

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

**Nurses' Support of Treatment Decision-Making for Patients with Cancer During the
COVID-19 Pandemic in Japan**

Shiori Yoshida^{1*}, Konosuke Sasaki¹, Fumiko Sato²

¹ Department of Oncology Nursing, Health Sciences, Tohoku University Graduate School of
Medicine, Sendai, Miyagi, Japan

² School of Nursing, Fukushima Medical University, Fukushima, Fukushima, Japan

* Corresponding author

E-mail: shiori.y@med.tohoku.ac.jp

20 **Abstract**

21 During the COVID-19 pandemic, cancer patients became reluctant to come to the hospital,
22 receive cancer treatment, and were willing to interrupt or postpone treatment due to concerns
23 about infection. The purpose of this study was to discuss effective treatment strategy decision
24 making support for cancer patients by nurses recognized during the COVID-19 pandemic.
25 The study population comprised nurse of decision-making support at cancer care during
26 COVID-19 from May to July 2021 at 49 the cancer care center hospitals were established in
27 each prefecture, who had engaged 50% of their nursing care provided to patients with cancer.
28 Data were collected on treatment strategy decision-making support using an online cross-
29 sectional survey. Factors that influenced patients' decision-making were identified using
30 multivariable logistic regression analysis. A total of 182 (25.0%) were nurses engaged in
31 decision making were enrolled in this study. Factors that influenced patients' decision to
32 receive treatment to their satisfaction were their resignation or compromise in accepting the
33 decision due to the pandemic (odds ratio [OR] 0.44 (95% CI [0.22, 0.87]), videoconference
34 follow-up (OR 0.17, 95% CI [0.04, 0.66]), and infection prevention information provision
35 (OR 3.82, 95% CI [1.54,9.46]). Factors influencing patients' decision to give up and accept
36 the doctor's recommendation even though they were not convinced included fear of disease
37 progression (OR 2.51, 95% CI [1.21, 5.22]), anger at not receiving the treatment they desired
38 (OR 2.48, 95% CI [1.17, 5.27]), and compromise with the pandemic situation (OR 3.15, 95%

39 CI [1.53, 6.50]). The factor that influenced patients' continued treatment even though they
40 were not convinced included the nurse listened to the patients' thoughts (OR 0.07, 95% CI
41 [0.01, 0.51]). Treatment decision support of patients with cancer during COVID-19 included
42 lifestyle guidance to prevent the spread of infection and listening to their concerns to help
43 them find meaning in their choices.

44 *Keywords:* cancer, COVID-19, decision-making, disaster nursing

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53 **Introduction**

54 COVID-19 was first identified in China in December 2019 and spread rapidly worldwide.

55 The World Health Organization ¹⁾ characterized it a global pandemic on March 11, 2020,

56 declaring the end of COVID-19 as an international public health emergency in 2023. As of

57 last reported on September 1, 2023, more than 770 million cases and 6.9 million deaths were

58 reported worldwide²⁾. Patients with cancer have a 3.5-fold higher risk of contracting a serious

59 COVID-19 infection ³⁾ and a 5.6% risk of fatality ⁴⁾. Nevertheless, they must make treatment

60 choices even during a life-threatening crisis, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Medical

61 treatment strategies include adjuvant chemotherapy and the postponement of surgery for low-

62 risk patients with cancer³⁾⁵⁾.

63 Physical distancing (sometimes called social distancing) became the norm during the

64 COVID-19 pandemic⁶⁾. Consequently, patients with cancer refrained from visiting the

65 hospital due to fear of infection and were reluctant to receive cancer treatment, with some

66 even considering suspending or postponing their treatment ⁷⁾. In Japan, cancer screening

67 uptake declined by 10%–30% during the pandemic period⁸⁾, and cancer diagnosis

68 registrations decreased by 4.6%⁹⁾. This was due to delays in screening and receiving medical

69 care as a result of new COVID-19 infections and not due to a decrease in the number of

70 cancer cases¹⁰⁾. Similarly, cancer center hospitals in Latin America reported a 60% decrease

71 in the number of surgeries, a 27.5% decrease in patients receiving intravenous chemotherapy,

72 and a 30.9% increase in new patients receiving oral chemotherapy compared to the pre-
73 COVID-19 period¹¹).

74 The COVID-19 pandemic caused patients with cancer to have increased anxiety
75 regarding what they can do to protect themselves and how their treatment would be
76 affected¹²). Depression—which reduces survival in patients with cancer¹³)—was reported to
77 be 8%–24% among this cohort of patients before the pandemic¹⁴) compared to 40.7% during
78 the pandemic¹⁵). Patients' psychological distress can create conflicts in their treatment
79 strategy selection¹⁶). Discussions between physicians and patients regarding receiving cancer
80 treatment during the COVID-19 pandemic were potentially psychologically distressing
81 because of the added life-threatening risk of infection, differing from discussions regarding
82 the usual treatment. However, it was unknown how patients with cancer would react and
83 what kind of treatment plan they would choose in the event of a pandemic. Furthermore, the
84 actual state of nursing care to support their decision-making was unclear.

85 Using an online survey, we investigated the actual decision-making support provided
86 by nurses to patients with cancer during the COVID-19 pandemic, which often required
87 considering changes in treatment plans. This study provides basic data on what type of
88 nursing care can support patient decision-making during any future pandemic. Pandemics
89 caused by infectious diseases are classified as a disaster nursing event. In the future, our
90 findings may guide nurses in providing decision support to patients with cancer during global

91 health crises.

92 **Materials and Methods**

93 **Study design, setting, and participants**

94 This was an online cross-sectional study was conducted throughout Japan as COVID-19
95 infections were identified nationwide. Participants were nurses working in the wards or
96 outpatient clinics of all cancer treatment base hospitals in Japan from May to July 2021, with
97 50% of their nursing care provided to patients with cancer. The cancer nursing engagement
98 ratio was used as a reference for the amount of work required in the application for Certified
99 Nurse Specialist in Cancer Nursing. In Japan, cancer care center hospitals were established in
100 each prefecture to provide high-quality cancer care. These hospitals provide cancer care even
101 in situations where infectious diseases are prevalent⁸). Nurses at these hospitals were included
102 in the study because they were expected to provide decision-making support for cancer
103 treatment during the COVID-19 pandemic.

