

Understanding diagnostic delay for endometriosis: a scoping review

Ms Jodie Fryer^a

Dr Amanda J. Mason-Jones^b

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4292-3183>

Dr Amie Woodward^c

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9579-4012>

^a North Yorkshire County Council, Harrogate, UK.

^b Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK.

^c Institute for Health and Care Improvement, York St John University, UK.

Corresponding author: amanda.mason-jones@york.ac.uk

Room 233, Seebohm Rowntree Building, Department of Health Sciences, University of

York, Heslington, YO10 5DD, UK.

Tel: +44(0)1904321290

Acknowledgements

We thank our employers for supporting this work. JF received support from Harrogate Borough Council, AMJ received support from the University of York and AW received support from York St John University.

Abstract

Introduction

Diagnostic delay for endometriosis is a well-established phenomenon. Despite this, little is known about where in the health care system these delays occur or why they occur. Our review is the first attempt to synthesise and analyse this evidence.

Methods

A systematic scoping review with a pre-specified protocol was used to incorporate the global mixed methods literature on diagnostic delay for endometriosis. Four databases (PubMed,

33 MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsychINFO) were searched from inception to September 2023 with a
34 search strategy designed specifically for each.

35 **Results**

36 The search yielded 367 studies, 22 of which met the inclusion criteria. A third of studies has
37 been published since 2020 and 65% were from high income countries. Six were qualitative
38 and 16 were quantitative studies. The average age of onset of endometriosis was 14 years
39 for adolescents and 20 for adults. On average, the diagnostic delay reported for
40 endometriosis across the included studies was 6.6 years (range 1.5 to 11.3 years) but this
41 masked the very wide differences reported between countries such as a 0.5-year delay in
42 Brazil to a 27-year delay in the UK.

43 **Discussion**

44 Health system barriers included access to private healthcare for those with limited finance,
45 physical access for those using public health systems and a general lack of knowledge
46 amongst patients and health care professionals. Women often reported feeling unheard by
47 health professionals. Considering the impact on individuals and the health system,
48 addressing diagnostic delay for endometriosis must remain a priority for researchers, health
49 care providers and policy makers.

50

51 **What is already known on this topic**

52 Endometriosis is currently difficult to diagnose. This results in delays in diagnosis which
53 negatively impacts those suffering and increases the severity of pain and extent of the
54 disease with increased costs to health systems.

55 **What this study adds**

56 The scoping review methodology included studies using a range of methods. The longest
57 average delay occurs in secondary care. Those seeking public health care experienced

58 longer average delay in diagnosis compared to those seeking private health care. Improved
59 clinical guidelines may reduce diagnostic delay.

60 **How this study might affect research, practice or policy**

61 This is the first known review to explore diagnostic delay for endometriosis and provides an
62 overview of the current literature. Clearer definitions of diagnostic delay for endometriosis
63 are needed to aid in comparisons across countries. Improving education, tracking outcomes
64 through medical records and developing non-invasive diagnostic tools will be crucial to
65 improve women's health.

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79 Introduction

80 Endometriosis is an oestrogen dependent gynaecological condition characterised by the
 81 presence of active endometrial tissue lying outside of the uterus, typically in the pelvic region
 82 (1). It is a chronic, progressive inflammatory disease which affects more than 170 million
 83 women worldwide (2). Endometriosis mainly affects women of reproductive age (15-49
 84 years), with up to 1 in 10 believed to have the condition, although it is estimated that as
 85 many as 60% of endometriosis cases remain undiagnosed (2, 3). Prevalence estimates of
 86 endometriosis are generally poor and highly varied, ranging from 4% to 50%; however the
 87 most consistent estimates suggest prevalence ranging from 6-10% (4). Despite the
 88 progressive nature of endometriosis, a correct diagnosis takes an average of 10 years and
 89 at least 7 visits to a health practitioner (5, 6). This lengthy delay is reflected in the disease
 90 burden in which gynaecological diseases are reported as the leading cause of Disability
 91 Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) and Years Lived with Disability (YLD) among the 15-49-year
 92 age group (7). This is despite clear clinical diagnostic indicators including chronic pelvic pain
 93 (CPP), dysmenorrhea (painful, heavy menstruation), dyspareunia (painful intercourse), that
 94 are known for 82.9% of women (1, 8). Apart from the YLD the economic impact includes
 95 increased costs to the individual, to healthcare providers, and to the wider economic
 96 infrastructure (9). The current 'gold standard' for diagnosis is a laparoscopy, although
 97 surgeons may be hesitant to perform this due to the invasive nature of the procedure (8, 10).
 98 There is also evidence that symptoms may be dismissed as 'normal' by health care
 99 practitioners (1, 11).

