMC (Bugando Medical Centre), MTRH (Moi Teaching and Referral Hospital), The Lung Laboratory Research and Intervention Unit Helen Joseph Hospital (University of the Witwatersrand Centre of Respiratory Excellence). aOR: *Adjusted for Age-group, Gender, Education, Occupation, Smoking, MLCCP site, Clinical staging, ECOG performance, Comorbidity.*

164

165 The symptom scores were significantly higher among patients with below average GQoL (<50) for fatigue, pain, dyspnoea, insomnia, appetite

166 loss and constipation when compared to above average GqoL (≥50) (Table 5). Higher symptom scores are associated with global health status.

Table 5: Associations between symptoms and financial difficulty with global quality of life

	Global quality of life (GQoL)				P-value
	Below average (<50)		Above average (≥50)		
	n=110		n=100		
	Median	IQR	Median	IQR	
Fatigue	66.7	44.4 - 88.9	44.4	22.2 - 66.7	<0.001*
Nausea and vomiting	0	0 - 33.3	0	0 - 16.7	0.0552
Pain	66.7	50 - 100	50	33.3 - 66.7	<0.001*
Dyspnoea	66.7	33 - 66.7	33.3	0 - 66.7	0.0018*

Insomnia	66.7	33 - 66.7	33.3	0 - 66.7	<0.001*
Appetite loss	33.3	0 - 66.7	33.3	0 - 66.7	0.0043*
Constipation	0	0 - 33.3	0	0 - 0	0.0489*
Diarrhoea	0	0 - 0	0	0 - 0	0.0582
Financial difficulties	66.7	33.3 - 100	66.7	33.3 - 100	0.1775

*Statistically significant (P<0.05)

167

168 Discussion

169 This study aimed to describe the common symptoms, quality of life of lung cancer patients and association of demographic and clinical
170 characteristics with global health status (GQoL). The EORTC GQoL for the lung cancer cohort in this study is low and differed across the three
171 sites, with BMC and the Lung Lab reporting significantly lower GQoL compared to MTRH. The symptom burden is higher among patients with
172 lower GQoL, with common symptoms being pain, fatigue, dyspnoea and insomnia, and appetite loss. There are significant differences in the
173 socio-demographic, clinical characteristics, global health status, social functioning, common symptoms, and financial difficulties between the
174 sites, as well as significant association between poor global health status, and ECOG performance and the type of symptoms.

175 Quality of life

176 Our study has found that the GQOL of lung cancer patients at the three sites is low compared to the EORTC lung cancer reference sample
177 (Median 58.3), consistent with previous studies²⁰.Togas, in a Greek study of 200 lung cancer patients found that the GQoL and functionality

178 among their cohort lower than the mean scores for the reference population, but slightly higher than that of our study: physical functioning
179 (56.9), role functioning (48.9), and social functioning (50.5)²¹. Except for the emotional, all functional scales in our study are low compared to
180 the reference sample. Poor physical and role functioning relates to daily activities that patients have to engage in, their need for assistance,
181 ability to be productive at work and fulfilment of social roles. With advancing disease, most patients will require assistance with walking,
182 washing, or bathing themselves and to fulfil their family responsibilities and roles as husband/wife, father/mother. Cognitive functioning among
183 our participants is low, and also differed significantly between the sites, with MTRH the lowest at 58.3 (IQR 25-83.3)^{11 22 23 24}. Cognitive
184 functioning measures difficulty in remembering, concentration and paying attention. Previous studies have reported high cognitive functioning
185 (82-89) among lung cancer patients compared to this study^{11 22 23}. In a study of 139 lung cancer patients with stage III and IV, Yu Lee Dai
186 reported cognitive functioning of 89.93 at baseline for lung cancer patients, concurring with previous reports²³. The reason for the low cognitive
187 functioning among the MTRH patients may be related to dyspnoea, pain and insomnia which are common among this cohort, and has been
188 reported previously²⁵. According to Chen among 115 lung cancer patients, insomnia negatively affected cognitive function. Cognitive ability
189 reduces stress and symptoms and help patients cope²⁶. Efforts to improve cognitive functioning may assist patients to cope with their disease.