104 A survey request form and a survey instruction sheet with a QR code that could be
105 used to download the survey form were sent to the heads of nursing managers at 49 Japanese
106 cancer care center hospitals. Nursing managers distributed the survey instruction sheet to
107 nurses who were willing to participate in the survey. Informed consent was provided in the
108 survey instructions and it was explained that those who responded to the online survey were
109 considered to have consented to the survey.

110 **Measures**

111 **Socio-demographic characteristics**

112 Socio-demographic variables, including nurse's age, year of cancer nursing experience for
113 nurse, emergency declaration area, situations in which decision-making support for treatment
114 strategies was provided, department and barriers to overall cancer nursing practice caused by
115 COVID-19.

116 **The decision support for COVID-19-related treatment strategies in cancer** 117 **patients Questionnaire**

118 The decision support for COVID-19-related treatment strategies in cancer patients
119 Questionnaire items were extracted from interviews with two certified nurse specialists in
120 cancer nursing affiliated with a base hospital for cancer care. The questionnaire covered
121 various aspects, including determined treatment strategy(3 items), the characteristics of the
122 patient who needed support for treatment decision as recognized by the nurse (5items) , the
123 nursing care provided to patients who needed decision-making support (13items) , the
124 patient's response to the nursing practice as recognized by the nurses (4 items). Participants
125 selected all that applied item.

126 **Statistical analysis**

127 The data were analyzed using the IBM® SPSS® Statistics 27.0 statistical software package.
128 The independent variables were factors related to patients' treatment decisions, namely,

129 “characteristics of patients needed support for treatment decisions as recognized by the
130 nurses” and “nursing care provided to patients who needed decision-making support.” The
131 dependent variable was “the patient’s response to the nursing practice as recognized by the
132 nurses.”

133 The relationship between the factors related to characteristics of patients needing
134 support for treatment decisions as perceived by nurses and response to the nursing practice as
135 recognized by the nurses and the patients’ treatment decisions was analyzed by a chi-square
136 test. A multivariable logistic regression analysis was performed using the chi-square test
137 results for each item, with items with a p value less than 10% as the independent variables
138 and “the patients’ response to nursing practice as perceived by nurses” as the dependent
139 variable.

140 **Ethical consideration**

141 This study was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee Tohoku University Graduate
142 School of Medicine (Approval No. 2021-1-215). Informed consent was considered to be
143 provided upon the completion of the online survey and to extend to the registration of the
144 results. Responses to the survey were handled anonymously.

145 **Results**

146 The survey was sent to 49 cancer treatment center hospitals in Japan, and a total of
147 182 (25.0%) were nurses engaged in decision making were enrolled in this study.

148 **Characteristics of the study participants**

149 Table 1 shows participant characteristics. The mean number of years of nurse's cancer
 150 nursing experience was 13.3 ($SD = 8.52$) years. Nurses provided support in the decision-
 151 making process for 61 (33.5%) outpatients and 133 (73.1%) inpatients. The most common
 152 department in which nurses worked was respiratory medicine (54; 29.7%), followed by
 153 gastroenterological surgery (41; 22.5%) and gastrointestinal medicine (40; 22.0%). The most
 154 common barrier to overall cancer nursing practice caused by COVID-19 was "lack of nursing
 155 care support for family caregivers due to restricted visitation during hospitalization" in the
 156 case of 147 (80.8%) patients. This was followed by "more unusual tasks such as infection
 157 prevention measures and zoning for COVID-19" in 135 (72.2%) and "lack of psychological
 158 support for patients" in 109 (59.9%) patients.

| <i>Participant Characteristics</i> | | <i>n</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---|--|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Age | | | | 39.7 | 10.04 |
| Nurse's cancer nursing experience (years) | | | | 13.3 | 8.52 |
| Emergency declaration area | | | | | |
| | Emergency | 12 | 6.6 | | |
| | Prevention of spread | 53 | 29.1 | | |
| | Not applicable | 117 | 64.3 | | |
| Situations in which decision-making support for treatment strategie | | | | | |
| | Outpatient | 61 | 33.5 | | |
| | Inpatient | 133 | 73.1 | | |
| Department (multiple responses) | | | | | |
| | Respiratory medicine | 54 | 29.7 | | |
| | Gastrointestinal surgery | 41 | 22.5 | | |
| | Gastrointestinal medicine | 40 | 22 | | |
| | Otorhinolaryngology | 34 | 18.7 | | |
| | Hematology | 34 | 18.7 | | |
| | Medical oncology | 29 | 15.9 | | |
| | Gynecology | 26 | 14.3 | | |
| | Respiratory surgery | 24 | 13.2 | | |
| | Urology | 20 | 11 | | |
| | Breast | 17 | 9.3 | | |
| | Radiology | 6 | 3.3 | | |
| | Pediatrics | 5 | 2.7 | | |
| | Other | 16 | 8.8 | | |
| Barriers to overall cancer nursing practice caused by COVID-19 | | | | | |
| | Lack of nursing care support for family caregivers due to restricted visitation during hospitalization | 147 | 80.8 | | |
| | More unusual tasks such as infection prevention measures and zoning for COVID-19 | 135 | 74.2 | | |
| | Lack of psychological support for patients | 109 | 59.9 | | |
| | Lack of nursing care support for family caregivers due to restrictions on accompanying patients during outpatient visits | 79 | 43.4 | | |
| | Limitation of nursing intervention time | 75 | 41.2 | | |
| | Lack of social support for patients | 74 | 40.7 | | |
| | Lack of spiritual support for patients | 56 | 30.8 | | |
| | Lack of symptom management support for patients | 43 | 23.6 | | |

160 **The decision support for COVID-19-related treatment strategies**
161 **in patients with cancer**

162 Table 2 shows the decision support for COVID-19-related treatment strategies in patients
163 with cancer. The determined treatment strategy was postponement of treatment (131; 72.0%),
164 followed by change of treatment (71; 39.0%) and discontinuation of treatment (41; 22.5%).
165 The most common characteristics of patients who needed support for treatment decision as
166 recognized by the nurses were “fear of disease progression” (93; 51.1%), followed by
167 “anxiety about the future” (89; 48.9%) and “resignation or compromise in accepting the
168 decision due to the pandemic” (82; 45.1%). Nursing care provided to patients who needed
169 decision-making support included 169 (92.9%) nurses who listened to the patient’s thoughts,
170 87 (47.8%) who listened to the patient’s intentions and thoughts again after treatment
171 decision, and 77 (42.3%) who coordinated opportunities for additional explanations from the
172 doctor. The response of the patients to nursing practice as recognized by the nurses included
173 128 (70.3%) patients who were satisfied and received the treatment they had chosen, and four
174 (2.2%) who continued the treatment because they were not convinced.

| | n | % |
|---|-----|------|
| Determined treatment strategy (multiple responses) | | |
| Postponement of treatment | 131 | 72.0 |
| Change of treatment | 71 | 39.0 |
| Discontinuation of treatment | 41 | 22.5 |
| Characteristics of patients needing support for treatment decisions as perceived by the nurse (multiple responses) | | |
| Fear of disease progression | 93 | 51.1 |
| Anxiety about the future | 89 | 48.9 |
| Resignation or compromise in accepting the decision due to the pandemic | 82 | 45.1 |
| Anger at not receiving the desired treatment | 54 | 29.7 |
| Anticipatory anxiety about the COVID-19-induced death of a famous person coinciding with their own death | 33 | 18.1 |
| Other | 12 | 6.6 |
| Nursing care provided to patients who needed decision-making support (multiple responses) | | |
| The nurse listened to the patient's thoughts | 169 | 92.9 |
| The nurse listened to the patient's intentions and thoughts again after the treatment decision | 87 | 47.8 |
| The nurse coordinated opportunities for additional explanations from the doctor | 77 | 42.3 |
| The nurse explained the physical and mental impact of the chosen treatment strategy to patients | 58 | 31.9 |
| The nurse provided information about infection prevention while living with COVID-19 | 52 | 28.6 |
| The nurse assured the patient that they could take immediate action with the doctor's permission if symptoms worsened | 35 | 19.2 |
| The nurse confirmed the reason for the selection and corrected the patient if their perception was incorrect | 32 | 17.6 |
| The nurse followed up with the patient's symptoms and changes in decision-making on treatment strategies via telephone | 27 | 14.8 |
| The nurse followed up via telephone with the patient's family caregivers | 20 | 11.0 |
| The nurse followed up via videoconference with the patient's family caregivers | 12 | 6.6 |
| The nurse followed up via videoconference concerning changes in the patient's symptoms and decision-making perceptions | 5 | 2.7 |
| The nurse provided encouragement | 5 | 2.7 |
| The nurse provided interventions to help patients gain the strength to overcome the crisis | 4 | 2.2 |
| Other | 2 | 1.1 |
| The patient's response to nursing practice as recognized by nurses (multiple responses) | | |
| The patient was satisfied and received the chosen treatment | 128 | 70.3 |
| The patient was not convinced, but gave up and accepted the treatment recommended by the doctor | 61 | 33.5 |
| The patient was not convinced, but gave up and decided to discontinue treatment | 12 | 6.6 |
| The patient was not convinced and continued with the previous treatment | 4 | 2.2 |
| Other | 4 | 2.2 |

175

176

Univariate analysis of decision support for COVID-19-related

177

treatment strategies in patients with cancer

178

Table 3 shows the relationship in univariate analysis between the factors related to

179

“the characteristics of patients needed support for treatment decisions as recognized by

180

nurses” and “the nursing care provided to patients who needed decision-making support” as

181

independent variables, and the relationship with “the patient’s attitude to the nursing practice

182

as perceived by nurses” as the dependent variable. The number of nurses who recognized that

183

a patient had “resignation or compromise in accepting the decision due to the pandemic”

184

increased significantly, indicating that patients were satisfied with their treatment ($p = 0.04$).

185

The number of nurses who “provided information about infection prevention while living

186 with COVID-19” increased significantly, indicating that patients were satisfied with their
187 treatment ($p = 0.03$). However, the number of nurses who “followed up via videoconference
188 with the patient’s family caregivers” decreased, indicating that patients were satisfied with
189 their treatment ($p = 0.05$).

190 The number of nurses who recognized that a patient had “fear of disease progression,”
191 “resignation or compromise in accepting the decision due to the pandemic,” “anger at not
192 receiving the desired treatment,” and “anticipatory anxiety about the COVID-19–induced
193 death of a famous person coinciding with their own death,” increased significantly, thus
194 indicating that patients was not convinced, but gave up and accepted the treatment
195 recommended by the doctor ($p < 0.10$ for each). The number of nurses who practiced
196 “listened to the patient’s thoughts” decreased significantly, leading to the perception that the
197 patient was not convinced, and thus they continued with the previous treatment ($p = 0.03$).
198 Conversely, the number of nurses who “listened to the patient’s intentions and thoughts again
199 after the treatment decision,” “assured the patient that they could take immediate action with
200 the doctor's permission if symptoms worsened,” “followed up with the patient’s symptoms
201 and changes in decision-making on treatment strategies via telephone,” and “followed up via
202 videoconference concerning changes in the patient’s symptoms and decision-making
203 perceptions,” increased significantly, indicating that the patient was not convinced, but gave
204 up and accepted the treatment recommended by the doctor ($p < 0.10$ for each).

Table 3
The Relationship Between Factors Related to the Patient's Treatment Decision and Response to Nursing Practice as Perceived by Nurses

N = 182

| Characteristics of patients needing support for treatment decisions as perceived by the nurse | The patient was satisfied and received the chosen treatment | | | | | | The patient's response to nursing practice as recognized by the nurses | | | | | | The patient was not convinced and continued with the previous treatment | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|------|----|------|------|--|------|-----|------|------|----|---|-----|------|------|---|-------|-----|------|------|
| | Yes | No | % | p | Yes | No | % | p | Yes | No | % | p | Yes | No | % | p | | | | | |
| Fear of disease progression | Yes | 67 | 52.3 | 26 | 48.1 | 0.63 | 40 | 65.6 | 53 | 43.8 | 0.01 | 7 | 58.3 | 86 | 50.6 | 0.77 | 3 | 75.0 | 90 | 50.6 | 0.62 |
| | No | 61 | 47.7 | 28 | 51.9 | | 21 | 34.4 | 68 | 56.2 | | 5 | 41.7 | 84 | 49.4 | | 1 | 25.0 | 88 | 49.4 | |
| Anxiety about the future | Yes | 67 | 52.3 | 22 | 40.7 | 0.19 | 28 | 45.9 | 61 | 50.4 | 0.64 | 5 | 41.7 | 84 | 49.4 | 0.77 | 1 | 25.0 | 88 | 49.4 | 0.62 |
| | No | 61 | 47.7 | 32 | 59.3 | | 33 | 54.1 | 60 | 49.6 | | 7 | 58.3 | 86 | 50.6 | | 3 | 75.0 | 90 | 50.6 | |
| Resignation or compromise in accepting the decision due to the pandemic | Yes | 51 | 39.8 | 31 | 57.4 | 0.04 | 39 | 63.9 | 43 | 35.5 | 0.00 | 7 | 58.3 | 75 | 44.1 | 0.38 | 2 | 50.0 | 80 | 44.9 | 1.00 |
| | No | 77 | 60.2 | 23 | 42.6 | | 22 | 36.1 | 78 | 64.5 | | 5 | 41.7 | 95 | 55.9 | | 0 | 0.0 | 98 | 55.1 | |
| Anger at not receiving the desired treatment | Yes | 34 | 26.6 | 20 | 37.0 | 0.16 | 27 | 44.3 | 27 | 22.3 | 0.00 | 4 | 33.3 | 50 | 29.4 | 0.75 | 0 | 0.0 | 54 | 30.3 | 0.32 |
| | No | 94 | 73.4 | 34 | 63.0 | | 34 | 55.7 | 94 | 77.7 | | 8 | 66.7 | 120 | 70.6 | | 4 | 100.0 | 124 | 69.7 | |
| Anticipatory anxiety about the COVID-19-induced death of a famous person coinciding with their own death | Yes | 23 | 18.0 | 10 | 18.5 | 1.00 | 16 | 26.2 | 17 | 14.0 | 0.07 | 1 | 8.3 | 32 | 18.8 | 0.70 | 0 | 0.0 | 33 | 18.5 | 1.00 |
| | No | 105 | 82.0 | 44 | 81.5 | | 45 | 73.8 | 104 | 86.0 | | 11 | 91.7 | 138 | 81.2 | | 4 | 100.0 | 145 | 81.5 | |
| Nursing care provided to patients who needed decision-making support | Yes | 120 | 93.8 | 49 | 90.7 | 0.53 | 57 | 93.4 | 112 | 92.6 | 1.00 | 11 | 91.7 | 158 | 92.9 | 0.60 | 2 | 50.0 | 161 | 93.8 | 0.03 |
| | No | 8 | 6.3 | 5 | 9.3 | | 4 | 6.6 | 9 | 7.4 | | 1 | 8.3 | 12 | 7.1 | | 2 | 50.0 | 11 | 6.2 | |
| The nurse listened to the patient's thoughts | Yes | 60 | 46.9 | 27 | 50.0 | 0.75 | 39 | 63.9 | 48 | 39.7 | 0.00 | 4 | 33.3 | 83 | 48.8 | 0.38 | 3 | 75.0 | 84 | 47.2 | 0.35 |
| | No | 68 | 53.1 | 27 | 50.0 | | 22 | 36.1 | 74 | 60.3 | | 8 | 66.7 | 87 | 51.2 | | 1 | 25.0 | 94 | 52.8 | |
| The nurse coordinated opportunities for additional explanations from the doctor | Yes | 55 | 43.0 | 22 | 40.7 | 0.87 | 27 | 44.3 | 50 | 41.3 | 0.75 | 3 | 25.0 | 74 | 43.5 | 0.24 | 2 | 50.0 | 75 | 42.1 | 1.00 |
| | No | 73 | 57.0 | 32 | 59.3 | | 34 | 55.7 | 71 | 58.7 | | 9 | 75.0 | 96 | 56.5 | | 2 | 50.0 | 103 | 57.9 | |
| The nurse explained the physical and mental impact of the chosen treatment strategy to patients | Yes | 42 | 32.8 | 16 | 29.6 | 0.73 | 22 | 36.1 | 36 | 29.8 | 0.40 | 3 | 25.0 | 53 | 31.2 | 0.53 | 2 | 50.0 | 56 | 31.5 | 0.59 |
| | No | 86 | 67.2 | 38 | 70.4 | | 39 | 63.9 | 85 | 70.2 | | 7 | 58.3 | 117 | 68.8 | | 2 | 50.0 | 122 | 68.5 | |
| The nurse assured the patient that they could take immediate action with the doctor's permission if symptoms worsened | Yes | 27 | 21.1 | 8 | 14.8 | 0.41 | 17 | 27.9 | 18 | 14.9 | 0.05 | 1 | 8.3 | 34 | 10.0 | 0.47 | 0 | 0.0 | 35 | 19.7 | 1.00 |
| | No | 101 | 78.9 | 47 | 85.2 | | 44 | 72.1 | 103 | 85.1 | | 11 | 91.7 | 136 | 80.0 | | 4 | 100.0 | 143 | 80.3 | |
| The nurse confirmed the reason for the selection and corrected the patient if their perception was incorrect | Yes | 26 | 20.3 | 6 | 11.1 | 0.20 | 12 | 19.7 | 20 | 16.5 | 0.68 | 3 | 25.0 | 29 | 17.1 | 0.45 | 0 | 0.0 | 32 | 18.0 | 1.00 |
| | No | 102 | 79.7 | 48 | 88.9 | | 49 | 80.3 | 101 | 83.5 | | 9 | 75.0 | 141 | 82.9 | | 4 | 100.0 | 146 | 82.0 | |
| The nurse followed up with the patient's symptoms and changes in decision-making on treatment strategies via telephone | Yes | 18 | 14.1 | 9 | 16.7 | 0.65 | 14 | 23.0 | 13 | 10.7 | 0.04 | 2 | 16.7 | 25 | 14.7 | 0.69 | 1 | 25.0 | 26 | 14.6 | 0.48 |
| | No | 110 | 85.9 | 46 | 83.3 | | 47 | 77.0 | 108 | 89.3 | | 10 | 83.3 | 145 | 85.3 | | 3 | 75.0 | 152 | 85.4 | |
| The nurse followed up via telephone with the patient's family caregivers | Yes | 14 | 10.9 | 6 | 11.1 | 1.00 | 10 | 16.4 | 10 | 8.3 | 0.13 | 1 | 8.3 | 19 | 11.2 | 1.00 | 1 | 25.0 | 19 | 10.7 | 0.38 |
| | No | 114 | 89.1 | 48 | 88.9 | | 51 | 83.6 | 111 | 91.7 | | 11 | 91.7 | 151 | 88.8 | | 3 | 75.0 | 159 | 89.3 | |
| The nurse followed up via videoconference with the patient's family caregivers | Yes | 5 | 3.9 | 7 | 13 | 0.05 | 6 | 9.8 | 6 | 5.0 | 0.22 | 2 | 16.7 | 10 | 5.9 | 0.18 | 1 | 25.0 | 11 | 6.2 | 0.24 |
| | No | 123 | 96.1 | 47 | 87 | | 55 | 90.2 | 115 | 95.0 | | 10 | 83.3 | 160 | 94.1 | | 3 | 75.0 | 167 | 93.8 | |
| The nurse followed up via videoconference concerning changes in the patient's symptoms and decision-making perceptions | Yes | 2 | 1.6 | 3 | 5.6 | 0.16 | 4 | 6.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.05 | 1 | 8.3 | 4 | 2.4 | 0.29 | 1 | 25.0 | 4 | 2.2 | 0.11 |
| | No | 126 | 98.4 | 51 | 94.4 | | 57 | 93.4 | 120 | 99.2 | | 11 | 91.7 | 167 | 97.6 | | 3 | 75.0 | 174 | 97.8 | |
| The nurse provided encouragement | Yes | 5 | 3.9 | 0 | 0 | 0.32 | 3 | 4.9 | 2 | 1.7 | 0.34 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 2.9 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 2.8 | 1.00 |
| | No | 123 | 96.1 | 54 | 100 | | 58 | 95.1 | 119 | 98.3 | | 12 | 100.0 | 165 | 97.1 | | 4 | 100.0 | 173 | 97.2 | |
| The nurse provided interventions to help patients gain the strength to overcome the crisis | Yes | 3 | 2.3 | 1 | 1.9 | 1.00 | 3 | 4.9 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.11 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 2.4 | 1.00 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 2.2 | 1.00 |
| | No | 125 | 97.7 | 53 | 98.1 | | 58 | 95.1 | 120 | 99.2 | | 12 | 100.0 | 166 | 97.6 | | 4 | 100.0 | 174 | 97.8 | |
| The nurse provided information about infection prevention while living with COVID-19 | Yes | 43 | 33.6 | 9 | 16.7 | 0.03 | 19 | 31.1 | 33 | 27.3 | 0.61 | 2 | 16.7 | 50 | 29.4 | 0.51 | 1 | 25.0 | 51 | 28.7 | 1.00 |
| | No | 85 | 66.4 | 45 | 83.3 | | 42 | 68.9 | 88 | 72.7 | | 10 | 83.3 | 120 | 70.6 | | 3 | 75.0 | 127 | 71.3 | |

206 **Multivariate analysis of LCS behaviors in high-risk individuals**

207 Table 4 shows results of the multivariate analysis of the factors influencing patients’
 208 treatment decisions as recognized by nurses. Factors that influenced the patients’ decision to
 209 receive treatment to their satisfaction were “resignation or compromise in accepting the
 210 decision due to the pandemic” with an odds ratio (OR) of 0.44 (95% CI [0.22, 0.87]), “the
 211 nurse followed up via videoconference concerning changes in the patient’s symptoms and
 212 decision-making perceptions” with an OR of 0.17 (95% CI [0.04, 0.66]) and “the nurse
 213 provided information about infection prevention while living with COVID-19” with an OR of
 214 3.82 (95% CI [1.54, 9.46]). These results indicate that videophone follow-up is not necessary
 215 and that the provision of infection prevention information by nurses and patient’s resignation
 216 or compromise in accepting the decision due to the pandemic influences patients’ decisions to
 217 receive satisfactory treatment.

Table 4
Results of the Multivariate Analysis of the Factors Influencing Patients’ Treatment Decisions as Recognized by Nurses

| | | B | SE | OR | 95% CI | p value |
|---|--|--------|-------|------|------------|---------|
| The patient was satisfied and received the treatment they had chosen | Resignation or compromise in accepting the decision due to the pandemic | -0.818 | 0.346 | 0.44 | 0.22-0.87 | 0.018 |
| | The nurse followed up via videoconference concerning changes in the patient’s symptoms and decision-making perceptions | -1.765 | 0.689 | 0.17 | 0.04-0.66 | 0.010 |
| | The nurse provided information about infection prevention while living with COVID-19 | 1.339 | 0.463 | 3.82 | 1.54-9.46 | 0.004 |
| The patient was not convinced, but gave up and accepted the treatment recommended by the doctor | Anticipatory anxiety about the COVID-19-induced death of a famous person coinciding with their own death | 0.481 | 0.470 | 1.62 | 0.64-4.06 | 0.306 |
| | Fear of disease progression | 0.919 | 0.374 | 2.51 | 1.21-5.22 | 0.014 |
| | Anger at not receiving the desired treatment | 0.908 | 0.385 | 2.48 | 1.17-5.27 | 0.018 |
| | Resignation or compromise in accepting the decision due to the pandemic | 1.147 | 0.370 | 3.15 | 1.53-6.50 | 0.002 |
| | The nurse listened to the patient’s intentions and thoughts again after the treatment decision | 0.614 | 0.370 | 1.85 | 0.89-3.81 | 0.097 |
| The patient was not convinced and continued with the previous treatment | The nurse followed up with the patient’s symptoms and changes in decision-making on treatment strategies via telephone | 0.082 | 0.548 | 1.09 | 0.37-3.18 | 0.881 |
| | The nurse followed up via videoconference concerning changes in the patient’s symptoms and decision-making perceptions | 1.755 | 1.306 | 5.78 | 0.45-74.75 | 0.179 |
| | The nurse assured the patient that they could take immediate action with the doctor’s permission if symptoms worsened | -0.012 | 0.476 | 0.99 | 0.39-2.51 | 0.979 |
| | The nurse listened to the patient’s thoughts | -2.72 | 1.047 | 0.07 | 0.01-0.51 | 0.009 |

218
 219 Factors influencing patients’ decision to give up and accept the doctor’s
 220 recommendation even though they were not convinced included “fear of disease progression”
 221 (OR 2.51, 95% CI [1.21, 5.22]), “anger at not receiving the desired treatment” (OR 2.48, 95%
 222 CI [1.17,5.27]), and “resignation or compromise in accepting the decision due to the

223 pandemic” (OR 3.15, 95% CI [1.53, 6.50]). These results indicate that patients were reluctant
224 to accept recommended treatments due to fear of disease progression, anger at not receiving
225 the treatment and their resignation or compromise in accepting the decision due to the
226 pandemic.

227 The factor that influenced patients’ continued treatment—even though they were not
228 convinced—including “the nurse listened to the patient’s thoughts” (OR 0.07, 95% CI [0.01,
229 0.51), indicating that nurses’ failure to listen to patients’ thoughts is a contributing factor to
230 patients continuing treatment even though they are not satisfied with it. “The patient was not
231 convinced but gave up and decided to discontinue treatment” had no analysis results as no
232 items fell below the 10% significance level.

233 **Discussion**

234 This study investigated the experiences of nurses to examine effective nursing support for
235 decision-making regarding treatment strategies for patients with cancer during the COVID-19
236 pandemic. During the study period, Japan was experiencing the fourth and fifth waves of the
237 COVID-19 outbreak. This period was characterized by the emergence of new variants, such
238 as the alpha and delta strains, which caused a critical medical situation¹⁷⁾, and both patients
239 and medical personnel being fearful of the unknown infectious disease. Moreover, vaccine
240 uptake for COVID-19 was only approximately 30% in Japan¹⁸⁾. During the COVID-19
241 pandemic, 72% of the patients in our study had to make decisions regarding postponement of

242 their treatment, 39% of the patients chose to change treatment, 22.5% chose to discontinue
243 treatment, 51.1% were worried about disease progression, and 48.9% were worried about an
244 uncertain future.

245 **The effective ways to support of treatment decision-making for** 246 **patients with cancer during COVID-19 pandemic**

247 The findings of this study suggest that the effective ways to provide care for
248 continuing cancer treatment included providing patients information on preventing COVID-
249 19 infection and patients' attitude of resignation or compromise in accepting the decision due
250 to the pandemic. Additionally, patients' acceptance of doctor-recommended treatment—even
251 if they were not satisfied with it—was influenced by patient attitudes such as anger, fear of
252 disease progression, and their resignation or compromise in accepting the decision due to the
253 pandemic.

254 First, during this pandemic, patient education on living with COVID-19 infection
255 prevention helped convince patients to accept the treatment. Patients with cancer undergoing
256 chemotherapy or surgical treatment are at an increased risk of contracting COVID-19³),
257 which in turn increases the risk of morbidity and mortality ¹⁹). During the decision-making
258 process, patients may change their treatment strategy based on the impact of the change in
259 treatment on the deterioration of their condition and the risk of contracting COVID-19 and
260 dying. One of the reasons for refusal of treatment due to COVID-19 was the risk of infection

261 ²⁰). Patients with cancer with a high fear of infection tend to delay treatment ²¹). Thorough
262 infection control measures in the hospital and lifestyle guidance for patients to prevent the
263 spread of infection are part of the basic care that patients need when trying to decide on a
264 treatment plan with which they are satisfied. Another factor influencing patient satisfaction
265 with decision-making was the lack of a need for follow-up by nurses via video calls.
266 Telemedicine was rapidly introduced during the pandemic, but one report found that video
267 calls were inefficient when used to explain uncertain prognoses or new treatments, and face-
268 to-face consultations were used instead in such situations ²²). Based on these findings, face-
269 to-face explanations are helpful for patient satisfaction when making decisions about very
270 serious, life-altering treatments—even during a pandemic. Conversely, it is not possible to
271 state with certainty that follow-up by video call is not necessary in cases where the illness is
272 not serious. In Japan, telemedicine was promoted as a contingency measure to prevent
273 infection during the rapid spread of COVID-19. Consequently, online and telephonic medical
274 treatment and medication guidance became available to patients who desired it ²³).
275 Telemedicine and telenursing have a lower threshold for contact compared to regular
276 telephone consultations and are useful for effective communication and decision-
277 making²⁴⁾²⁵⁾²⁶). Additionally, telehealth was an important component of cancer nursing care
278 during COVID-19²⁷), and “provide support via information and communication” was one of
279 the several types of support deemed necessary for discussing patients’ treatment choices

280 during the COVID-19 pandemic. Telehealth is also recommended by the European Society
281 for Medical Oncology²⁸). During a pandemic that requires physical distancing through contact
282 prevention, care using telenursing may support patients' safe home care. Considering these
283 findings and recommendations, to ensure patient satisfaction with the decision-making
284 process, nurses may be helpful in supporting patients when making a choice between face-to-
285 face or remote care, while reviewing their health status and preferences.

286 Second, communication skills are important for providing patient-centered care
287 during a pandemic²⁹). One reason why patients in our study continued treatment without
288 being satisfied with their choices was that nurses did not listen to them. This finding suggests
289 that communicative care through listening may reduce the stress caused by patients' inability
290 to agree on a treatment plan in social situations where changes are needed due to the spread
291 of an infectious disease. Listening is a form of care that attends to the patient's search for
292 meaning and answers during an illness²⁹). In the Nursing Model for Supporting Shared
293 Decision Making, it is also important to encourage patients to express their feelings and focus
294 on their problems to clarify their true needs and the direction of decision support³⁰). Holistic
295 nursing care that attends to the patient's suffering also forms the ethical foundation of
296 nursing. To aid patients in making decisions about treatment strategies during a pandemic, it
297 is important to support them in finding meaning in their decisions.

298 Third, acceptance of recommended treatment was influenced not by patients'
299 perceptions of their care, but by patients' feelings of fear of disease progression and anger at
300 not receiving the treatment they desired and their willingness to compromise with the
301 pandemic situation. This is consistent with the results report by Savard et al ³¹⁾. In their study,
302 patients felt stressed during the COVID-19 pandemic because they believed that changes in
303 cancer treatment schedules and treatments would negatively impact their cancer progression
304 and prognosis. Thus, nurses must support patient decision-making by providing sufficient
305 information to enable the patient to understand their current condition. This includes
306 explaining that the disease may progress if the patient delays seeing a doctor.

307 Finally, 43.4% of the nurses in our study responded that COVID-19 resulted in a lack
308 of family caregivers' support. In Japanese medical facilities, patient visits were restricted to
309 prevent the spread of COVID-19. This resulted in a decrease in family caregivers
310 accompanying patients to the hospital to maintain physical distance restrictions and increased
311 burden of care due to caregiver anxiety ³²⁾. Family caregiver distress is a dual complication
312 due to both the risk of infection to the patient and also the caregiver's own social isolation
313 ³³⁾³⁴⁾, and requires the introduction of active nursing support for family caregivers as well as
314 patients. Nursing support for caregivers can be recommended by explaining the use of
315 personal protective equipment, providing remote consultation for caregivers, and establishing
316 social networks on digital platforms³⁵⁾³⁶⁾.

317 **Limitations of the study**

318 This study has a limitation in that the survey was not conducted on patients; nurses'
319 recognition of the patients' treatment choices was based on nurses' own assumptions. We
320 propose future prospective observational studies of nurses and patients at the point when a
321 patient needs to change treatment.

322 **Conclusions**

323 Support of treatment decision-making for patients with cancer during the COVID-19
324 pandemic included lifestyle advice to prevent infection spread and helping patients
325 understand their choices through listening. By improving the fundamentals of patient-
326 centered care and the ability to respond to infections, these measures may convince patients
327 to accept treatment options recommended by their doctor in future global health crises.

328

329 **Acknowledgments**

330 The author would like to thank all the participants in this study.

331

332 **References**

333 1)World Health Organization. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media
334 briefing on COVID-19. 2020 March 11 [Cited 16 May 2024] Available
335 from:<https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s->

336 [opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020](#)

337 2) World Health Organization. Weekly epidemiological update on COVID-19-1 September

338 2023. 2023 September 1 [Cited 16 May 2024] Available from:

339 <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---1->

340 [september-2023](#)

341 3) Liang W, Guan W, Chen R, Wang W, Li J, Xu K, Li C, Qing A, Weixiang L, Liang H, Li

342 S, He J. Cancer patients in SARS-CoV-2 infection: A nation-wide analysis in China.

343 The Lancet Oncol. 2020; 21(3). 335–337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470->

344 [2045\(20\)30096-6](#)

345 4) Wu Z, McGoogan JM. (2020). Characteristics of and important lessons from the

346 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: Summary of a report of

347 72,314 cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention.

348 JAMA.2020; 323(13): 1239–1242. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.2648>

349 5) Japanese Society for Clinical Oncology, Japanese Cancer Association, & Japanese Society

350 of Cancer Nursing. Cancer care and novel coronavirus infection: Q&A for healthcare

351 professionals. Revised 3rd edition. 2021 February 2 [Cited 15 May 2024] Available

352 from: https://www.jsco.or.jp/covid19_med_qa/

353 6) [World Health Organization. What are relevant, feasible and effective approaches to](#)

354 [promote acceptance, uptake and adherence to physical distancing measures for](#)

- 355 COVID-19 prevention and control? 2021 March 2 [Cited 16 May 2024] Available
- 356 from: <https://www.who.int/europe/publications/i/item/9789289054911>
- 357
- 358 7) Japanese Society of Cancer Nursing. Internet. Disaster Preparedness Committee. 2020
- 359 June 3 [Cited 15 May 2024] Available from: [https://jscn.or.jp/covid-19/doc/covid-](https://jscn.or.jp/covid-19/doc/covid-19_questionnaire_report.pdf)
- 360 [19_questionnaire_report.pdf](https://jscn.or.jp/covid-19/doc/covid-19_questionnaire_report.pdf)
- 361 8) Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. (2022). Development of base hospitals for cancer
- 362 treatment. 2022 August 1 [Cited 15 May 2024] Available from:
- 363 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/000972176.pdf>
- 364 9) Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Promoting the recommendation of medical
- 365 examinations for early detection of cancer: The number of newly diagnosed cancer
- 366 cases will decrease in 2020. 2021 November 26 [Cited 15 May 2024] Available
- 367 from: https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seiei_daijinhosyo_00003.html
- 368 10) Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Impact of new coronavirus infections on cancer
- 369 screening and cancer treatment. 2022 September 5 [Cited 15 May 2024] Available
- 370 from: <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10901000/000985034.pdf>
- 371 11) Araujo SEA, Leal A, Centrone AFY, Teich VD, Malheiro DT, Cypriano AS, Neto MC,
- 372 Klajner S. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on care of oncological patients: Experience
- 373 of a cancer center in a Latin American pandemic epicenter. Einstein (São Paulo).

- 374 2020; 19: Article eAO6282. https://doi.org/10.31744/einstein_journal/2021AO6282
- 375 12) Constantinou C, Kolokotroni O, Mosquera MC, Heraclides A, Demetriou C, Karayiannis
376 P, Quattrocchi A, Charalambous A. Developing a holistic contingency plan:
377 Challenges and dilemmas for cancer patients during the COVID-19. *Cancer Med*,
378 2020;9(17): 6082–6092. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.3271>
- 379 13) Chen J, Li W, Cui L, Qian Y, Zhu Y, Gu H, Chen G, Shen Y, Liu Y. Chemotherapeutic
380 response and prognosis among lung cancer patients with and without depression. *J*
381 *Cancer*. 2015; 6(11): 1121–1129. <https://doi.org/10.7150/jca.11239>
- 382 14) Krebber AMH, Buffart LM, Kleijn G, Riepma IC, de Bree R, Leemans CR, Becker A,
383 Brug J, van Straten A, Cuijpers P, Verdonck-de Leeuw IM. Prevalence of depression
384 in cancer patients: A meta-analysis of diagnostic interviews and self-report
385 instruments. *PsychoOncology*. 2014;23(2): 121–130.
386 <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.3409>
- 387 15) Zheng X, Tao G, Huang P, He F, Shao X, Xu Y, Zhong L, Yang G. Self-reported
388 depression of cancer patients under 2019 novel coronavirus pandemic. *The Lancet*
389 *Oncology*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3555252>
- 390 16) Köther AK, Alpers GW, Büdenbender B, Lenhart M, Michel MS, Kriegmair MC.
391 Predicting decisional conflict: Anxiety and depression in shared decision making.
392 *Patient Educ Couns*. 2021; 104(5): 1229–1236.

393 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2020.10.037>

394 17) Saito T. Recent trends in new coronavirus infections and the expected role of public

395 health nurses. 2021 October 15 [Cited 15 May 2024] Available from:

396 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/11907000/000843134.pdf>

397 18) Global Change Data Lab. Share of people who completed the initial COVID-19

398 vaccination protocol: Total number of people who received all doses prescribed by the

399 initial vaccination protocol, divided by the total population of the country. 2022

400 [Cited 2022 November 24] Available from:

401 <https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/share-people-fully-vaccinated-covid>

402 19) World Health Organization. Report of the WHO–China joint mission on coronavirus

403 disease 2019 (COVID-19). 2020 February 28 [Cited 16 May 2024] Available

404 from: [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/report-of-the-who-china-joint-mission-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/report-of-the-who-china-joint-mission-on-coronavirus-disease-2019-(covid-19))

405 [on-coronavirus-disease-2019-\(covid-19\)](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/report-of-the-who-china-joint-mission-on-coronavirus-disease-2019-(covid-19))

406 20) Vanni G, Materazzo M, Pellicciaro M, Ingallinella S, Rho M, Santori F, Cotesta M, Caspi

407 J, Makarova A, Pistolese CA, Buonomo OC. Breast cancer and COVID-19: The

408 effect of fear on patients' decision-making process. *In Vivo*.2020; 34(3 Suppl): 1651–

409 1659. <https://doi.org/10.21873/invivo.11957>

410 21) Caston NE, Lawhon VM, Smith KL, Gallagher K, Angove R, Anderson E, Balch A,

411 Azuero A, Huang CHS, Rocque GB. Examining the association among fear of

- 412 COVID-19, psychological distress, and delays in cancer care. *Cancer Med.* 2021;
413 10(24): 8854–8865. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.4391>
- 414 22) Perumalswami CR, Chen E, Martin C, Goold SD, De Vries R, Griggs JJ, Jagsi R. I'm
415 being forced to make decisions I have never had to make before”: Oncologists'
416 experiences of caring for seriously ill persons with poor prognoses and the dilemmas
417 created by COVID-19. *JCO Oncol Pract.* 2022; 18(1): e89–e97.
418 <https://doi.org/10.1200/OP.21.00119>
- 419 23) Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. (2020a). Temporary and exceptional treatment
420 of medical treatment using telephones and information and communication devices
421 during the spread of new coronavirus infections. 2020 April 10 [Cited 16 May
422 2024] Available from: <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/000620995.pdf>
- 423 24) Kord Z, Fereidouni Z, Mirzaee MS, Alizadeh Z, Behnammoghadam M, Rezaei M, Abdi
424 N, Delfani F, Zaj P. Telenursing home care and COVID-19: A qualitative study. *BMJ*
425 *Support Palliat Care.* 2021: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjspcare-2021-003001>
- 426 25) Paul LR, Salmon C, Sinnarajah A, Spice R. Web-based videoconferencing for rural
427 palliative care consultation with elderly patients at home. *Support Care Cancer.* 2019;
428 27: 3321–3330. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-018-4580-8>
- 429 26) Yoshida S, Sato T, Tagami K, Shimoyama M, Takahashi S. Evaluating the pilot usability
430 for telenursing-based cancer pain monitoring system. *Palliative Care Research.*

- 431 2021;16(1): 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.2512/jspm.16.99>
- 432 27) Duncan R, Szabo B, Jackson QL, Crain M, Lett C, Masters C, Spinks R, Uhrig LK,
433 Gullatte MM. Care and coping during COVID-19: Practice changes and innovations
434 in the oncology setting. *Clin J Oncol Nurs*. 2021;25(1): 48–55.
435 <https://doi.org/10.1188/21.CJON.48-55>
- 436 28) Curigliano G, Banerjee S, Cervantes A, Garassino MC, Garrido P, Girard N, Hannen J,
437 Jordan K, Lordick F, Machiels JP, Michielin O, Peters S, Tabernero J, Douillard J,
438 Pentheroudakis G, all Panel Members. Managing cancer patients during the COVID-
439 19 pandemic: An ESMO multidisciplinary expert consensus. *Ann Oncol*. 2020;
440 31(10): 1320–1335. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2020.07.010>
- 441 29) Rosa WE, Dahlin C, Battista V, Finlayson CS, Wisniewski RE, Greer K, Ferrell BR.
442 Primary palliative care clinical implications: Oncology nursing during the COVID-19
443 pandemic. *Clin J Oncol Nurs*. 2021;25(2): 119–125.
444 <https://doi.org/10.1188/21.CJON.119-125>
- 445 30) Kawasaki Y. Consultation techniques using shared decision making for patients with
446 cancer and their families. *Clin J Oncol Nurs*. 2014;18(6): 701–706.
447 <https://doi.org/10.1188/14.CJON.701-706>
- 448 31) Savard D, Jobin-Théberge A, Massicotte V, Banville C. How did women with breast
449 cancer experience the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic? A qualitative study.

- 450 Support Care Cancer. 2021;29: 5721–5727. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-021-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-021-06089-w)
- 451 [06089-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-021-06089-w)
- 452 32) Akkuş Y, Karacan Y, Ünlü K, Deniz M, Parlak, A. (2022). The effect of anxiety and
- 453 spiritual well-being on the care burden of caregivers of cancer patients during the
- 454 COVID-19 pandemic. Support Care Cancer. 2022; 30(2): 1863–1872.
- 455 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-021-06611-0>
- 456 33) Dang S, Penney LS, Trivedi R, Noel PH, Pugh MJ, Finley E, Pugh JA, Van Houtven,
- 457 CH, Leykum L. Caring for caregivers during COVID-19. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2020;
- 458 68(10): 2197–2201. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.16726>
- 459 34) Sannes TS, Yeh IM, Gray TF. Caring for loved ones with cancer during the COVID-19
- 460 pandemic: A double hit risk for social isolation and need for action.
- 461 PsychoOncology.2020; 29(9): 1418–1420. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.5466>
- 462 35) Kent EE, Ornstein KA, Dionne-Odom JN. The family caregiving crisis meets an actual
- 463 pandemic. J Pain Symptom Manag. 2020; 60(1): Article e66–e69.
- 464 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2020.04.006>
- 465 36) Mishra S, Biswas S, More S, Gupta R, Bharti SJ, Nandi R. Caring the cancer caregivers
- 466 in the era of COVID-19 outbreak. Asian Pac J Cancer Care. 2020;5(S1): 203–208.
- 467 <https://doi.org/10.31557/apjcc.2020.5.S1.203-208>
- 468