100
 101 The aim of this review was to explore the delay faced by those attempting to obtain a
 102 diagnosis of endometriosis and appropriate treatment.

103 Methods

105 The study protocol was registered on the Open Science Framework OSF:
 106 [10.31219/osf.io/yzuvb](https://osf.io/yzuvb)

Patient and public involvement

Women who have experienced diagnostic delay for endometriosis were involved in designing the research. The research question was informed by their priorities, experiences and preferences. Dissemination of this research will be facilitated through charities focussed on endometriosis.

Data sources and search strategy

Development of the search strategy was guided by the SPIDER framework to ensure key concepts were captured in searches. Four databases were searched between from inception to September 2023. They included PubMed, MEDLINE, EMBASE and PsycINFO. No date limits were set on the searches. Search terms included key terms derived from search strings relating to 'endometriosis' and 'diagnostic delay' and were adapted for each database; For example, the search strategy for MEDLINE was: 'Endometriosis.mp. or (exp Pelvic Pain/ or exp Chronic Pain/)) and exp Delayed Diagnosis/'.

Eligibility criteria

Included studies were primary research in English involving the pelvic region or reproductive organs only, that mentioned pelvic pain with a suspicion of endometriosis, and diagnostic delay (in the context of endometriosis).

Screening and data extraction

All studies were screened by one reviewer (JF) with a 10 percent sample checked by a second reviewer (MS) and any disagreements resolved by a third reviewer (AW/AMJ).

Data were extracted on a predeveloped and piloted data extraction form and included study characteristics, methods and design, and demographic characteristics of the population. Additionally, the most frequently reported symptoms, length of and reason for delay were recorded.

Analysis

Studies were grouped by themes that emerged from the individual included studies (12) and contextualised to form a public policy perspective using the socio-ecological model (13).

Results

Selection of studies

The searches yielded 367 studies following deduplication. Title and abstract screening, and full-text screening resulted in 23 studies that met the inclusion criteria (see figure 1).

[Figure 1]

No formal quality appraisal was undertaken in line with methodological guidance for scoping reviews (14).

Study characteristics

Table 1 provides an overview of the included studies and highlights the diversity of methods used. Six were qualitative and 16 were quantitative studies. Almost a third of studies (8/22) were published relatively recently (since 2020) from a range of countries. Fifteen were conducted in high income countries including the UK (15, 16), US (17-21), Netherlands (22, 23), Norway (24, 25), Canada (26), Australia (27), New Zealand (28), and Italy (29). Three were conducted in middle income countries; Brazil (30, 31) and Iran (32) and four were conducted in multiple countries (33-36). The average age of participants across the studies was 32.7 but the age range of participants was between 12 and 74 years old.

Age of onset of endometriosis

The mean age at onset of endometriosis symptoms was 14.1 years old for adolescents (range 13-15.3 years), and 20.4 years old for adults (range 20-23.2 years). The average age at diagnosis was 16 for adolescents and 28.8 for adults (range 22-32). Average age of first GP visit was 14 for adolescents and 25.8 years for adults (range 20-32.6).

[Table 1]

Diagnostic delay

The definition of diagnostic delay was consistent across studies and was defined as the time between symptom onset and diagnosis. The average diagnostic delay was 6.6 years with an average of 1.5 years in Australia (27) and 11.3 years in the US (18). However, there was a wide range between the shortest and longest delay reported. The shortest delay was 0.5 years in Brazil (30), and the longest delay was 27 years in the UK (15). Though the range was wider than previously reported by other studies i.e. 3.3 - 11.7 years, the average diagnostic delay was consistent with their finding of 6.7 years (35). Some studies reported specific points at which delays occurred, these were from symptom onset to primary care consultation (15, 17-19, 21-23, 25, 26, 28, 33), referral for gynaecology consultation (15, 16, 22, 23, 33), and gynaecology referral to diagnosis (15, 16, 22, 23, 33). Mean delays through this pathway reported across the studies were 2.0 years, 2.5 years, and 2.8 years respectively. Time from primary care presentation to diagnosis was reported by some studies without mention of transition to secondary care (16, 19, 21, 25, 26). The average diagnostic delay between primary care presentation and diagnosis was 2.9 years (see figure 2).

[Figure 2]

Reasons for delay

Most studies focussed on the patients' perspective, two studies focussed on the health care provider (HCP) perspective, and one included both perspectives. There were 6 main themes that emerged. A summary of these can be seen in table 2.

[Table 2]

Access to care differed depending on the specific health system in place. While financial barriers were more prominent for those seeking private healthcare, physical access to care was more frequently noted for those seeking public healthcare services. Only one study compared wait times between those seeking public healthcare and insurance or self-funded

healthcare (35). They found that wait times for endometriosis care were significantly longer for those seeking public rather than private healthcare (8.3 years vs. 5.5 years).

Both HCPs and patients shared similar views on the reasons for diagnostic delay although they expressed the delays differently. Where HCP thought frequently presenting patients were somatising, patients stated they presented frequently because they felt unheard by HCPs. This was reflected by the number of doctors seen, which averaged 2.0 for adolescents (19) and 4.1 for adults (range 2.5-7) (19, 26, 28, 33, 35) and the number of times symptoms were discussed before diagnosis, with more than a quarter of women saying they discussed symptoms more than 20 times (34). Interestingly, none of the studies evaluated the number of consultations prior to referral, nor the effect of diagnostic delay qualitatively or quantitatively based on the type (doctor, nurse, etc.) or gender of the HCP.

The emerging themes identified increased diagnostic delay at each point along the diagnostic pathway, from symptom onset to diagnosis. This resulted in prolonging diagnosis which led to increases in both the severity of pain and the extent of disease (20, 21) (see figure 3). Both patients and HCPs appeared to demonstrate an overall lack of understanding and education about endometriosis.

[Figure 3]

Diagnostic delay: evidence of delays being addressed

Overall, four studies reported interventions implemented to tackle diagnostic delay. Of these, two studies reported reduced time to diagnosis following the introduction of clinical guidelines (27, 28) and one study that found diagnostic delays were reduced by the introduction of specialist endometriosis centres in the US, but not in the UK (16). Only one study quantified the reduction in delay (8.4 years), while the others reported a 'downward trend' in diagnostic delays (16, 27, 28). Becoming a member of an endometriosis society had no effect on diagnostic delay (35).

The discrepancy in effectiveness of the introduction of specialist endometriosis centres may be due to differences in health care systems including access to care, service use, service cost, referral pathways and diagnostic guidelines.

A range of interventions to reduce diagnostic delay for endometriosis were suggested including education and awareness campaigns, collaboration, and multidisciplinary working between HCPs, promoting health-seeking behaviour for patients, the use of screening tools, increased research into endometriosis, improving access to medical records, clinical guidelines written in the native language, the use of reliable diagnostic indicators and early intervention.

[Figure 4]

The interventions suggested span the entirety of the socio-ecological framework (see figure 5). This multi-level approach to intervention allows for the introduction of all encompassing, yet targeted and effective interventions tailored according to individual factors and behaviours (13) and the wider health care system. Using this framework for diagnostic delay in endometriosis is useful to visualise the complexity involved whilst providing a range of options for intervention.

[Figure 5]

The breadth of interventions identified was aided by the diversity of participants included in the studies and was enhanced by the inclusion of views from a range of HCPs (17, 24, 32).

Discussion

Diagnostic delay associated with endometriosis is a well-established phenomenon. Prior to our review it was not clear where in the health care system these delays occurred or why they occurred. Our review is the first attempt to synthesise and analyse this evidence. On average, the diagnostic delay for endometriosis was 6.6 years across the studies and ranged from 1.5 years to 11.3 years. Delays were identified at all stages from symptom

onset to receiving a diagnosis. The longest average delay was the time from gynaecology referral to diagnosis (2.8 years), followed by primary care presentation to diagnosis (2.5 years), and finally, from symptom onset to primary care presentation (2.0 years). Only 2 studies used a CPP comparator group, while 2 used healthy controls, no other studies used a comparator or control, and none provided information on women with negative findings at laparoscopy.

We acknowledge the limitation of the scoping review methodology. The exclusion criteria meant that some papers were not included, such as those focussing on specific biomarkers. All included studies relied on patients recalling the start of their symptoms rather than tracking patients throughout their diagnostic journey or using medical records for verification which could reduce recall bias. The strength of our study was a clear focus following a pre-published protocol, including a wide range of papers from all over the world and locating the problem within the socio-ecological framework.

An area in critical need of further research is closer tracking of patients throughout their diagnostic journey. This should include the time from presentation to diagnosis, including cases where patients have met all criteria to be considered for surgery but do not have endometriosis, what their differential diagnoses are and what the differences are between women with a positive and negative laparoscopy. This may be improved by using reporting endometriosis as a differential diagnosis earlier along the diagnostic journey, and by ensuring primary and secondary care are better connected so the diagnostic journey can be properly followed. Additionally, it may be useful to have the details of the HCP available and their role e.g. primary care practitioner, gynaecologist, and their gender, age, and length of service, all of which may affect diagnostic delay.

The definition and calculation of diagnostic delay is also an area that requires urgent attention. Rather than studies describing the time from symptom onset to diagnosis, the current definition of diagnostic delay used across studies, it would be more beneficial to determine *excess delay*. This could provide regional and national estimates of the true diagnostic delay or excess delay based on regional and national average wait times for primary care appointments, referral to gynaecology, and for surgery. This measure could allow direct comparisons of care and delays between public and private provision of services for endometriosis care.

Secondly, the length of delay matters in terms of cost and severity for women and the wider health system. Accurate calculation of diagnostic delay for endometriosis may be the first step to improving guidelines, diagnostic measures, and diagnosis more broadly. Additionally, it is important to establish and address barriers to diagnosis. More investigation is needed on the effect of diagnostic delay to determine the cost-benefit of reducing diagnostic delay (37).

Though there remains much to be done, the results of this study can provide a platform for further future research to prevent the unnecessary and extended suffering resulting from diagnostic delays of endometriosis. The socio-ecological framework can be used to assess where improved policies may be effective, how widespread the effects might be and to provide a benchmark for their perceived benefit (financial and otherwise). Further research studies would benefit from utilising medical records to track the number of consultations, range of HCPs, and time elapsed from initial referral to a final diagnosis and treatment. Our review provides a starting point for others to improve our understanding of where changes need to be made to reduce the delay in diagnosis of endometriosis.

References

1. Olšarová K, Mishra GD. Early life factors for endometriosis: a systematic review. Hum Reprod Update. 2020;26(3):412-22.

