

1 **Factors associated with breast lesions among women attending select**
2 **teaching and referral health facilities in Kenya: a cross-sectional study.**

3
4 Josephine Nyabeta Rioki^{1*}, Marshal Mweu², Emily Rogena³, Elijah M. Songok⁴, Joseph
5 Mwangi⁴, Lucy Muchiri¹

6 ¹Department of Human Pathology, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Nairobi

7 ²Department of Public and Global Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of
8 Nairobi

9 ³Department of Human Pathology, School of Medicine, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture
10 and Technology

11 ⁴Kenya Medical Research Institute (KEMRI)

12

13

14 *Corresponding author

15

16 Email: jrioki@uonbi.ac.ke (JNR)

17

18 Abstract

19 **Background:** Despite extensive research on the risk factors for breast cancer, little is known
20 about the factors contributing to other breast lesions, of which some may indicate an increased
21 risk for this disease. The objective of this study was to identify the risk factors for breast lesions
22 among women with breast lumps seeking care at select teaching and referral hospitals in Kenya
23 between December 2016 to December 2019.

24 **Methods:** An analytical cross-sectional study design was used to investigate the risk factors for
25 breast lesions among 651 women with breast lumps. Data was collected using a semi-structured
26 questionnaire. A multivariable logistic regression model was used to evaluate the impact of the
27 predictors on the breast lesions. Ethical approval was granted by Kenyatta National Hospital
28 (KNH) and the University of Nairobi Ethics and Research Committee (UoN-ERC) under study
29 number P334/04/2016.

30 **Results:** The median age of participants was 30 years (range 16-87), with the majority having
31 secondary education and belonging to the Kikuyu ethnic group. Parity, exercise, and
32 contraceptive use were significant predictors of breast lesions identified. Nulliparous women had
33 significantly lower odds of developing malignant (aOR: 0.11; 95% CI: 0.05-0.26), and suspicious
34 (aOR: 0.23; 95% CI: 0.07-0.71) lesions. Regular exercise was associated with lower odds of both
35 malignant and suspicious lesions. Conversely, contraceptive use increased the odds of developing
36 atypical (aOR 0.92; 95% CI: 0.28-2.98) lesions, suspicious (aOR 0.33; 95% CI: 0.14-0.78), and
37 malignant lesions (aOR of 0.31; 95% CI: 0.18- 0.55).

38 **Conclusion:** Exercise, parity, and hormonal contraception were independently found to be
39 significant predictors of breast lesions. These findings underscore the necessity for personalized
40 risk reduction strategies and emphasize the importance of understanding the risk factors for both
41 benign and malignant breast disease to inform public health policies.

42 **Keywords:** Breast cancer, factors, women, breast lesions

43 **Background**

44 The most frequently diagnosed breast disease among women worldwide is breast cancer (BC),
45 also referred to as a malignant breast lesion. About 80% of patients with the disease are
46 individuals aged >50 [1]. It is recorded that BC incidence rates are higher but with low mortality
47 rates in transitioned versus transitioning countries [2]. The incidence is noted to be higher
48 among white women unlike black women, who have higher mortality [3]. In Kenya, the rise in
49 BC incidence has been reported with a prediction that by 2025, it will surge by a devastating 35%
50 [4].

51 About half of breast cancers can be explained by known risk factors (such as age and female
52 gender) while the other half may not be known [5]. However, even with known risk factors, it
53 is not certain that females with other risk factors will get BC. Based on calculated incidence rates,
54 about 12.9% of women will develop BC in their lifetime. Risk factors for BC are classified into
55 modifiable and non-modifiable factors. Modifiable risk factors include education level, parity,
56 breastfeeding, passive smoking, and obesity. Non-modifiable risk factors include age, age at
57 menarche, menopause, family history of any type of cancer, and family history of BC [6-8].

58 Global studies have examined the impact of reproductive factors on BC risk, including age at
59 menarche, age at first childbirth, age at menopause, parity, breastfeeding, number of pregnancies,
60 and the occurrence of abortion [9, 10]. Existing literature indicates that changes in reproductive
61 patterns, such as lower parity, delayed pregnancies, and shorter breastfeeding duration,
62 contribute to an increased susceptibility to BC in women [11]. Another previous research has
63 also suggested that prolonged exposure to endogenous oestrogen due to early menarche, delayed
64 first childbirth, late menopause, or exogenous exposure through hormone replacement therapy
65 or oral contraceptive use, are associated with a higher risk of BC [10]. Physical exercise has been

66 shown to affect the fourteen hallmarks of breast cancer, thereby preventing the development of
67 the disease [12].

68 Though extensive research has been done focusing on the factors associated with BC, little is
69 documented on the factors associated with other breast lesions such as benign, atypical, and
70 suspicious lesions. Some of these lesions are associated with the risk of developing the disease.
71 Notably, among women diagnosed with invasive breast cancer, 30% had benign breast disease
72 previously [13]. Among all atypical breast lesions, atypical ductal hyperplasia (ADH) has the
73 highest likelihood of progressing to malignancy [14].

74 Since there are differences in population structure, cultural factors, and the adoption of
75 Western lifestyles across different regions, this study aimed to identify the factors associated
76 with BC and other breast lesions among women in Kenya. Understanding these context-specific
77 factors is crucial to inform the development of personalized risk reduction strategies and public
78 health Policies. We report the association between parity, hormonal contraception, and physical
79 exercise with breast lesions from a hospital-based cross-sectional study of 651 women in Kenya.

80 **Material and methods**

81 **Ethical considerations**

82 Approval to conduct this study was granted by the Kenyatta National Hospital and the
83 University of Nairobi Ethics and Research Committee (study no. P334/04/2016) as well as the
84 institutional review boards of the select facilities. All participants provided written informed
85 consent. The study was conducted following the Helsinki Declaration.

86 **Study design**

87 This was a cross-sectional study aimed at investigating the factors associated with breast lesions
88 (benign, atypical, suspicious, and malignant breast lesions) among women attending select
89 teaching and referral health facilities in Kenya between December 2016 to December 2019. The

90 study was reported as per the STROBE guidelines for reporting observational studies [15]. This
91 work is part of a larger study, [reference number P334/04/2016] whose main objective was to
92 characterize breast cancer phenotypes and genotypes among women diagnosed with breast
93 cancer at selected teaching and referral health facilities in Kenya.

94 **Study sites**

95 This study was conducted in two major health facilities in Kenya. The sites were selected due to
96 their status as major referral centres with well-established and busy fine needle aspiration (FNA)
97 clinics that attend to a significant number of women with breast lumps.

98 Kenyatta National Hospital [KNH] is a Level 6 teaching and national tertiary referral health
99 facility situated in the capital city. It is also a teaching hospital for the University of Nairobi
100 Faculty of Health Sciences. The hospital has FNA clinic that runs once a week and receives about
101 10-15 women with breast lumps a week.

102 Nakuru County Referral Hospital [NCRH] is a large county referral hospital located in Nakuru
103 town west of Nairobi. The hospital has FNA clinic that runs once a week. It receives about 10
104 women with breast lumps per week.

105 **Study population, eligibility, and selection of participants**

106 The study population consisted of all women with palpable breast lumps presenting to the FNA
107 clinics at NCRH and KNH for care. To be eligible for participation in the study, a woman had to
108 meet the criteria which included the presence of a palpable breast lump and the provision of
109 written informed consent for participation. Women with breast lumps due to trauma were
110 excluded from the study.

111

112

113 **Outcome definitions**

114 A breast lesion was defined as a mass that could either be classified as benign, atypical, suspicious
115 of malignancy, or malignant (cancerous). The classification was based on the International
116 Academy of Cytology Yokohama System (IAC YS) as follows:

117 A benign lesion is a diagnosis made in cases with unequivocally benign cytological features,
118 which may or may not be diagnostic of a specific benign lesion. The criteria include a pattern of
119 predominantly large, cohesive monolayered sheets of uniform ductal epithelial cells or cohesive
120 3-dimensional epithelial tissue fragments showing streaming of epithelial cells around irregular
121 slit-like holes (secondary lumina’); there may be a mix of smaller tissue fragments and sheets, but
122 dispersal is usually not prominent [16].

123 Atypical lesion is defined as the presence of cytological features seen predominantly in
124 benign processes or lesions, but with the addition of some features that are uncommon in benign
125 lesions, and which may be seen in malignant lesions. The criteria include, high cellularity,
126 dispersal of intact single cells, varying degrees of nuclear enlargement and pleomorphism and
127 the presence of nucleoli, -features seen in both fibroadenoma and carcinomas [16].

128 Suspicious of malignancy is defined as the presence of some cytomorphological features which
129 are usually found in malignant lesions, but with insufficient malignant features, either in number
130 or quality, to make a definitive diagnosis of malignancy. The criteria include, high cellularity,
131 overlapping of the cytological criteria for benign and malignant tumors, large epithelial tissue
132 fragments, with some showing a cribriform or micropapillary architecture, in association with
133 smaller tissue fragments and plentiful dispersed cells showing low- to intermediate-grade nuclear
134 atypia [16].

135 A malignant cytopathological diagnosis is an unequivocal statement that the material is
136 malignant. The criteria include the following: for high grade carcinomas, there is predominantly
137 discohesive smaller tissue fragments with some dispersed single cells, moderate to high N:C ratio,
138 marked irregular chromatin and prominent nucleoli. For low grade carcinoma, high cellularity,
139 predominance of large irregular 3D epithelial tissue fragments with some smaller fragments and
140 dispersed single cells [17]. These are features of breast cancer.

141 **Data collection and study variables**

142 Three research assistants were recruited and trained to assist with data collection. Quantitative
143 data were collected using structured questionnaires. Information gathered included:
144 demographics (Age, ethnicity, education level, employment status), family history of breast
145 cancer, reproductive factors (menstrual cycle, menstrual status, parity), hormonal contraceptive
146 use, and lifestyle factors (history of smoking, alcohol history, and exercise). The predictors
147 assessed in this study are summarised in Table 1.

148

149 **Table 1: Predictor variables and their measurements**

Variables	Measurements
Age (continuous)	Captured in years
Level of education (ordinal)	Assessed in four levels: None, primary, secondary, and tertiary
Ethnicity (nominal)	Major tribes in Kenya captured as specific tribes (Kikuyu, Luo, Luhya, Kalenjin, Kamba) and minor tribes captured as others
Employment status (nominal)	Captured as employed or unemployed
Menstrual cycle (nominal)	Captured as regular or irregular
Menstrual status (nominal)	Captured as premenopausal or post-menopausal
Parity (nominal)	Captured as nulliparous or parous
Contraception use (nominal)	Captured as those who had ever used either implant, oral and injection forms at any given time, or implant and oral only, injection only, oral only, implant only and never used any method
Family history of BC (nominal)	Captured as yes for those with family history or no for those without family history
Smoking history (nominal)	Captured as yes for those who have ever smoked or no for those who have never smoked.
Alcohol history (nominal)	Captured as yes for those who have ever taken alcohol and no for those who have never taken alcohol
Exercises (nominal)	Captured as yes for those who perform regular exercises and no for those that do not

150

151 **Data processing and statistical analysis**

152 Responses for qualitative variables from the questionnaires were coded before data entry. The
153 data were entered in an MS Excel spreadsheet and exported to Stata v13 software for cleaning
154 and analysis. Continuous variables were summarized using the median and range. For categorical
155 variables, proportions were computed. To assess the association between the study predictors
156 and the breast lesion outcome, a univariable multinomial logistic regression model was used.
157 Predictors with $p \leq 0.2$ in the univariable analysis were included in the multivariable analysis. Due
158 to small number of observations in some categories of contraceptive use, this variable was
159 recategorized into a binary variable: use versus no use.

160 For the multivariable analysis, significant variables from the univariable analysis were
161 offered to a multinomial logistic regression model and their significance was evaluated at a strict

162 $p \leq 0.05$. To minimize confounding, non-significant variables were only excluded from the model
163 when the coefficients of the remaining variables did not change by more than 30%. The validity
164 of the final parsimonious model was assessed by testing the assumption of independence
165 irrelevant alternatives using the Hausman-McFadden test. The null hypothesis for the test is
166 that the model is valid at $p > 0.05$.

167 **Results**

168 **Descriptive statistics**

169 A total of 651 women with breast lumps were eligible for inclusion in the study. The median age
170 for the participants was 30 years (Range: 16-97 years). Most women had attained secondary
171 education (45.9%, $n=299$) while 0.6% ($n=4$) had no formal education. Kikuyus were the majority
172 (54.5%, $n=355$) with breast lumps followed by other tribes (19.4%, $n=126$). Most participants
173 had formal employment (54.5%, $n=355$). The majority (83.3%, $n=542$) of the participants were
174 premenopausal. Those with regular menstrual cycle were 87% ($n=569$) and 52.8% ($n=344$) were
175 parous while 47.2% ($n=307$) were nulliparous. Among women using hormonal contraception
176 methods, 29.3% ($n=190$) had used oral pills only while 0.9% ($n=6$) had used three methods (oral,
177 injection and implant) in their lifetime. Among the study participants, 10.5% ($n=68$) were
178 diagnosed with malignant lesions (breast cancer), 4.2% ($n=27$) with lesions suspicious of
179 malignancy, 1.8% ($n=12$) atypical cytologic findings, and 83.6% ($n=544$) benign lesions. The
180 descriptive statistics for the predictors of breast lesions are displayed in Table 2.

181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190

191
192
193 **Table 2: Descriptive statistics of predictors of breast lesions among women with breast**
194 **lumps attending two select teaching and referral health facilities in Kenya (n=651)**
195

Variable	Responses	Frequency n (%)
Age (years)	16-97	-
Level of education	None	4(0.6)
	Primary	167(25.7)
	Secondary	299(45.9)
	Tertiary	181(27.8)
Ethnicity	Kamba	48(7.4)
	Kalenjin	26(4)
	Luhya	32(4.9)
	Luo	64(9.8)
	Kikuyu	355(54.5)
	Others	126(19.4)
Employment status	Yes	355(54.5)
	No	296(45.5)
Menstrual cycle	Regular	569(87)
	Irregular	82(12)
Menstrual status	Pre-menopause	542(83.3)
	Menopause	109(16.7)
Parity	Parous	344 (52.8)
	Nulliparous	307(47.2)
Contraception use	Injection+Implant only	4(0.6)
	Oral+Injection+Implant	6(0.9)
	Oral+Implant only	13(2)
	Oral+Injection only	19(2.9)
	Implant only	26(4)
	Injection only	65(10)
	Oral only	190(29.3)
	None	326(50.2)
Family history of BC	Yes	32(4.9)
	No	618 (95.1)
Smoking history	Yes	12(1.8)
	No	639(98.2)
Alcohol history	Yes	40 (6.1)
	No	611(93.9)
Exercise	Yes	326(50.1)
	No	325(49.9)

196 Key: n; number of respondents, %; percentage

197

198

199 **Logistic regression analyses**

200 **Univariable analysis**

201 Based on the results from univariable analysis, age, ethnicity, level of education, employment
202 status, menstruation status, parity, contraceptive use, family history of BC, and exercise were
203 significantly associated with breast lesions at $p \leq 0.20$ (Table 6. 3). These variables were offered
204 to a multivariate multinomial model to minimize confounding.

205 **Table 3: Univariable analysis of the risk factors for breast lesions among women with**
 206 **breast lumps attending two select referral health facilities in Kenya, using a multinomial**
 207 **logistic regression model**
 208

Factors	Atypical lesions	Suspicious lesions	Malignant lesions	<i>P</i> -value
	cOR (95% C.I)	cOR (95% C.I)	cOR (95% C.I)	
Age in years*	1.02(0.98, 1.06)	1.04(1.01, 1.06)	1.06(1.04, 1.07)	<i><0.001</i>
Ethnicity*				<i>0.149</i>
Kamba	1.62(0.14, 18.51)	0.46(0.06, 3.92)	3.50(1.49, 8.21)	
Kalenjin	2.36(0.21, 27.22)	0.68(0.08, 5.77)	0.73(0.15, 3.45)	
Luhya	2.00(0.17, 22.91)	0.57(0.07, 4.85)	1.23(0.37, 4.09)	
Luo	1.79(0.25, 13.07)	5.39x10 ⁻⁶ (-, -)	0.55(0.17, 1.77)	
Kikuyu	0.86(0.16, 4.50)	0.84(0.34, 2.07)	0.82(0.41, 1.63)	
Others (Ref)	1	1	1	
Level of education*				<i>0.008</i>
None	0.00(0,-)	0.00(0,-)	6.22(0.59,65.92)	
Primary	6.72(0.78, 58.17)	6.27(1.76, 22.29)	3.43(1.54, 7.68)	
Secondary	4.06(0.48, 34.03)	2.26(0.61,8.33)	2.63(1.23, 5.62)	
Tertiary (Ref)	1	1	1	
Employment status*				<i><0.001</i>
Employed	0.97(0.31, 3.05)	2.31(0.99, 5.36)	3.75(2.03, 6.90)	
Unemployed (Ref)	1	1	1	
Menstrual cycle				<i>0.335</i>
Irregular	0.64(0.08, 5.01)	0.27(0.04, 2.02)	1.5(0.77, 2.94)	
Regular	1	1	1	
Menstrual status*				<i><0.001</i>
Menopause	2.19(0.58, 8.26)	2.29(0.94, 5.62)	4.32(2.50, 7.45)	
Pre-menopause (Ref)	1	1	1	
Parity*				<i><0.001</i>
Nulliparous	0.43(0.13, 1.45)	0.15(0.05, 0.44)	0.10(0.04, 0.22)	
Parous (Ref)	1	1	1	
Contraception use*	6.34(1.38, 29.20)	10.14(3.02, 34.08)	3.52(2.00, 6.19)	<i><0.001</i>
Family history of BC*				<i>0.069</i>
Yes	4.52(0.94, 21.84)	2.35x10 ⁻⁶ (-, -)	2.60(1.07, 6.30)	
No (Ref)	1	1	1	
Smoking history				<i>0.532</i>
Yes	3.67x10 ⁻⁶ (-, -)	3.67x10 ⁻⁶ (-, -)	2.74(0.72, 10.37)	
No (Ref)	1	1	1	
Alcohol history				<i>0.953</i>
Yes	1.18x10 ⁻⁶ (-, -)	0.56(0.07, 4.24)	0.91(0.31, 2.64)	
No (Ref)	1	1	1	
Exercises*				<i><0.001</i>
Yes	0.86(0.27, 2.71)	0.36(0.16, 0.84)	0.36(0.21, 0.62)	
No (Ref)	1	1	1	

209 Key: Reference category for outcome is Benign, * Variables eligible for inclusion in the
 210 multivariable model ($p \leq 0.05$), cOR; crude odds ratio, CI; confidence interval.
 211 <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/2OXWTA>

212 **Multivariable multinomial analysis**

213 Based on results from the multivariable analysis, parity, contraceptive use, and exercise were
214 found to be significant predictors of breast lesions at less than 5% significance level. Table 4
215 illustrates the odds ratios and confidence intervals for the breast lesion predictors across the
216 three categories of breast lesion outcomes (atypical, suspicious, and malignant lesions).
217 The odds of atypical, suspicious, and malignant diagnoses in nulliparous women are about one-
218 tenth, close to a quarter, and four-fifths respectively [aOR: 0.11; 95% CI: 0.05-0.26; p=0.001,
219 aOR: 0.23; 95% CI: 0.07-0.71, p=0.001; aOR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.21-2.9, p=0.001] controlling for
220 exercise and contraceptive use.

221 The odds of a diagnosis of atypical lesions is slightly less than a third (aOR: 0.31; 95% CI:
222 0.18-0.55, p=0.001), for suspicious lesions is a third (aOR: 0.33; 95% CI: 0.14-0.78, p=0.001) and
223 for malignant lesions is more than three quarters (aOR: 0.92; 95% CI: 0.28-2.98, p=0.001), in
224 women who do regular exercise controlling for parity and contraceptive use.

225 The odds of diagnosing atypical lesions in women who use contraceptives are more than five
226 times (aOR: 5.73; 95% CI: 1.14-28.94, p=0.002), for suspicious lesions is more than six times
227 (aOR: 6.02; 95% CI: 1.73-20.95, p=0.002) while for malignant lesions it is more than one (aOR:
228 1.8; 95% CI: 0.99-3.34, p=0.002) controlling for parity and exercises.

229 **Table 4: Multivariable analysis of the risk factors for breast lesions among women with breast**
 230 **lumps attending two select teaching and referral health facilities in Kenya using a multinomial**
 231 **logistic regression model**

Factors	Values	Atypical lesions	Suspicious of malignancy	Malignant lesions (Breast cancer)	<i>p-value</i>
		aOR (95% C.I)	aOR (95% C.I)	aOR (95% C.I)	
Parity	Nulliparous	0.79(0.21, 2.9)	0.23(0.07, 0.71)	0.11(0.05, 0.26)	0.001
	Parous	1	1	1	
Exercises	Yes	0.92(0.28, 2.98)	0.33(0.14, 0.78)	0.31(0.18, 0.55)	0.001
	No	1	1	1	
Contraception	Yes	5.73(1.14, 28.94)	6.02(1.73, 20.95)	1.82(0.99, 3.34)	0.002
	No	1	1	1	

232 Key: aOR; adjusted odds ratio
 233 <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/2OXWTA>
 234

235 Discussion

236 The key findings of this study suggest that parity, exercise, and contraceptive use are significant
 237 predictors of breast cancer and other breast lesions among women in Kenya. Nulliparity was found
 238 to have a substantial protective effect against the development of both suspicious lesions of the breast
 239 and BC. This is a contradictory finding to other studies in the literature that identified parity as
 240 protective in the development of breast cancer, especially those that are ER+/PR+ [18-20].
 241 However, our findings correlate with some studies that have reported parous women to be more likely
 242 to develop triple-negative breast cancer [21-24]. This means that parity is not protective against all
 243 types of BC as conventionally documented. Although nulliparous women had lower odds of
 244 developing atypical lesions, the difference was not statistically significant. Nevertheless, there is an
 245 indication that the likelihood of developing atypical breast lesions is lower in women who have never
 246 given birth.

247 In this study, regular exercise was found to be significantly associated with a lower likelihood of
 248 BC and other breast lesions. Comparing respondents who didn't regularly exercise, participants who

249 exercised were less likely to have BC and less likely to be diagnosed with suspicious lesions. There is
250 strong evidence to support that physical exercise has a significant impact on reducing the odds of
251 developing BC [25, 26]. This is mainly because exercise modulates BMI and reduces obesity, which
252 are both risk factors for BC [27]. In addition, physical activity is associated with a significantly
253 delayed onset of BC among breast cancer gene 1 and breast cancer gene 2 (BRCA1/2) mutation
254 carriers [28, 29]. This is because exercise is known to enhance the body's Deoxyribonucleic acid
255 (DNA) repair mechanisms, potentially correcting mutations that could lead to cancer. Though the
256 odds of developing atypical breast lesions in this population were lower, the difference between those
257 who reported having regular exercise and those who had never had regular exercise was not
258 statistically different.

259 Our study established that participant who used hormonal contraceptives had higher odds of being
260 diagnosed with BC. These findings compare with those of a study done in Jordan which indicated that
261 regular use of oral contraception [OCs] increased the risk of BC [30]. Contraception use had also
262 been associated with a substantially increased risk of developing suspicious lesions among
263 contraception users and atypical lesions in this study.

264 In contraceptive usage, almost an equal number of participants had used compared to those who
265 had not. A no-method preference has been reported as the second most preferred in some studies
266 [31]. Our findings compare with data from 47 countries which indicated that 40.9% of women in
267 need of contraception were not using any methods. Moreira and others have explored reasons for the
268 non-use of contraception despite the unmet need. Major reasons for non-use included, health
269 concerns, infrequent sex, and opposition from others [32]. Religious reasons and cultural factors may
270 be the other reasons for non-use in our study population.

271 In terms of the breakdown of various contraceptives and their preference among women, the oral
272 contraceptive was preferred. This finding is consistent with those reported in the literature [33]. Our

273 study also indicates multiple uses of hormonal contraception over time, where the same individuals
274 had used oral, injection, or implant. Similar findings have been reported previously in the US [34].
275 Simultaneous use of more than one contraception during sex has also been reported in the literature
276 [35].

277 Patients' demographic and socioeconomic characteristics are important considerations in BC
278 diagnosis and management. Most participants in this study had a minimum of secondary education
279 suggesting a level of breast health awareness and positive health-seeking behavior in this population.
280 Most participants were of the Kikuyu ethnic community. This is likely since this is the second most
281 populous ethnic group in Nakuru County and the largest ethnic group in Kenya. In addition, Nairobi
282 City is in close proximity to Central Kenya, a geographical region historically occupied by Kikuyus.
283 Kikuyus being the majority attending the Breast FNA Clinic in KNH could be purely due to the case
284 of accessibility in this case rather than other factors.

285 Concerning parity, a small difference was noted between the parous and nulliparous BC patients.
286 Ideally, since many of the women in this study were in their thirties, one would have expected most
287 of them to be parous, but this was not the case. This could have been due to lifestyle and priority
288 changes. Most ladies would want to focus on their career paths before they start getting children
289 while others plan to have babies after the age of 30 [36].

290 The prevalence of other known risk factors for cancer including family history, alcohol use, and
291 smoking were very low among our study participants. Generally, a proportion of cancer cases are
292 attributable to smoking and high alcohol consumption [37]. Exercises or no exercise/lack of it was
293 almost equally practiced among our study participants. This is important to note since our
294 participants seemed to do exercises at a higher percentage [about 50%] than one would expect in the
295 general population. Data from Europe indicate that 60% of individuals aged 15 and above rarely or
296 never participate in exercise or sports [38]. While physical exercise contributes to a healthy life, most

297 people do not engage in exercise. Physical inactivity is a major public health problem for people of all
298 ages and is currently rated as the fourth-highest global risk factor for mortality and pathologies such
299 as type 2 diabetes, coronary heart disease, and certain types of cancer [39]. Study participants in the
300 current study probably participate in exercise due to increased awareness and need, based on their
301 medical condition, or it is part of their lifestyle since an equal percentage did not as well.

302 Overall, from the univariable analysis, the factors that were found to be significantly associated
303 with breast lesions included age, ethnicity, level of education, employment status, family history of
304 BC, and exercise. The findings from this study correlate with those of other studies. The risk of BC
305 increases with age [40]. Incidence also increases and reaches its peak in the age of menopause and
306 then gradually decreases or remains constant [41]. Several studies have reported racial and ethnic
307 variation in BC where a minority of women present with higher-stage BC than white women [42,
308 43]. Such differences in race and ethnicity have also been discussed by others [42, 44, 45].

309 Education level and employment status were significantly associated with breast cancer in this
310 study. This is consistent with other studies [46, 47]. This could be mainly because employment and
311 education are associated with awareness, quality of life, and exposure to other risk factors like alcohol
312 and smoking, as well as postponement of childbearing and number of children while women pursue
313 further education and careers [48]. Family history is an important risk factor for BC as demonstrated
314 in our study. This important association has been demonstrated previously and in other studies [49-
315 53].

316 **Conclusion**

317 From this study, exercise, parity, and hormonal contraception were found to be significant
318 predictors of breast cancer and other breast lesions. These findings warrant consideration of BC risk

319 reduction through empowering women to make informed reproductive choices and the choice of
320 contraception use and weight management.

321 **Acknowledgement**

322 The authors wish to express their sincere gratitude to the study participants for contributing to the
323 research. They also acknowledge the University of Nairobi's Building Capacity for Writing
324 Scientific Manuscripts (UANDISHI) Program at the Faculty of Health Sciences for the training on
325 manuscript writing.

326 **Author Contributions**

327 Conceptualization: Josephine Nyabeta Rioki, Emily Rogena.
328 Data curation: Josephine Nyabeta Rioki, Marshal Mweu.
329 Formal analysis: Josephine Nyabeta Rioki, Marshal Mweu.
330 Funding acquisition: Josephine Nyabeta Rioki, Elijah Songok.
331 Investigation: Josephine Nyabeta Rioki, Lucy Muchiri, Marshal Mweu, Elijah Songok, Emily
332 Rogena.
333 Methodology: Josephine Nyabeta Rioki, Marshal Mweu.
334 Project administration: Josephine Nyabeta Rioki, Lucy Muchiri, Marshal Mweu, Elijah Songok,
335 Emily Rogena.
336 Supervision: Lucy Muchiri, Marshal Mweu, Elijah Songok, Emily Rogena.
337 Writing – original draft: Josephine Nyabeta Rioki, Joseph Mwangi.
338 Writing – review & editing: Josephine Nyabeta Rioki, Lucy Muchiri, Marshal Mweu, Elijah Songok,
339 Emily Rogena.

340 **References**

- 341 1. Łukasiewicz S, Czezelewski M, Forma A, Baj J, Sitarz R, Stanisławek A. Breast Cancer—
342 Epidemiology, Risk Factors, Classification, Prognostic Markers, and Current Treatment
343 Strategies—An Updated Review. *Cancers*. 2021;13(17):4287. [https://www.mdpi.com/2072-](https://www.mdpi.com/2072-6694/13/17/4287)
344 [6694/13/17/4287](https://www.mdpi.com/2072-6694/13/17/4287).
- 345 2. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, et al. Global Cancer
346 Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in
347 185 Countries. *CA A Cancer J Clinicians*. 2021 M;71(3):209–49.
348 <https://acsjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.3322/caac.21660>.
- 349 3. Zavala VA, Bracci PM, Carethers JM, Carvajal-Carmona L, Coggins NB, Cruz-Correa MR, et al.
350 Cancer health disparities in racial/ethnic minorities in the United States. *Br J Cancer*.
351 2021;124(2):315–32. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41416-020-01038-6>.
- 352 4. Gakunga R, Ali Z, Korir A, Kinyanjui AW, Ochieng' E, Gikaara N, et al. Social determinants and
353 individual health-seeking behaviour among women in Kenya: protocol for a breast cancer cohort
354 feasibility study. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(1):e023171.
355 <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-023171>.
- 356 5. Chlebowski R. Factors that modify breast cancer risk in women [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 May
357 22]. <https://medilib.ir/uptodate/show/792>.
- 358 6. Khoramdad M, Solaymani-Dodaran M, Kabir A, Ghahremanzadeh N, Hashemi EOS, Fahimfar N, et
359 al. Breast cancer risk factors in Iranian women: a systematic review and meta-analysis of matched
360 case-control studies. *Eur J Med Res*. 2022;27(1):311.

- 361 7. Arafat HM, Omar J, Muhamad R, Al-Astani TAD, Shafii N, Al Laham NA, et al. Breast Cancer Risk
362 From Modifiable and Non-Modifiable Risk Factors among Palestinian Women: A Systematic
363 Review and Meta-Analysis. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2021;22(7):1987–95.
- 364 8. Daly AA, Rolph R, Cutress RI, Copson ER. A Review of Modifiable Risk Factors in Young Women
365 for the Prevention of Breast Cancer. *Breast Cancer (Dove Med Press).* 2021; 13:241–57.
- 366 9. Anderson KN, Schwab RB, Martinez ME. Reproductive risk factors and breast cancer subtypes: a
367 review of the literature. *Breast Cancer Res Treat [Internet].* 2014;144(1):1–10.
368 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10549-014-2852-7>.
- 369 10. Karim SM, Baeshen W, Neamatullah SN, Bin B. Oral Contraceptives, Abortion and Breast Cancer
370 Risk: a Case Control Study in Saudi Arabia. *Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention.*
371 2015;16(9):3957–60.
372 <http://koreascience.or.kr/journal/view.jsp?kj=POCPA9&py=2015&vnc=v16n9&sp=3957>.
- 373 11. Inumaru LE, Irineu Gomes Duarte Quintanilha M, Aparecida Da Silveira É, Veloso Naves MM.
374 Risk and Protective Factors for Breast Cancer in Midwest of Brazil. *Journal of Environmental and*
375 *Public Health.* 2012; 2012:1–9. <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jeph/2012/356851/>.
- 376 12. García-Chico C, López-Ortiz S, Peñín-Grandes S, Pinto-Fraga J, Valenzuela PL, Emanuele E, et al.
377 Physical Exercise and the Hallmarks of Breast Cancer: A Narrative Review. *Cancers.*
378 2023;15(1):324. <https://www.mdpi.com/2072-6694/15/1/324>.
- 379 13. Figueroa JD, Gierach GL, Duggan MA, Fan S, Pfeiffer RM, Wang Y, et al. Risk factors for breast
380 cancer development by tumor characteristics among women with benign breast disease. *Breast*
381 *Cancer Res.* 2021;23(1):34. [https://breast-cancer-](https://breast-cancer-research.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13058-021-01410-1)
382 [research.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13058-021-01410-1](https://breast-cancer-research.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13058-021-01410-1).

- 383 14. Amin AL, Wagner JL. Contemporary management of atypical breast lesions identified on
384 percutaneous biopsy: a narrative review. *Ann Breast Surg.* 2021; 5:9–9.
385 <https://abs.amegroups.com/article/view/6578/html>.
- 386 15. Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The
387 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement:
388 guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology.* 2008;61(4):344–9.
389 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0895435607004362>.
- 390 16. Field AS, Raymond WA, Rickard M, Schmitt F. Breast fine needle aspiration biopsy cytology: the
391 potential impact of the International Academy of Cytology Yokohama System for Reporting Breast
392 Fine Needle Aspiration Biopsy Cytopathology and the use of rapid on-site evaluation. *Journal of the*
393 *American Society of Cytopathology.* 2020;9(2):103–11.
394 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2213294520300120>.
- 395 17. Brachtel EF, Field AS, Rickard MT, Raymond WA, Lee AHS, Chong PY, et al. Malignant. In: Field
396 AS, Raymond WA, Schmitt F, editors. *The International Academy of Cytology Yokohama System*
397 *for Reporting Breast Fine Needle Aspiration Biopsy Cytopathology.* Cham: Springer International
398 Publishing; 2020. p. 83–118. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26883-1_6.
- 399 18. Azubuike SO. Relationship between parity and breast cancer risk: A critical review of evidence (with
400 focus on sub-Saharan Africa). *International Journal of Noncommunicable Diseases.* 2023;8(2):66.
401 https://journals.lww.com/ijnc/fulltext/2023/08020/Relationship_between_parity_and_breast_cancer.2.aspx.
402
- 403 19. Fortner RT, Sisti J, Chai B, Collins LC, Rosner B, Hankinson SE, et al. Parity, breastfeeding, and
404 breast cancer risk by hormone receptor status and molecular phenotype: results from the Nurses'

- 405 Health Studies. *Breast Cancer Res.* 2019;21(1):40. [https://breast-cancer-](https://breast-cancer-research.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13058-019-1119-y)
406 [research.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13058-019-1119-y](https://breast-cancer-research.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13058-019-1119-y).
- 407 20. Balekouzou A, Yin P, Pamatika CM, Bekolo CE, Nambei SW, Djeintote M, et al. Reproductive risk
408 factors associated with breast cancer in women in Bangui: a case–control study. *BMC Women’s*
409 *Health.* 2017;17(1):14. [http://bmcwomenshealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12905-017-](http://bmcwomenshealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12905-017-0368-0)
410 [0368-0](http://bmcwomenshealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12905-017-0368-0).
- 411 21. Lambertini M, Santoro L, Del Mastro L, Nguyen B, Livraghi L, Ugolini D, et al. Reproductive
412 behaviors and risk of developing breast cancer according to tumor subtype: A systematic review and
413 meta-analysis of epidemiological studies. *Cancer Treatment Reviews.* 2016; 49:65–76.
414 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0305737216300627>.
- 415 22. Romieu I, Biessy C, Joffe M, Cubasch H, Norris S, Vorster HH, et al. Reproductive factors and risk
416 of breast cancer in black South African women. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2021;32(4):415–22.
417 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10552-021-01390-9>.
- 418 23. Azubuike SO, Hayes L, Sharp L, McNally R. Reproductive factors and the risk of breast cancer
419 among Nigerian women by age and oestrogen receptor status. *Cancer Causes Control.*
420 2022;33(12):1401–12. <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10552-022-01629-z>.
- 421 24. Akoko LO, Rutashobya AK, Lutainulwa EW, Mwanga AH, Kivuyo SL. The effect of reproductive,
422 hormonal, nutritional and lifestyle on breast cancer risk among black Tanzanian women: A case
423 control study. Doku DT, editor. *PLoS ONE* [Internet]. 2022 Feb 9 [cited 2024;17(2):e0263374].
424 <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0263374>.

- 425 25. Guo W, Fensom GK, Reeves GK, Key TJ. Physical activity and breast cancer risk: results from the
426 UK Biobank prospective cohort. *Br J Cancer*. 2020;122(5):726–32.
427 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41416-019-0700-6>.
- 428 26. Hardefeldt PJ, Penninkilampi R, Edirimanne S, Eslick GD. Physical Activity and Weight Loss
429 Reduce the Risk of Breast Cancer: A Meta-analysis of 139 Prospective and Retrospective Studies.
430 *Clinical Breast Cancer*. 2018;18(4):e601–12.
431 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1526820916304293>.
- 432 27. Chan DSM, Abar L, Cariolou M, Nanu N, Greenwood DC, Bandera EV, et al. World Cancer
433 Research Fund International: Continuous Update Project—systematic literature review and meta-
434 analysis of observational cohort studies on physical activity, sedentary behavior, adiposity, and
435 weight change and breast cancer risk. *Cancer Causes Control*. 2019;30(11):1183–200.
436 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10552-019-01223-w>.
- 437 28. Bucy AM, Valencia CI, Howe CL, Larkin TJ, Conard KD, Anderlik EW, et al. Physical Activity in
438 Young BRCA Carriers and Reduced Risk of Breast Cancer. *American Journal of Preventive*
439 *Medicine*. 2022;63(5):837–45. <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S074937972200246X>.
- 440 29. Xu Y, Rogers CJ. Physical Activity and Breast Cancer Prevention: Possible Role of Immune
441 Mediators. *Front Nutr*. 2020; 7:557997.
442 <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnut.2020.557997/full>.
- 443 30. Bardaweel SK, Akour AA, Al-Muhaissen S, AlSalamat HA, Ammar K. Oral contraceptive and breast
444 cancer: do benefits outweigh the risks? A case – control study from Jordan. *BMC Women’s Health*.
445 2019;19(1):72. <https://bmcwomenshealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12905-019-0770-x>.

- 446 31. He K, Dalton VK, Zochowski MK, Hall KS. Women's Contraceptive Preference-Use Mismatch. *J*
447 *Womens Health (Larchmt)*. 2017 Jun;26(6):692–701.
- 448 32. Moreira LR, Ewerling F, Barros AJD, Silveira MF. Reasons for nonuse of contraceptive methods by
449 women with demand for contraception not satisfied: an assessment of low and middle-income
450 countries using demographic and health surveys. *Reprod Health*. 2019;16(1):148.
451 <https://reproductive-health-journal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12978-019-0805-7>.
- 452 33. Hassan NEM, Khedr NFH, El-Sayed HESM. Women Preference for Family Planning Methods.
453 *IJN*. 2020;7(2). <http://ijnnet.com/vol-7-no-2-december-2020-abstract-13-ijn>.
- 454 34. Frederiksen B. The Sexual and Reproductive Health Landscape In the US: Current Trends and
455 Impact of the Pandemic. 2021. [https://policycommons.net/artifacts/1596123/the-sexual-and-](https://policycommons.net/artifacts/1596123/the-sexual-and-reproductive-health-landscape-in-the-us/2285892/)
456 [reproductive-health-landscape-in-the-us/2285892/](https://policycommons.net/artifacts/1596123/the-sexual-and-reproductive-health-landscape-in-the-us/2285892/).
- 457 35. Kavanaugh ML, Pliskin E, Jerman J. Use of concurrent multiple methods of contraception in the
458 United States, 2008 to 2015. *Contraception: X*. 2021; 3:100060.
459 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2590151621000071>.
- 460 36. Safdari-Dehcheshmeh F, Noroozi M, Taleghani F, Memar S. Factors influencing the delay in
461 childbearing: A narrative review. *Iranian J Nursing Midwifery Res*. 2023;28(1):10.
462 <http://www.ijnmrjournal.net/text.asp?2023/28/1/10/368514>.
- 463 37. Mons U, Gredner T, Behrens G, Stock C, Brenner H. Cancers Due to Smoking and High Alcohol
464 Consumption. *Deutsches Ärzteblatt international*. 2018;
465 <https://www.aerzteblatt.de/10.3238/arztebl.2018.0571>.

- 466 38. Ferrando-Terradez I, Dueñas L, Parčina I, Čopić N, Petronijević S, Beltrami G, et al. Women's
467 Involvement in Steady Exercise (WISE): Study Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial.
468 *Healthcare*. 2023;11(9):1279. <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9032/11/9/1279>.
- 469 39. Wu XY, Han LH, Zhang JH, Luo S, Hu JW, Sun K. The influence of physical activity, sedentary
470 behavior on health-related quality of life among the general population of children and adolescents:
471 A systematic review. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(11):e0187668.
- 472 40. Malherbe F, Nel D, Molabe H, Cairncross L, Roodt L. Palpable breast lumps: An age-based
473 approach to evaluation and diagnosis. *S Afr Fam Pract* [Internet]. 2022;64(1).
474 <https://safpj.co.za/index.php/safpj/article/view/5571>.
- 475 41. Momenimovahed Z, Salehiniya H. Epidemiological characteristics of and risk factors for breast
476 cancer in the world. *Breast Cancer (Dove Med Press)*. 2019; 11:151–64.
477 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6462164/>.
- 478 42. Hirko KA, Rocque G, Reasor E, Taye A, Daly A, Cutress RI, et al. The impact of race and ethnicity
479 in breast cancer—disparities and implications for precision oncology. *BMC Med*. 2022;20(1):72.
480 <https://bmcmmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12916-022-02260-0>.
- 481 43. Yedjou CG, Sims JN, Miele L, Noubissi F, Lowe L, Fonseca DD, et al. Health and Racial Disparity
482 in Breast Cancer. In: Ahmad A, editor. *Breast Cancer Metastasis and Drug Resistance*. Cham:
483 Springer International Publishing; 2019. p. 31–49. (*Advances in Experimental Medicine and*
484 *Biology*; vol. 1152). http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-030-20301-6_3.
- 485 44. Stringer-Reasor EM, Elkhanany A, Khoury K, Simon MA, Newman LA. Disparities in Breast
486 Cancer Associated with African American Identity. *American Society of Clinical Oncology*

- 487 Educational Book [Internet]. 2021;(41):e29–46.
488 https://ascopubs.org/doi/10.1200/EDBK_319929.
- 489 45. Sayed S, Field A, Rajab J, Mutuiiri A, Githanga J, Mungania M, et al. Task Sharing and Shifting to
490 Provide Pathology Diagnostic Services: The Kenya Fine-Needle Aspiration Biopsy Cytology and
491 Bone Marrow Aspiration and Trephine Biopsy Training Program. *JGO*. 2018;(4):1–11.
- 492 46. Jiang R, Wang X, Sun Z, Wu S, Chen S, Cai H. Association of education level with the risk of
493 female breast cancer: a prospective cohort study. *BMC Women's Health*. 2023;23(1):91.
494 <https://bmcwomenshealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12905-023-02245-y>.
- 495 47. Dong JY, Qin LQ. Education level and breast cancer incidence: a meta-analysis of cohort studies.
496 *Menopause*. 2020;27(1):113–8. <https://journals.lww.com/00042192-202001000-00018>.
- 497 48. Machiyama K, Mumah JN, Mutua M, Cleland J. Childbearing desires and behaviour: a prospective
498 assessment in Nairobi slums. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*. 2019;28;19(1):100.
499 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-019-2245-3>.
- 500 49. Han Y, Moore JX, Colditz GA, Toriola AT. Family History of Breast Cancer and Mammographic
501 Breast Density in Premenopausal Women. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(2): e2148983.
502 <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2789129>.
- 503 50. Ekpe E, Shaikh AJ, Shah J, Jacobson JS, Sayed S. Metastatic Breast Cancer in Kenya: Presentation,
504 Pathologic Characteristics, and Patterns—Findings from a Tertiary Cancer Center. *JGO*.
505 2019;(5):1–11. <https://ascopubs.org/doi/10.1200/JGO.19.00036>.
- 506 51. Durham DD, Abraham LA, Roberts MC, Khan CP, Smith RA, Kerlikowske K, et al. Breast cancer
507 incidence among women with a family history of breast cancer by relative's age at diagnosis.

- 508 Cancer. 2022;128(24):4232–40.
509 <https://acsjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/cncr.34365>.
- 510 52. Anyigba CA, Awandare GA, Paemka L. Breast cancer in sub-Saharan Africa: The current state and
511 uncertain future. *Exp Biol Med* (Maywood). 2021;246(12):1377–87.
512 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/15353702211006047>.
- 513 53. Braithwaite D, Miglioretti DL, Zhu W, Demb J, Trentham-Dietz A, Sprague B, et al. Family
514 History and Breast Cancer Risk Among Older Women in the Breast Cancer Surveillance
515 Consortium Cohort. *JAMA Intern Med* [Internet]. 2018;178(4):494.
516 <http://archinte.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamainternmed.2017.8642>.

517

518 **Supporting information**

- 519 **S1 File:** Harvard Dataverse: Replication data for: Factors associated with breast lesions among
520 women attending select teaching and referral health facilities in Kenya: a cross-sectional study,
521 <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/2OXWTA>.

522

523