190 **Sociodemographic and clinical characteristics**

191 The study presents interesting differences in demographic and clinical characteristics between the three sites. The Lung Lab cohort differed
192 from MTRH and BMC in that the participants were mostly male, had higher education levels, were likely to be smokers, had co-morbidities and
193 likely to be diagnosed with stage 3 cancer, compared to stage 4 at other sites. Previous studies have reported that geographical distance can
194 negatively affect access to cancer care²⁷. In a qualitative study in KwaZulu Natal, Lubuzo highlighted distance from the facility as one barrier to

195 accessing lung cancer care. The Lung Lab services a predominantly urban population compared to BMC and MTRH, which might explain the
196 low number of stage 3 patients diagnosed at the two sites. Other reasons for the difference might be access to qualified radiologists available in
197 South Africa. Further research to understand this difference is recommended.

198 Studies have previously reported association between patients' sociodemographic characteristics and QoL. Research reports associating QoL
199 with age, education, gender, economic status and GQoL are inconclusive, with some reporting better GQoL among older patients, males and
200 those with higher level of education ¹¹, while others reports better QoL among younger patients females ²⁸. In a study 6,420 lung cancer
201 patients in Texas, USA, Pierznski et al found that patients with higher level of education reported better GQoL^{20 29}. Despite differences in
202 sociodemographic characteristics between Wits- Core and the other sites in the current study, only the level of education was associated with
203 GqoL. Literacy affects patients' understanding of health information, motivation to seek help, application of information and making
204 judgements³⁰. The patients with the lowest level of education are at BMC and MTRH, both of which serve significant proportions of rural
205 communities compared to the Lung Lab. Efforts to provide cancer health education in local languages and in rural communities in Kenya and
206 Tanzania is recommended if we aim to improve early detection of lung cancer that will affect the QoL. Smoking is associated with poor quality
207 of life and survival^{31 25}. In a case control study of 168 cases and 334 controls, Chen et al (2015) found that smoking affected the quality of life
208 as well as symptoms of lung cancer patients even after diagnosis²⁵. We found no association between smoking and global health status GQoL,
209 like what was reported by Togas et al²¹.

210

211

212 **Common symptoms**

213 Advanced disease is associated with severe symptoms and poor QoL among lung cancer patients¹¹. Almost all participants in our study had
214 advanced disease. Common symptoms reported in this study include fatigue, pain, dyspnoea, insomnia, and loss of appetite, which is
215 consistent with what has been reported elsewhere ^{11 32 7 33}. The severity of pain and insomnia was higher amongst patients at BMC than at the
216 Lung Lab and MTRH. Pain and insomnia have been reported among lung cancer patients elsewhere^{7 21}. Higher pain scores among BMC may
217 be related to access and availability and access of health services and pain medication. Challenges to the use of opioids for pain in SSA
218 include strict laws controlling availability and prescription, health professional knowledge gaps and out of pocket expenditure among the poor
219 communities³⁴. To improve pain control in SSA, we advocate for policy change to allow for healthcare providers other than doctors to prescribe
220 opioids for palliative care, make healthcare services affordable, and address the knowledge gaps among health professionals across all levels
221 of care. Uganda is one of the countries that has allowed nurses trained in palliative care to prescribe morphine, a practice that can be emulated
222 by other countries³⁵. Fatigue, pain, dyspnoea, insomnia, and loss of appetite are associated with poor quality of life in our study. Similar findings
223 have been reported by other studies³⁵. Physical symptom management to improve quality of life is a core principle of palliative care, and is
224 recognised as integral to good quality cancer care^{37 38 39}. We recommend that all sites integrate palliative care as a component of cancer care
225 to address the common symptoms and improve GQoL among lung cancer patients.

226 **Financial difficulties**

227 Financial difficulty is associated with late presentation, poor GQoL, high symptom burden and non-adherence to treatment, but not in the
228 current study^{40 41 34}. Financial hardship may be direct (cost of health care services) or indirect (cost of transport, food, loss of income)^{34 40 41}.

229 Most (80%) patients in our study were unemployed. Patients at BMC and MTRH reported greater financial difficulties than at Wits- Core or in
230 other studies^{20 24}. A study of 150 cancer patients in Ethiopia, also found that cancer patients have financial difficulty⁴¹. Financial difficulty
231 affects the ability to travel to health facilities for treatment, follow up visits, buying necessary food, supplements vitamins, and over the counter
232 medicine^{34 40 41}. In the multi-site CanCORS study of 10,000 lung and colon cancer patients in the United States of America, Lathan reported a
233 strong association between financial strain, poor QoL and high symptom burden⁴⁰. The South African government provides social grants to
234 patients disabled with severe limitations of activities of daily living including advanced cancer. We recommend that other countries in SSA
235 consider allocating a budget towards similarly assisting patients with severe life-limiting illnesses to improve financial stability, thereby
236 impacting on their quality of life.

237 Our study also has some limitations. The sample sizes at BMC and MTRH were small. While all sites used the standardised QLQ C30 tool,
238 languages of interviews differed which may have affected the fidelity of data collection. Reported stages of lung cancer may have been affected
239 by facilities available for accurate staging. Cough, which is one of the commonest symptoms of lung cancer is not included in the assessments
240 and other unmeasured factors such as treatment effects, nutritional factors, use of alternative treatments such as herbal treatment and
241 polypharmacy may have impacted on the GQoL. However, to our knowledge, this is the first study to describe the quality of life and common
242 symptoms among patients diagnosed with lung cancer across three countries in SSA through collaborative research.

243 Conclusion

244 This study found low levels of quality of life, physical functioning, role functioning and social functioning among lung cancer patients at three
245 SSA sites, which was variable between sites. Poor QoL in the study is associated with level of education, performance status, fatigue, pain,

246 dyspnoea, insomnia, loss of appetite and constipation. While all three sites had access to diagnostic tools, early diagnosis remains a challenge,
247 especially in Kenya and Tanzania. There are no official screening programs for lung cancer in the three countries, due to constrained
248 resources^{42 43}. Risk factor modification, such as smoking cessation however has been at the forefront in cancer prevention. We recommend
249 that more research be conducted to investigate the effectiveness of programs to reduce lung cancer risks, reasons for delays in diagnosis, the
250 needs of lung cancer patients in different countries, and factors that may be impacting the quality of life. This research would guide
251 interventions that best impact on the burden of lung cancer on patients in sub-Saharan Africa.

252 **Acknowledgements**

253 The research was supported through grants from Bristol Myers Squibb Foundation. We acknowledge the support received from the clinical
254 teams at Moi Teaching and referral Hospital (Kenya), Bugando Medical Centre (Tanzania) and Wits Centre for Palliative Care (South Africa).

255

256 **References:**

- 257 1. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36
258 Cancers in 185 Countries. *CA Cancer J Clin.* 2021;71(3):209-249. doi:10.3322/caac.21660
- 259 2. Dlamini SB, Sartorius B, Ginindza TG. Knowledge, attitudes and practices towards lung cancer among adults in KwaZulu-Natal, South
260 Africa: a cross-sectional survey. *J Public Health Africa.* 2022;13(3):2111. doi:10.4081/jphia.2022.2111
- 261 3. Lubuzo B, Ginindza T, Hlongwana K. The barriers to initiating lung cancer care in low-and middle-income countries. *Pan Afr Med J.*

- 262 2020;35:38. doi:10.11604/pamj.2020.35.38.17333
- 263 4. Cassim S, Chepulis L, Keenan R, Kidd J, Firth M, Lawrenson R. Patient and carer perceived barriers to early presentation and diagnosis
264 of lung cancer: a systematic review. *BMC Cancer*. 2019;19(1):25. doi:10.1186/s12885-018-5169-9
- 265 5. Mapanga W, Norris SA, Chen WC, et al. Consensus study on the health system and patient-related barriers for lung cancer
266 management in South Africa. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(2):e0246716. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0246716
- 267 6. Tsai CH, Kung PT, Kuo WY, Tsai WC. Effect of time interval from diagnosis to treatment for non-small cell lung cancer on survival: a
268 national cohort study in Taiwan. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(4):e034351. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-034351
- 269 7. Iyer S, Taylor-Stokes G, Roughley A. Symptom burden and quality of life in advanced non-small cell lung cancer patients in France and
270 Germany. *Lung Cancer*. 2013;81(2):288-293. doi:10.1016/j.lungcan.2013.03.008
- 271 8. Iyer S, Roughley A, Rider A, Taylor-Stokes G. The symptom burden of non-small cell lung cancer in the USA: a real-world cross-
272 sectional study. *Support care cancer Off J Multinatl Assoc Support Care Cancer*. 2014;22(1):181-187. doi:10.1007/s00520-013-1959-4
- 273 9. Montazeri A. Quality of life data as prognostic indicators of survival in cancer patients: an overview of the literature from 1982 to 2008.
274 *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2009;7:102. doi:10.1186/1477-7525-7-102
- 275 10. Braun DP, Gupta D, Staren ED. Quality of life assessment as a predictor of survival in non-small cell lung cancer. *BMC Cancer*.
276 2011;11(1):353. doi:10.1186/1471-2407-11-353

- 277 11. Larsson M, Ljung L, Johansson BBK. Health-related quality of life in advanced non-small cell lung cancer: correlates and comparisons
278 to normative data. *Eur J Cancer Care (Engl)*. 2012;21(5):642-649. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2354.2012.01346.x
- 279 12. Avelino CUR, Cardoso RM, Aguiar SS de, Silva MJS da. Assessment of quality of life in patients with advanced non-small cell lung
280 carcinoma treated with a combination of carboplatin and paclitaxel. *J Bras Pneumol publicacao Of da Soc Bras Pneumol e Tisilogia*.
281 2015;41(2):133-142. doi:10.1590/S1806-37132015000004367
- 282 13. Polanski J, Jankowska-Polanska B, Rosinczuk J, Chabowski M, Szymanska-Chabowska A. Quality of life of patients with lung cancer.
283 *Onco Targets Ther*. 2016;9:1023-1028. doi:10.2147/OTT.S100685
- 284 14. Thronicke A, von Trott P, Kröz M, Grah C, Matthes B, Schad F. Health-Related Quality of Life in Patients with Lung Cancer Applying
285 Integrative Oncology Concepts in a Certified Cancer Centre. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med*. 2020;2020:5917382.
286 doi:10.1155/2020/5917382
- 287 15. Osoba D, Rodrigues G, Myles J, Zee B, Pater J. Interpreting the significance of changes in health-related quality-of- life scores. *J Clin*
288 *Oncol*. 1998;16(1):139-144. doi:10.1200/JCO.1998.16.1.139
- 289 16. Oken MM, Creech RH, Tormey DC, et al. Toxicity and response criteria of the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. *Am J Clin Oncol*.
290 1982;5(6):649-655.
- 291 17. Fayers P, Bottomley A. Quality of life research within the EORTC-the EORTC QLQ-C30. European Organisation for Research and
292 Treatment of Cancer. *Eur J Cancer*. 2002;38 Suppl 4:S125-33. doi:10.1016/s0959-8049(01)00448-8

- 293 18. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J*
294 *Biomed Inform.* 2019;95:103208. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208
- 295 19. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven
296 methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform.* 2009;42(2):377-381.
297 doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
- 298 20. Scott NW, Fayers P, Aaronson NK, Bottomley A, de Graeff A GM et al. EORTC QLQ-C30 Reference Values Manual. 2nd ed. *EORTC*
299 *QLQ-C30 Ref Values Manual 2nd ed.* 2008;1(2nd ed):427. [https://abdn.pure.elsevier.com/en/publications/eortc-qlq-c30-reference-](https://abdn.pure.elsevier.com/en/publications/eortc-qlq-c30-reference-values-manual)
300 [values-manual](https://abdn.pure.elsevier.com/en/publications/eortc-qlq-c30-reference-values-manual)
- 301 21. Togas C, Alexias G, Anagnostopoulos F. Evaluation of Health-Related Quality of Life in Lung Cancer Patients in Greece and
302 Associations with Demographic and Medical Characteristics. *J Biosci Med.* 2019;07(10):17-31. doi:10.4236/jbm.2019.710002
- 303 22. Hung HY, Wu LM, Chen KP. Determinants of Quality of Life in Lung Cancer Patients. *J Nurs Scholarsh an Off Publ Sigma Theta Tau*
304 *Int Honor Soc Nurs.* 2018;50(3):257-264. doi:10.1111/jnu.12376
- 305 23. Dai YL, Yang CT, Chen KH, Tang ST. Changes in and Determinants of Quality of Life in Patients With Advanced Non-Small-Cell Lung
306 Cancer Undergoing Initial Chemotherapy. *J Nurs Res.* 2017;25(3):203-215. doi:10.1097/JNR.000000000000148
- 307 24. Koch M, Hjermstad MJ, Tomaszewski K, et al. Gender effects on quality of life and symptom burden in patients with lung cancer: results
308 from a prospective, cross-cultural, multi-center study. *J Thorac Dis.* 2020;12(8):4253-4261. doi:10.21037/jtd-20-1054

- 309 25. Chen ML, Yu CT, Yang CH. Sleep disturbances and quality of life in lung cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy. *Lung Cancer*.
310 2008;62(3):391-400. doi:10.1016/j.lungcan.2008.03.016
- 311 26. Porter LS, Keefe FJ, Garst J, McBride CM, Baucom D. Self-efficacy for managing pain, symptoms, and function in patients with lung
312 cancer and their informal caregivers: associations with symptoms and distress. *Pain*. 2008;137(2):306-315.
313 doi:10.1016/j.pain.2007.09.010
- 314 27. Tegegne TK, Chojenta C, Loxton D, Smith R, Kibret KT. The impact of geographic access on institutional delivery care use in low and
315 middle-income countries: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(8):1-16. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0203130
- 316 28. Derogar M, van der Schaaf M, Lagergren P. Reference values for the EORTC QLQ-C30 quality of life questionnaire in a random sample
317 of the Swedish population. *Acta Oncol*. 2012;51(1):10-16. doi:10.3109/0284186X.2011.614636
- 318 29. Pierzynski JA, Ye Y, Lippman SM, Rodriguez MA, Wu X, Hildebrandt MAT. Socio-demographic, Clinical, and Genetic Determinants of
319 Quality of Life in Lung Cancer Patients. *Sci Rep*. 2018;8(1):1-8. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-25712-1
- 320 30. Sørensen K, Van Den Broucke S, Fullam J, et al. Health literacy and public health: A systematic review and integration of definitions and
321 models. *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12(1):80. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-80
- 322 31. Danson SJ, Rowland C, Rowe R, et al. The relationship between smoking and quality of life in advanced lung cancer patients: a
323 prospective longitudinal study. *Support care cancer Off J Multinatl Assoc Support Care Cancer*. 2016;24(4):1507-1516.
324 doi:10.1007/s00520-015-2928-x

- 325 32. Bülbül Y, Ozlu T, Arinc S, et al. Assessment of Palliative Care in Lung Cancer in Turkey. *Med Princ Pract Int J Kuwait Univ Heal Sci*
326 *Cent.* 2017;26(1):50-56. doi:10.1159/000452801
- 327 33. Iwase S, Kawaguchi T, Tokoro A, et al. Assessment of Cancer-Related Fatigue, Pain, and Quality of Life in Cancer Patients at Palliative
328 Care Team Referral: A Multicenter Observational Study (JORTC PAL-09). *PLoS One.* 2015;10(8):e0134022.
329 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0134022
- 330 34. Namisango E, Allsop MJ, Powell RA, et al. Investigation of the Practices, Legislation, Supply Chain, and Regulation of Opioids for
331 Clinical Pain Management in Southern Africa: A Multi-sectoral, Cross-National, Mixed Methods Study. *J Pain Symptom Manage.*
332 2018;55(3):851-863. doi:10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2017.11.010
- 333 35. Jagwe J. Delivering Analgesia in Rural Africa.pdf. Published online 2007.
- 334 36. Lemonnier I, Guillemin F, Arveux P, et al. Quality of life after the initial treatments of non-small cell lung cancer: a persistent predictor for
335 patients' survival. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2014;12:73. doi:10.1186/1477-7525-12-73
- 336 37. Ferrell BR, Temel JS, Temin S, et al. Integration of Palliative Care Into Standard Oncology Care: American Society of Clinical Oncology
337 Clinical Practice Guideline Update. *J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol.* 2017;35(1):96-112. doi:10.1200/JCO.2016.70.1474
- 338 38. Dans M, Smith T, Back A, et al. NCCN Guidelines Insights: Palliative Care, Version 2.2017. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw.* 2017;15(8):989-
339 997. doi:10.6004/jnccn.2017.0132
- 340 39. Smith CB, Phillips T, Smith TJ. Using the New ASCO Clinical Practice Guideline for Palliative Care Concurrent With Oncology Care

- 341 Using the TEAM Approach. *Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ book Am Soc Clin Oncol Annu Meet.* 2017;37:714-723.
342 doi:10.1200/EDBK_175474
- 343 40. Lathan CS, Cronin A, Tucker-Seeley R, Zafar SY, Ayanian JZ, Schrag D. Association of Financial Strain With Symptom Burden and
344 Quality of Life for Patients With Lung or Colorectal Cancer. *J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol.* 2016;34(15):1732-1740.
345 doi:10.1200/JCO.2015.63.2232
- 346 41. Abegaz TM, Ayele AA, Gebresillassie BM. Health Related Quality of Life of Cancer Patients in Ethiopia. *J Oncol.* 2018;2018:1467595.
347 doi:10.1155/2018/1467595
- 348 42. Dlamini SB, Hlongwana KW, Ginindza TG. Lung cancer awareness training experiences of community health workers in KwaZulu-Natal,
349 South Africa. *African J Prim Heal care Fam Med.* 2022;14(1):e1-e9. doi:10.4102/phcfm.v14i1.3414
- 350 43. Koegelenberg CFN, Dorfman S, Schewitz I, et al. Recommendations for lung cancer screening in Southern Africa. *J Thorac Dis.*
351 2019;11(9):3696-3703. doi:10.21037/jtd.2019.08.66
352