2. Della Corte L, Di Filippo C, Gabrielli O, Reppuccia S, La Rosa VL, Ragusa R, et al. The Burden of Endometriosis on Women's Lifespan: A Narrative Overview on Quality of Life and Psychosocial Wellbeing. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(13).
3. Agarwal SK, Chapron C, Giudice LC, Laufer MR, Leyland N, Missmer SA, et al. Clinical diagnosis of endometriosis: a call to action. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2019;220(4):354.e1-.e12.
4. Zhang S, Gong TT, Wang HY, Zhao YH, Wu QJ. Global, regional, and national endometriosis trends from 1990 to 2017. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2021;1484(1):90-101.
5. Bach AM, Risoer MB, Forman A, Seibaek L. Practices and Attitudes Concerning Endometriosis Among Nurses Specializing in Gynecology. *Glob Qual Nurs Res*. 2016;3:2333393616651351.
6. Eisenberg VH, Decter DH, Chodick G, Shalev V, Weil C. Burden of Endometriosis: Infertility, Comorbidities, and Healthcare Resource Utilization. *J Clin Med*. 2022;11(4).
7. GBD Compare. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. [Available from: <http://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare>.
8. Becker K, Heinemann K, Imthurn B, Marions L, Moehner S, Gerlinger C, et al. Real world data on symptomology and diagnostic approaches of 27,840 women living with endometriosis. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):20404.
9. Surrey E, Soliman AM, Trenz H, Blauer-Peterson C, Sluis A. Impact of Endometriosis Diagnostic Delays on Healthcare Resource Utilization and Costs. *Adv Ther*. 2020;37(3):1087-99.
10. NICE. Recommendations | Endometriosis: diagnosis and management 2017 [Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng73/chapter/Recommendations>.
11. Bullo S. "I feel like I'm being stabbed by a thousand tiny men": The challenges of communicating endometriosis pain. *Health (London)*. 2020;24(5):476-92.
12. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 2006;3(2):77-101.

13. Lee BC, Bendixsen C, Liebman AK, Gallagher SS. Using the Socio-Ecological Model to Frame Agricultural Safety and Health Interventions. *J Agromedicine*. 2017;22(4):298-303.
14. Grant MJ, Booth A. A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Info Libr J*. 2009;26(2):91-108.
15. Ballard K, Lowton K, Wright J. What's the delay? A qualitative study of women's experiences of reaching a diagnosis of endometriosis. *Fertil Steril*. 2006;86(5):1296-301.
16. Ghai V, Jan H, Shakir F, Haines P, Kent A. Diagnostic delay for superficial and deep endometriosis in the United Kingdom. *J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2020;40(1):83-9.
17. As-Sanie S, Black R, Giudice LC, Gray Valbrun T, Gupta J, Jones B, et al. Assessing research gaps and unmet needs in endometriosis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2019;221(2):86-94.
18. DiBenedetti DB, Soliman AM, Ervin C, Evans E, Coddington CC, Agarwal SK, et al. Development of the Painful Periods Screening Tool for endometriosis. *Postgrad Med*. 2018;130(8):694-702.
19. DiVasta AD, Vitonis AF, Laufer MR, Missmer SA. Spectrum of symptoms in women diagnosed with endometriosis during adolescence vs adulthood. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2018;218(3):324.e1-.e11.
20. Dmowski WP, Lesniewicz R, Rana N, Pepping P, Noursalehi M. Changing trends in the diagnosis of endometriosis: a comparative study of women with pelvic endometriosis presenting with chronic pelvic pain or infertility. *Fertil Steril*. 1997;67(2):238-43.
21. Soliman AM, Fuldeore M, Snabes MC. Factors Associated with Time to Endometriosis Diagnosis in the United States. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)*. 2017;26(7):788-97.
22. Staal AH, van der Zanden M, Nap AW. Diagnostic Delay of Endometriosis in the Netherlands. *Gynecol Obstet Invest*. 2016;81(4):321-4.
23. van der Zanden M, de Kok L, Nelen WLDM, Braat DDM, Nap AW. Strengths and weaknesses in the diagnostic process of endometriosis from the patients' perspective: a focus group study. *Diagnosis (Berl)*. 2021;8(3):333-9.

24. Fernandes A, Skotnes LL, Major M, