

1 **Cancer services during the COVID-19 pandemic: systematic review of patients' and**  
2 **caregivers' experiences**

3

4 **Author list and affiliations**

5

6 Symran Dhada<sup>1</sup>

7 Derek Stewart<sup>2</sup>

8 Ejaz Cheema<sup>1</sup>

9 Muhammed Abdul Hadi<sup>1</sup>

10 Vibhu Paudyal<sup>1</sup>

11

12 <sup>1</sup>College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom

13 <sup>2</sup>College of Pharmacy, Qatar University, Doha, Qatar

14

15

16 \*Correspondence:

17 Vibhu Paudyal, PhD

18 ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4173-6490>

19 College of Medical and Dental Sciences, Sir Robert Aitken Institute for Medical Research

20 University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK B15 2TT

21 Phone: 0121 4142538 Email [v.paudyal@bham.ac.uk](mailto:v.paudyal@bham.ac.uk)

22

23

24 **Abbreviations**

25 ASCO: The American Society of Clinical Oncology

26 CASP: Critical Appraisal Skills Programme

27 NIH: National Institute of Health

28 PPE: Personal Protective Equipment

29 PRISMA: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

30

31

32

33

34 **Cancer services during the COVID-19 pandemic: systematic review of patients' and**  
35 **caregivers' experiences**

36

37 **Abstract**

38 **Background** Cancer patients have faced intersecting crises in the face of COVID-19 pandemic.

39 This review aimed to examine patients' and caregivers' experiences of accessing cancer

40 services during the COVID-19 pandemic and perceived impact of the pandemic on their

41 psychological wellbeing.

42

43 **Methods** A protocol-led (CRD42020214906) systematic review was conducted by searching six

44 databases including EMBASE, MEDLINE and CINAHL for articles published in English-language

45 between 1/2020-12/2020. Data were extracted using a pilot-tested, structured data extraction

46 form. Thematic synthesis of data was undertaken and reported as per the PRISMA guideline.

47

48 **Results** A total of 1110 articles were screened of which 19 studies met the inclusion criteria.

49 Studies originated from 10 different countries including the US, UK, India and China. Several

50 themes were identified which were categorised into seven categories. Postponement and delays

51 in cancer screening and treatment, drug shortages and inadequate nursing care were commonly

52 experienced by patients. Hospital closures, resource constraints, national lockdowns and patient

53 reluctance to use health services because of infection worries contributed to the delay. Financial

54 and social distress, isolation; and spiritual distress due to the uncertainty of rites as well as

55 fulfilment of last wishes were also commonly reported. Caregivers felt anxious about infecting

56 cancer patients with COVID-19.

57

58 **Conclusions** Patients and caregivers experienced extensive impact of COVID-19 on cancer

59 screening, treatment and care, and their own psychological wellbeing. Patient and caregiver

60 views and preferences should be incorporated in ensuring resilient cancer services that can

61 minimise the impact of ongoing and future pandemic on cancer care and mitigate patient fears.

62

63 **Protocol Registration:** Published protocol registered with Centre for Review and Dissemination

64 CRD42020214906 ([https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display\\_record.php?RecordID=214906](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID=214906))

65

66 **Key words-** cancer care; cancer screening; COVID-19; Coronavirus; patients; caregivers

67

68

69

70

## 71 **Introduction**

72           Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), caused by the novel severe acute respiratory  
73 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) [1], has challenged resilience of healthcare systems and  
74 economies globally. The pandemic has placed an immense strain on cancer services, resulting  
75 in disruptions to oncology practices contributed both by measures to minimise patient exposure  
76 to the virus and strains on health services resources. Such disruptions in services inflicts dual  
77 disadvantage to cancer patients as they have poor prognosis compared to non-cancer patients  
78 [2]. Overall case fatality rate due to COVID-19 for cancer patients is reported to be 23.4% (95%  
79 CI= 9.7% to 40.5%) compared to 5.9% (95% CI= 1.9% to 11.7) for non-cancer patients [3]. Data  
80 estimates suggest up to 85% reduction in cancer screening services in the US at the height of  
81 the first pandemic (March- July 2020) [4]. In the UK, there were 290,000 fewer urgent referrals to  
82 cancer services during the first national lockdown (between March and June) [5]. Subsequently,  
83 the number of avoidable cancer related deaths are expected to increase substantially<sup>6</sup> as early  
84 diagnosis and timely access to appropriate treatment modality is critical in ensuring good patient  
85 outcomes [2,7,8]. Such interruptions in services can also negatively affect cancer patients  
86 undergoing or awaiting a palliative care.

87

88           The rapid resurgence of COVID-19 pandemic and diversification of health services to  
89 mitigate the impact of the pandemic has led many to question whether cancer has become the  
90 ‘forgotten C’[9,10] Cancer services have the difficult task of minimising patient exposure to the  
91 virus whilst not compromising cancer outcomes. For patients and caregivers, anxieties and fear  
92 may be heightened from psychological perspectives. Whilst current research places an emphasis  
93 on linking COVID-19 to treatment adjustments and survival outcomes [3,6-8,11,12], it is  
94 important to consider patient and caregiver views and experiences in developing resilient cancer  
95 service models for ongoing and future pandemic. This review aimed to examine patients’ and  
96 caregivers’ experiences of accessing cancer services during the COVID-19 pandemic and  
97 perceived impact of the pandemic on their psychological wellbeing.

98

99

## 100 **Methods**

101 A systematic review was conducted and reported in accordance with the recommendation of  
102 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines [13]  
103 based on a published protocol (CRD42020214906). CINAHL, EMBASE, MEDLINE, Google  
104 Scholar; and Wellcome Open Research and Authorea (for unpublished studies ongoing peer  
105 reviews) databases were searched systematically using medical subject headings (MeSH) and  
106 free-text keywords including 'cancer', 'oncology, and 'Coronavirus', 'COVID-19' and related terms  
107 (electronic supplementary material 1) from December 2019 till December 2020. Boolean  
108 operators were used to refine the search.

109

110 Studies published in English language that explored the views, experiences and perceived  
111 impact of COVID-19 on cancer screening and care from the perspective patients/public and their  
112 caregivers (both formal and informal) were included. Search was not restricted to any cancer  
113 types or participant demography or age. Experiences of cancer screening and care in any setting  
114 including cancer related palliative care were included.

115

116 Initial screening of titles was conducted independently by two investigators (SD and VP) in  
117 order to identify potentially relevant papers. Disagreements were resolved through discussion  
118 and a third investigator was consulted where necessary to resolve any disagreements. This was  
119 then followed by abstract and full-text screening against the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Data  
120 was extracted by one author (SD) and checked by another author (VP) for accuracy using a pilot  
121 tested, structured data collection sheet to extract relevant data in relation to views, experiences  
122 and perceived impact of COVID-19 on cancer screening, care and psychological impact on  
123 patients and carers. Thematic synthesis was adopted to analyse the extracted data and report  
124 into categories and themes [14]. A Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) tool was used to  
125 assess the quality of the qualitative studies [15] and the 'NIH Quality of Observational, Cohort  
126 and Cross-Sectional Studies Assessment Tool' was used to assess the quality of studies using  
127 survey methodology [16] Reporting was done as per PRISMA checklist[13] (electronic  
128 supplementary material 2).

## 129 **Results**

### 130 **Characteristics and quality of included studies**

131 The initial search yielded 1110 results. A total of nineteen studies [17-35] were included in the  
132 final review (figure 1). Studies represented experiences from 10 different countries and were  
133 largely based in Italy (n=4) followed by the US (n=3) and India (n=3). Two studies were  
134 conducted in the UK and the Netherlands. Five studies used qualitative methods (table 1). The  
135 majority of studies employed a survey methodology using questionnaire as data collection tools  
136 (n=14) (table 2). Results of quality assessment are presented in electronic supplement 3 and 4.

137

### 138 **Results of thematic synthesis**

139 Seven key categories of synthesised data and several themes were identified across the  
140 nineteen included studies. These related to- experiences of accessing cancer screening and  
141 diagnosis; experiences of accessing cancer treatment and care services; communication in  
142 relation to healthcare; perceived risks of infection; anxiety and fear; adverse impact on personal  
143 life, family and finances; caregivers specific concerns; and resilience and coping mechanisms  
144 (table 3).

145

#### 146 **(I) Experiences of accessing cancer screening and diagnostic services**

147 Disruption to cancer screening and diagnosis was a common theme reported in the included  
148 studies. A cross-sectional survey assessing the experiences of sarcoma patients at two of the  
149 largest specialist sarcoma centres in Europe reported that one-third of patients experienced  
150 postponement of appointments or scans by at least three months [35]. Patients also reported  
151 cancellations of routine follow-up clinic appointments in two studies, each conducted in the UK  
152 and US [31, 34]. Patients expressed feelings of anxiety and fear due to postponement of cancer-  
153 related laboratory tests and diagnostic imaging in two studies [24, 31]. This overwhelming sense  
154 of anxiety amongst patients was demonstrated further in one study where patients described the  
155 COVID-19 pandemic as overshadowing the needs of families and severely affecting the quality  
156 and scope of cancer services. Some patients described their experience of COVID-19 prevention  
157 taking precedence over cancer treatment and care [29].

158

159 **(II) Experiences of accessing cancer treatment and care services**

160 Participants in the majority of the included studies reported experiences of treatment delays  
161 [17,18,20,22,24,25-31]. Reasons ranged from hospital cancellations, city lockdowns and  
162 swabbing requirements. Deferral of radiotherapy dates and long waiting hours beyond scheduled  
163 appointment times was a problem cited by a number of participants in one study conducted in  
164 India [30]. Another study conducted in Italy reported that radiation, infusion therapies and  
165 surgical tumour removal experienced the most disruption [31]. The impact of the pandemic on  
166 cancer surgery was demonstrated in one study conducted in the US, where 10 of the included 38  
167 participants scheduled for surgical treatment for ovarian cancer experienced delays [24]. A study  
168 held at a tertiary-care referral hospital in Italy reported a median surgery waiting time of  
169 approximately 53 days (IQR: 35-72 days); reported to be a sharp increase on pre-pandemic  
170 waiting times [26].

171

172 Whilst the interruption of treatment was most apparent, one study based in India explored  
173 other implications of the pandemic including the deferral of advice from the nutritionist,  
174 unavailability of peer group support services and psychological counselling sessions [30].  
175 Although some of the participants had access to online counselling services, appointments were  
176 scarce.

177

178 Emotional distress was common in patients who had experienced disruption to cancer  
179 treatment [28]. Uncertainty surrounding medication availability and the lack of nursing care  
180 available for patients who were living alone added to their worries [22, 30]. For example, patients  
181 with cervical and oral cancer struggled to source certain dressing materials and so were left with  
182 defective dressings [22]. Visitors were prohibited from entering wards or accompanying the  
183 patient during appointments. In a study conducted at a palliative care centre in the US,  
184 participants likened the experience to being 'prisoners in a cage' [21].

185

186

187 **(III) Communication in relation to cancer care**

188 Disruptions in regular communications between patients and health services were commonly  
189 reported including the use of remote forms of communications using video technology or  
190 telephone [17,20,22,30,35]. Patients identified positive aspects of telecommunication for  
191 example, the ease of accessing care from the privacy and comfort of one's home and the ability  
192 to maintain physical distance [22]. The majority of patients in one study hoped for continuation of  
193 online services post-pandemic [25]. In another study, almost two-thirds of patients felt that  
194 despite virtual means, they were still able to contact the healthcare team and so expressed  
195 feelings of reassurance [35]. However in one study conducted in India, patients reported  
196 difficulties in booking a virtual appointments and unpredictable network issues [30].

197

198 **(IV) Perceived risk of infection, anxiety and fear**

199 Feelings of anxiety and fear surrounding the pandemic was common with eighteen studies  
200 referencing changes in emotional and psychological functioning [17-30,32-35]. Approximately  
201 55% of the 204 participants in a study conducted in a tertiary-institution study felt unsafe to visit  
202 the hospital [17]. Furthermore, cancer patients appeared overall more afraid about the  
203 complications which may arise from contracting COVID-19 [17] Prospects of not being able to  
204 say farewell to family and friends in case of dying were also reported [33]. References were also  
205 made to fears surrounding family members contracting the virus and patients expressed worries  
206 and concerns about treatment delays due to the postponement of elective procedures [32]. More  
207 than half of the participants in a US-led study disclosed a new-onset of borderline anxiety or  
208 depression [24]. Nearly a quarter (23% of the 204) participants in one study were in receipt of the  
209 government 'shielding' advice [34].

210

211 Two studies conducted in Saudi Arabia and Iran examined anxiety responses amongst  
212 children and their caregivers [17,29]. Parents reported fears surrounding COVID-19 mortality  
213 rates and expressed concerns about the high transmissibility and limited knowledge surrounding  
214 the virus [29]. In one of these studies [17], over 67% of parents reported the onset of new  
215 behavioural occurrences amongst their children since the pandemic. Parents were worried about

216 the negative effects of the pandemic on children’s mental and physical health, both now and in  
217 the long-term.

218

219 **(V) Adverse impact on personal life, family and finances**

220 Ten studies reported wider implications of the pandemic on cancer patient’s personal life, their  
221 family and the potential financial consequences [17, 19, 22, 24, 28, 29, 32-35]. Similarly, impact  
222 on social activities due to lockdowns were also described. Loneliness fuelled patients worries  
223 surrounding cancer and previously, social outings had offered them a healthy distraction [33].  
224 Concerns surrounding loss of income and employment instability for family members were  
225 reported [35]. Patients in palliative care expressed frustration and fear at the possibility of not  
226 being able to fulfil their last wishes; for example, spending their last days surrounded by family,  
227 as social isolation and travel restrictions had made this difficult [22].

228

229 **(VI) Caregiver specific concerns**

230 Concerns raised by caregivers were reported in two studies [22, 33]. In one study conducted  
231 in the Netherlands, more than half of the participants reported that they were worried about  
232 infecting cancer patients they were caring with COVID-19 [33]. In the second study, caregivers  
233 reported feelings of guilt due to their inability to ease their relatives’ suffering and in some cases  
234 were reluctant to go near the patient and change dressings due to worries about transmitting  
235 COVID-19 [22]. Moreover, caregivers reported that once lockdown commenced, they  
236 experienced feelings of helplessness as social distancing impacted their ability to provide  
237 adequate care [22].

238

239 Employment uncertainty was often reported to divert caregivers attention from caring for their  
240 relative and for some, the financial strain of the pandemic severely impacted their ability to  
241 address the basic needs of their patients. This ranged from sorting ambulance travel to providing  
242 necessities such as nutritious food; worsening feeling of guilt [22]. There was also expression of  
243 the difficulty arising from not being able to find clear information about COVID-19 and its  
244 potential impact on already vulnerable cancer patients [22].

245

## 246 **(VII) Developing resilience and coping mechanisms**

247 Patient and/or carer strategies to developing resilience and coping mechanisms were  
248 described by five studies [19, 28, 35, 29, 33]. For example, in one paediatric hospital based  
249 study, patients reported that together with their families that they altered their attitudes of  
250 nervousness and fear in order to regain control of living with the virus. They also developed  
251 strategies to deal with the anxiety associated with COVID-19 and cancer, and adapted  
252 themselves to live accordingly [29]. In two further studies, patients emphasised their  
253 appreciation for everyday life and reported feeling content as a result of lockdown [28, 33]. The  
254 lockdown offered them the time to reflect positively and focus on the 'silver lining' with many  
255 reporting that the daily overload they had experienced from external stimuli prior to the  
256 pandemic, had finally migrated. This created a sense of peace which seemed to ease their  
257 worries [28]. Several patients also described how the nature of their condition meant that they  
258 often spent a lot of time indoors however, with everyone being confined to their homes, they no  
259 longer felt isolated and so this reinstated a sense of belonging [33].

260

## 261 **Discussion**

### 262 **Discussion of key findings and implications**

263 This is the first systematic review that has explored patients and their caregivers' views,  
264 experiences and perceived impact of the pandemic on cancer screening and care. The review  
265 has identified major themes including barriers to accessing cancer screening and diagnosis;  
266 perceived risks of infection; anxiety and fear; adverse impact on personal life, family and  
267 finances, caregivers concerns and resilience and coping mechanisms adopted by patients and  
268 carers.

269 The entire landscape of cancer management has changed as a result of the COVID-19  
270 pandemic [36]. Whilst the findings from this review reinforce this, they also provide an insight into  
271 patients and carer experiences following the disruption to cancer screening and treatment. As a  
272 result of diagnostic and treatment delays, governments and health systems are expecting a  
273 surge in the number of avoidable, cancer-related deaths [37]. Participants in the included studies

274 of this review expressed concerns surrounding incomplete treatment, complications associated  
275 with contracting COVID-19 and changes to their psychological and emotional wellbeing. The  
276 suspension of cancer screening, cancellation of routine oncology appointments and  
277 postponement of treatment have each been associated with increased feelings of stress and  
278 anxiety; suggesting that there is a critical gap in disaster preparedness [38]. Consequently,  
279 vulnerable patients are left at greater risk of poor cancer outcomes with additional implications  
280 for mental health, symptom control and quality of life.

281 Perceived risk of infection, anxiety and fear when using cancer services was identified as a  
282 common theme. Such theme was prominent in studies conducted in low-and- middle income  
283 countries. For example, a study conducted in Gaza reported that prior to COVID-19, only one  
284 toilet was available for public use in the oncology department and with cancer patients  
285 expressing their fears about the lack of social distancing and, close proximity [18]. The World  
286 Health Organization (WHO) has also voiced concern about the lack of personal protective  
287 equipment (PPE), drug deficit and power supply problems [39]. The repercussions of resource  
288 availability on cancer treatment outcomes outlined above are further supported by current  
289 research which highlights the unequal impact of the Coronavirus pandemic [40] however, further  
290 in-depth review is required to explore this further.

291 Lessons learnt from this pandemic should become an integral part of oncology practice and  
292 thus ensure that there is the continuum of cancer care despite external challenges. Future  
293 pandemic preparedness is necessary in order to minimise the disruption experienced by both  
294 cancer patients and their caregivers. Efforts should firstly be placed on restoring cancer services  
295 with the prioritisation of screening, early detection and diagnosis according to patients COVID-19  
296 and cancer risk. As primary care is focal to diagnosis, it is vital that patients with symptoms are  
297 encouraged, and therefore feel comfortable with seeking medical help and are assessed in a  
298 timely manner [41]. Remote consulting comes with many communication challenges for example,  
299 'missed cues.' These would normally be more apparent in face-to-face consultations.

300 Introducing innovations such as triage tests for patients reporting a specific set of symptoms  
301 may help to address such communication challenges and ensure that prompt referrals are made  
302 [41]. The consequent delay of treatment due to COVID-related measures should be considered

303 on an individual, case by case basis for each patient; ensuring that critical patients receive  
304 adequate therapy. Alongside this, the public health implications of potentially delaying treatment  
305 versus COVID-19 prevention should be assessed and seemingly a balance is required.

306 Internationally, the professional cancer societies including The American Society of Clinical  
307 Oncology (ASCO) have produced guidance in relation to safe provision and continuity of cancer  
308 care during the pandemic [42,43]. While these guidance advocate greater flexibility and  
309 alternative treatment options to suit patient circumstances, the impact on personal, psychological  
310 and financial wellbeing on patients need to be considered. Patient centred communications from  
311 health service providers to address patient fears of contracting the virus while on treatment and  
312 reluctance to use health services are essential.

313 Throughout the pandemic, it is necessary to evaluate detection rates, treatment uptake and  
314 outcomes so that valid pre-pandemic comparisons can be made. It is also imperative to consider  
315 healthcare professionals' and wider stakeholders' experiences of delivering cancer services.

316

### 317 **Strengths and limitations**

318 Although we adopted rigorous and systematic approach to conducting the review, our study  
319 has some limitations. As the coronavirus pandemic is such a recent and rapidly advancing area  
320 of research, the date of coverage was very limited i.e. one year. As this is an international  
321 systematic review, data has been synthesised from a range of countries. However, healthcare  
322 systems can vary considerably and so caution should be exercised when considering the  
323 generalisability of the findings.

324

### 325 **Conclusion**

326 This systematic review suggests that globally, postponement and delays in the cancer  
327 screening and treatment, drug shortages and inadequate nursing care were commonly  
328 experienced these contributed to anxiety and fear amongst patients and carers. Hospital  
329 closures, lockdowns and patient reluctance to use services contributed to the treatment delays  
330 and cancellations. Patients had to undergo treatment or experience cancer journey on their own  
331 due to infection measures in treatment centres and shielding at home. Caregivers were reported

332 to be anxious about infecting cancer patients and financial concerns due to COVID-19 affected  
333 their ability to care. There is a need for sustained effort in continuation of essential cancer care  
334 services during the time of the pandemic. Clear communication from cancer services alongside  
335 activation of patient outreach services is imperative. Future research and service models should  
336 incorporate patient and caregiver views identified from this study.

337

### 338 **Declarations**

#### 339 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

340 Not applicable

#### 341 **Consent for publication**

342 Not applicable

#### 343 **Availability of data and materials**

344 The data underlying this article are available in the article and supplementary materials  
345 submitted with the manuscript.

#### 346 **Competing interests**

347 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

#### 348 **Funding**

349 This study received no external funding.

#### 350 **Authors' contributions**

351 VP was the principal investigator of the study and SD was the lead researcher. VP and DS  
352 originated the study idea. VP, MAH and SD conducted the literature search. EC and DS provided  
353 expert input into quality assessment, data extraction and analysis. SD undertook data extraction  
354 and quality assessment, VP undertook duplicate, independent assessment and quality checks.  
355 SD produced the first draft of the manuscript to which all authors contributed with expert input  
356 and comments. All authors agree to the final version of the manuscript.

357

#### 358 **Acknowledgements**

359 We would like to thank the University of Birmingham Library services for their support in the  
360 search process.

361  
362

## 363 References

- 364 1. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. Coronaviruses. [https://www.niaid.nih.gov/diseases-](https://www.niaid.nih.gov/diseases-conditions/coronaviruses)  
365 conditions/coronaviruses. Accessed October 10, 2020.
- 366 2. Maringe C, Spicer J, Morris M, Purushotham A, Nolte E, Sullivan R, Rachet B, Aggarwal A. The impact of the  
367 COVID-19 pandemic on cancer deaths due to delays in diagnosis in England, UK: a national, population-based,  
368 modelling study. *The Lancet Oncology*. 2020;1;21(8):1023-34.
- 369 3. Zhang H, Han H, He T, et al. Clinical characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19-infected cancer patients: A  
370 systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2020. doi: 10.1093/jnci/djaa168.
- 371 4. Patt D, Gordan L, Diaz M, Okon T, Grady L, Harmison M, Markward N, Sullivan M, Peng J, Zhou A. Impact of  
372 COVID-19 on Cancer Care: How the Pandemic Is Delaying Cancer Diagnosis and Treatment for American  
373 Seniors. *JCO clinical cancer informatics*. 2020 Nov;4:1059-71.
- 374 5. Cancer Research UK. Over 2 million people waiting for cancer screening, tests and treatments.  
375 [https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/about-us/cancer-news/press-release/2020-06-01-over-2-million-people-in-](https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/about-us/cancer-news/press-release/2020-06-01-over-2-million-people-in-backlog-for-cancer-care)  
376 backlog-for-cancer-care. Accessed October 12, 2020.
- 377 6. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7417808/#bib10>
- 378 7. Neal RD, Tharmanathan P, France B. Is increased time to diagnosis and treatment in symptomatic cancer  
379 associated with poorer outcomes? Systematic review. *Br J Cancer*. 2015;112(suppl 1):S92-S107.
- 380 8. Burki TK. Cancer guidelines during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet Oncol*. 2020 May 1;21(5):629-30.
- 381 9. Yorkshire Evening Post. Leeds mum diagnosed with stage four cancer months after screening was cancelled  
382 due to Covid. [https://www.yorkshireeveningpost.co.uk/health/leeds-mum-diagnosed-stage-four-cancer-months-](https://www.yorkshireeveningpost.co.uk/health/leeds-mum-diagnosed-stage-four-cancer-months-after-screening-was-cancelled-due-covid-3038701)  
383 after-screening-was-cancelled-due-covid-3038701. Accessed October 20, 2020.
- 384 10. Macmillan Cancer Support. 'The forgotten 'C'? The impact of COVID-19 on cancer care.  
385 <https://www.macmillan.org.uk/assets/forgotten-c-impact-of-covid-19-on-cancer-care.pdf>. Accessed October 23,  
386 2020.
- 387 11. Hartman HE, Sun Y, Devasia TP, et al. Integrated survival estimates for cancer treatment delay among adults  
388 with cancer during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA Oncol*. 2020;6(12):1881-1889.
- 389 12. Helena Carreira, Helen Strongman, Maria Peppia, et al. Prevalence of COVID-19-related risk factors and risk  
390 of severe influenza outcomes in cancer survivors: A matched cohort study using linked english electronic health  
391 records data. *eClinicalMedicine*. 2020;29:100656. doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100656.
- 392 13. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Prisma Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews  
393 and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS medicine*. 2009 Jul 21;6(7):e1000097.
- 394 14. Lucas PJ, Baird J, Arai L, Law C, Roberts HM. Worked examples of alternative methods for the synthesis of  
395 qualitative and quantitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Method*. 2007;7(1):1-7.
- 396 15. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Critical appraisal skills programme (CASP) checklists. [https://casp-](https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/)  
397 uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/. Accessed October 15, 2020.
- 398 16. National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute. Quality assessment tool for observational cohort and cross-  
399 sectional studies. <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools>. Accessed November  
400 05, 2020.
- 401 17. AlShahrani M, Elyamany G, Sedik Q, et al. The impact of COVID-19 pandemic in children with cancer: A  
402 report from Saudi Arabia. *SAGE Open*. 2020. doi: 10.1177/1178632920984161
- 403 18. AlWaheidi S, Sullivan R, Davies EA. Additional challenges faced by cancer patients in Gaza due to COVID-  
404 19. *eCancer Medical Science*. 2020;14:ed100. doi: 10.3332/ecancer.20202.ed.100.
- 405 19. Casanova M, Pagani Bagliacca E, Silva M, et al. How young patients with cancer perceive the COVID-19  
406 (coronavirus) epidemic in Milan, Italy: Is there room for other fears? *Pediatr blood & cancer*. 2020;67(7):e28318.  
407 doi: 10.1002/pbc.28318.)
- 408 20. de Joode K, Dumoulin DW, Engelen V, et al. Impact of the Coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic on cancer  
409 treatment: The patients' perspective. *Eur J Cancer*. 2020;136:132-139. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2020.06.019.
- 410 21. Desideri I, Ciccone PL, Stocchi G, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on patient-doctor interaction in a complex  
411 radiation therapy facility. *Support Care in Cancer*. 2020: 1-7. doi: 10.1007/s00520-020-05793-3.
- 412 22. Dhavale P, Koparkar A, Fernandes P. Palliative care interventions from a social work perspective and the  
413 challenges faced by patients and caregivers during COVID-19. *Indian J Palliat Care*. 2020;26(5):58-62.
- 414 23. Falcone R, Grani G, Ramundo V, et al. Cancer care during COVID-19 era: The quality of life of patients with  
415 thyroid malignancies. *Front Oncol*. 2020. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2020.01128.24. Frey 2020 (United States)(20)
- 416 25. Ghosh J, Ganguly S, Mondal D, Pandey P, Dabkara D, Biswas B. Perspective of oncology patients during  
417 COVID-19 pandemic: A prospective observational study from India. *J Glob Oncol*. 2020;6(6):844-851.
- 418 26. Greco F, Altieri VM, Esperto F, Mironi V, Scarpa RM. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on health-related  
419 quality of life in uro-oncologic patients: What should we wait for? *Clin Genitourin Cancer* 2020.  
420 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clgc.2020.07.008>
- 421 27. Guven DC, Sahin TK, Aktepe OH, Yildirim HC, Aksoy S, Kilickap S. Perspectives, knowledge, and fears of  
422 cancer patients about COVID-19. *Front Oncol*. 2020;10:1553. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2020.01553.
- 423 28. Hyland KA, Jim HSL. Behavioural and psychosocial responses of people receiving treatment for advanced  
424 lung cancer during the COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative analysis. *Psycho-Oncology*. 2020;29(9):1387-1392.
- 425 29. Mirlashari J, Ebrahimpour F, Salisu WJ. War on two fronts: Experience of children with cancer and their  
426 family during COVID-19 pandemic in Iran. *J Pediatr Nurs*. 2021;57:25-31. doi: 10.1016/j.pedn.2020.10.024.

- 427 30. Mitra M, Basu M. A study on challenges to health care delivery faced by cancer patients in India during the  
428 COVID-19 pandemic. *J Prim Care Community health*. 2020;11:1-5. doi: 10.1177/2150132720942705.
- 429 31. Papautsky EL, Hamlsh T. Patient-reported treatment delays in breast cancer care during the COVID-19  
430 pandemic. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2020;184(1):249-254.
- 431 32. Qian Y, Wu K, Xu H, et al. A survey on physical and mental distress among cancer patients during the  
432 COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China. *J Palliat Med*. 2020;23(7):888-889.
- 433 33. Schellekens MPJ, van der Lee M. Loneliness and belonging: Exploring experiences with the COVID-19  
434 pandemic in psycho-oncology. *Psycho-oncology*. 2020;29(9):1399-1401.
- 435 34. Swainston J, Chapman B, Grunfeld EA, Derakshan N. COVID-19 lockdown and its adverse impact on  
436 psychological health in breast cancer. *Front Psychol*. 2020;11:2033. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.626038.
- 437 35. Younger E, Smrke A, Lidington E, et al. Health-related quality of life and experiences of sarcoma patients  
438 during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Cancers*. 2020;12(8):2288.
- 439 36. Jones D, Neal RD, Duffy SRG, Scott SE, Whitaker KL, Brain K. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the  
440 symptomatic diagnosis of cancer: The view from primary care. *Lancet Oncol*. 2020;21(6):748-750
- 441 37. Maringe C, Spicer J, Morris M, et al. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer deaths due to delays  
442 in diagnosis in England, UK: A national, population-based, modelling study. *Lancet Oncol*. 2020;21(8):1023-  
443 1034.
- 444 38. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent. Disaster preparedness.  
445 <https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/what-we-do/disaster-and-crisis-management/disaster-preparedness/>. Accessed  
446 November 02, 2020.
- 447 39. World Health Organisation. Occupied Palestinian territory COVID-19 response plan 2020.  
448 <https://www.who.int/health-cluster/countries/occupied-palestinian-territory/occupied-palestinian-territory-covid-19-humanitarian-response-plan-april-2020.pdf?ua=1>. Accessed November 15, 2020.
- 449 40. Jazieh AR, Akbulut H, Curigliano G, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer care: A global  
450 collaborative study. *JCO Glob Oncol*. 2020;6:1428-1438. doi: 10.1200/GO.20.00351.
- 451 41. Neal RD, Nekhlyudov L, Wheatstone P, Koczwara B. Cancer care during and after the pandemic. *Br Med J*.  
452 2020;370:m2622. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m2622
- 453 42. NHS England. NHS England interim treatment options during the COVID-19 pandemic.  
454 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng161/resources/interim-treatment-change-options-during-the-covid19-pandemic-endorsed-by-nhs-england-pdf-8715724381>. Accessed December 28, 2020.
- 455 43. American Society Clinical Oncology, (ASCO). ASCO special report: A guide to cancer care delivery during  
456 the COVID-19 pandemic. <https://www.asco.org/sites/new-www.asco.org/files/content-files/2020-ASCO-Guide-Cancer-COVID19.pdf>. Accessed December 28, 2020.

460  
461  
462  
463

**Figure 1 legend: PRISMA flowchart**

**Table 1: Characteristics of qualitative studies and key results**

| Study ID & (Country)             | Study aim(s)   | Study setting           | Study design & methodology   | Participant numbers & selection   | Key findings  |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|---|---|
| Dhavale 2020 (India) (22)        | To describe the challenges faced by patients and caregivers during the lockdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic.            | Palliative care centre. | A qualitative study using an exploratory approach to review case notes followed by framework analysis. | Out of 30 patients, 9 families that had received care services during the lockdown period were invited to participate.                                | A range of challenges were faced by patients including: physical distress due to lack of availability of medicines and nursing care; emotional distress due to the interruption of cancer treatment; financial and social distress about loss of incomes, isolation; and spiritual distress due to the uncertainty of rites as well as fulfilment of last wishes. Three key themes were identified: swinging on the path of fear to adaptation, left-alone at emotional distances and care system confusion, and decreased quality of care. |
| Mirlashari 2020 (Iran) (29)      | To investigate the perspectives of children with cancer and their family in the era of the COVID-19 pandemic.            | Paediatric hospital.    | Semi-structured, telephone interviews followed by thematic analysis.                                   | 21 participants: five children, thirteen mothers, a father and three paediatric oncology nurses were selected using the purposive sampling technique. | The children expressed their concerns about being exposed to an unknown and enormous threat. They pointed out other significant concerns, such as changes in the treatment process, the lack of effective treatment, and how the disease has become so widespread.  |
| Hyland 2020 (United States) (28) | To characterise the behavioural and psychosocial responses of people with advanced lung cancer to the COVID-19 pandemic. | Cancer centre.          | Baseline questionnaire and semi-structured interview were conducted and repeated after one month.      | 15 patients.  | Several themes emerged from the data: cancer as the primary health threat, changes in oncology practice and access to cancer care, awareness of mortality and perceptions of risk, behavioural and psychosocial responses to COVID-19, sense of loss/mourning and positive reinterpretation/greater appreciation of life. All participants reported changing their behaviour in response to COVID-19.   |

|                            |  |                           |   |   |   |
|----------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| AlWaheidi 2020 (Gaza) (18) | To assess whether COVID-19 could lead to further inequity in cancer care and poorer outcomes for Palestinians with cancer. | Tertiary care setting.    | Semi-structured qualitative interviews were conducted prior to the introduction of COVID-19. The women were then followed-up in order to examine the changes in health and experiences of care. | 20 women with a breast cancer diagnosis between 2017 and 2018.  | A number of women expressed concerns about catching COVID-19 in the hospital setting. New concerns emerged about the impact of COVID-19 on treatment.   |
| Casanova 2020 (Italy) (19) | To assess the perception of risks and level of stress concerning COVID-19 amongst young patients with cancer.              | Paediatric oncology unit. | Semi-structured qualitative, online questionnaire.  | 75 patients: 25 were receiving treatment, 25 were in follow-up and had completed their treatment and 25 were healthy peers. | Whilst the majority of healthy peers did not expect to be affected by the virus, a large proportion of patients (more than those in follow-up), were worried and felt at risk of severe complications. Most responders in all three groups reported that they changed their daily habits. |

**Table 2: Characteristics of quantitative studies and key results**

| Study ID & (Country)                 | Study aim(s)   | Study setting                                   | Study design & methodology  | Participant numbers & selection   | Key findings   |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| AlShahrani 2020 (Saudi Arabia) (17)  | To assess the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on children with in terms of the medical service provided, precautionary measures implemented by the hospital cancer unit to prevent the spread of infection, the acceptance of virtual platforms and the psychological and mental impact.   | Tertiary institution within a hospital setting. | Cross-sectional observational study. Participating parents were asked to complete a booklet type survey questionnaire at the clinic visit or via a virtual platform.                                  | 204 cancer patients between 0-14 years of age diagnosed with or recently diagnosed with cancer.   | 63% of patients reported a delay in treatment received during the COVID-19 pandemic. Key reasons include hospital cancellations or procedure delays. A third of patients (30.8%) reported lack of cancer support and shortage of medications during the pandemic. Almost all were fearful of contracting the virus in healthcare settings and over 80% experienced an adverse impact on quality of life.   |
| Swainston 2020 (United Kingdom) (34) | To explore the effect of disruption to scheduled oncology services and the UK government shielding letter on emotional and cognitive vulnerability amongst a group of women affected by primary breast cancer; examine the relationship between COVID-19 related emotional vulnerability (COVID-EMV) and general anxiety, depression and perceived cognitive function. | Breast cancer unit.                             | Cross-sectional study design. Participants were asked to complete a series of online questionnaires.  | 234 women with a diagnosis of primary breast cancer were recruited through voluntary sampling using advertisements placed on support platforms. | About a third (31.6%) had been impacted by disruption to their scheduled oncology services (for example, had appointments cancelled or delivered over the phone). Disruption to scheduled oncology services had a significant main effect on women's COVID-EMV; a measure of COVID-19 related emotional vulnerability, their general anxiety and depression. Women who experienced severe disruption showed greater levels of general emotional vulnerability and COVID-EMV. |
| Desideri 2020 (Italy) (21)           | To prospectively assess patient satisfaction using patient reported measures (PREMs) about doctor-patient interaction in a high-volume radiation therapy and oncology centre during the COVID-19 pandemic.   | Radiation oncology unit.                        | A prospective monocentre study. Surveys consisting of two validated questionnaires (EORTC QLQ-C30 and FACIT-TS-G version 1) and 14 specific questions were administered to the recruited outpatients. | 125 patients.   | The average Global Health Status score (GHS) was 61.67. Emotional functioning, social and cognitive domains obtained scores of 75.48, 80.13 and 84.67, respectively. Majority of patients (89.6%) rated their treatment as good, very good or excellent. Despite stringent measures to contain the spread of COVID-19, there was a high level of cancer outpatient satisfaction.   |
| Güven et al, 2020 (Turkey) (27)      | To assess the perspectives and fears of cancer patients about COVID-19.  | Outpatient infusion chemotherapy unit.          | Questionnaire consisting of 13 multiple-choice questions.   | 250 adult cancer patients. A response rate of 78% (195/250) was achieved.   | Most patients saw treating oncologists at least once during the pandemic, mostly in hospital. Almost all patients had some degree of COVID-19 fear and more than 80% expected disruptions in cancer care.  |
| Schellekens                          | To explore experiences with the  | Mental health                                   | 12-item survey assessing  | 871 patients invited,   | The pandemic added uncertainty for many  |

|   |   |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 2020 (Netherlands) (33)                 | COVID-19 pandemic in patients or family members who sought help at a mental healthcare institute for psycho-oncology.   | institute specialising in psycho-oncology care.                             | the psychosocial burden of the COVID-19 pandemic followed by thematic analysis.   | 274 responded (233 patients and 41 family members). A response rate of 31.5% achieved.   | patients. 46% of patients feared not being able to say farewell to family and friends in case of dying from COVID-19. 36% of patients described feeling lonely which stimulated their worries regarding cancer. A large proportion of patients felt more at ease because of lockdown.   |
| Greco 2020 (Italy) (26) <sup>(17)</sup> | To investigate the health-related quality of life of uro-oncologic patients whose surgery was postponed without being rescheduled during the COVID-19 pandemic. | Tertiary-care referral hospital.  | SF-36 online questionnaire measuring eight domains.   | 50 patients (70% response rate).   | 86% of patients reported an almost intact physical function but a significant emotional alteration characterised by a prevalence of anxiety and loss of energy.   |
| Mitra 2020 (India) (30)                 | To study the challenges faced by cancer patients in India during the COVID-19 pandemic and assess the effectiveness of adopted interventions.                   | Hospital.   | Cross-sectional study. Participants completed an online pre-structured questionnaire. Data analysed using descriptive statistics. | 100 randomly selected cancer patients in different stages of treatment and follow-up. (36% response rate).   | 92% of patients reported an increase in anxiety levels. Reasons include: fear of COVID-19, fear of their inherent disease getting aggravated due to treatment delays, fear of death and fear of losing job and financial crisis for family members.   |
| Younger 2020 (United Kingdom) (35)      | To assess the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on care experiences, worry and health-related quality of life (HRQoL) in patients with sarcomas.                  | Medical oncology and radiation oncology departments at two sarcoma centres. | Cross-sectional survey.   | 350 patients. Response rate of 44%.  | Patients identified the following care modifications as a result of the pandemic: telemedicine (74%), postponement of appointments/scans (34%) and treatment (10%). Worry about COVID-19 infection was moderately high (5.8/10). Cancer-related worry, low resilient coping and uncertainty about treatment intent were associated with COVID-19 worry. |
| Ghosh 2020 (India) (25)                 | To analyse patients' willingness to continue chemotherapy during the pandemic and identify factors influencing decisions.                                       | Hospital medical oncology department.                                       | A prospective observational study. Questionnaire-based survey given to eligible patients.   | 302 patients, >18 years, undergoing systemic therapy for solid malignancies and who visited the centre during lockdown (1 <sup>st</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> April 2020). | 203 patients wanted to continue chemotherapy, 40 wanted to defer and 56 wanted the physician to decide. The worry about catching COVID-19 was high in those with controlled disease.  |

|                                     |   |   |  |  |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| Qian 2020 (China) (32)              | To explore the intensity of physical and mental distress among cancer patients during the epidemic.                     | Hospital radiation oncology department. | 53 question survey assessing patient's perception of the impact of COVID-19 using the Edmonton Symptom Assessment Scale (ESAS) and the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS). | 129 confirmed cancer patients. Response rate of 64.5%.                                       | All symptoms assessment scores on ESAS were mild except financial distress. The majority of patients expressed fear of becoming infected themselves (85%) or their family member (91%). 127 participants reported that their life was affected by COVID-19 and 91 reported they needed mental health support. |
| Frey 2020 (United States) (24)      | To evaluate the experience of women with Ovarian cancer during the Coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic.                   | Oncology department.                    | Online survey focussing on treatment interruptions and quality of life.  | 603 women with current or previous diagnosis of cancer. 92% response rate.                   | 175 participants experienced a delay in some component of their cancer care. 133 participants had a delayed physician appointment. 285 participants reported borderline anxiety and 147 reported borderline depression.   |
| Papautsky 2020 (United States) (31) | To assess healthcare needs of breast cancer patients requiring access to crucial services during the COVID-19 pandemic. | Oncology department.                    | 50-item survey.  | 609 adult breast cancer survivors. Snowball sampling technique used to recruit participants. | 44% of participants reported cancer treatment delays. 30% of respondents reported delays in hospital or clinic-based cancer therapies.  |
| De Joode 2020 (Netherlands) (20)    | To assess the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on patients with cancer and the consequences for their treatment.         | Hospital.                               | Online survey consisting of 20 questions on four topics: patients' characteristics, contact with the hospital, consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic and concerns about COVID-19.    | 5302 patients with cancer.   | 30% of patients reported consequences for their oncological treatment or follow-up. In most cases, this resulted in conversion from hospital visits to consultation by video or phone. Chemotherapy (30%) and immunotherapy (32%) were most frequently adjusted.  |
| Falcone 2020 (Italy) (23)           | To explore the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on emotional well-being and quality of life of cancer patients.          | Thyroid cancer centre.                  | Two online questionnaires: a 21-item questionnaire and EORTC QLQ-C30 questionnaire.  | 137 patients. Response rates were 51% and 44.5% for each questionnaire respectively.         | The median COVID-19 concern score was 8/12. Most responders reported being satisfied with the support they had received from health-care professionals since the start of the pandemic.   |

**Table 3: Emerging categories and themes from thematic synthesis**

| <b>Categories</b>   | <b>Themes</b>  |
|---|--|
| <b>I. Experiences of accessing cancer screening and diagnosis.</b>      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oncology appointment cancellations.</li> <li>• Reductions in referrals.</li> <li>• Screening non-attendance.</li> <li>• Delays in diagnosis.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>II. Experiences of accessing cancer treatment and care services.</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Postponement/delays to treatment schedules.</li> <li>• Medicine shortages.</li> <li>• Not allowing visitors in hospitals.</li> <li>• Changes to the prioritisation of care.</li> <li>• Cancellations of psychological counselling sessions.</li> <li>• Changes to nursing practices.</li> </ul>                     |
| <b>III. Communication in relation to cancer care.</b>                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Views and experiences of remote consultations.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>IV. Perceived risks of infection, anxiety and fear.</b>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fear of self and family members contracting the virus.</li> <li>• Fear of incomplete cancer treatment.</li> <li>• Concerns about contracting COVID-19 and the associated consequences.</li> <li>• Depression and changes in cognitive and emotional functioning.</li> <li>• Government shielding letter.</li> </ul> |
| <b>V. Adverse impact on personal life, family and finances.</b>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consequences of quarantine.</li> <li>• Feelings of loneliness and isolation.</li> <li>• Disruption to work-life.</li> <li>• Fulfilment of end of life wishes.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>VI. Caregivers specific concerns.</b>                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stressful aspects of care giving during a pandemic.</li> <li>• Grieving the loss of a relative.</li> <li>• Caregivers own health concerns.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>VII. Resilience and coping mechanisms</b>                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feelings of peace and belonging.</li> <li>• Greater appreciation of life.</li> <li>• Time to develop resilient coping mechanisms.</li> </ul>  |

Figure 1: PRISMA flowchart

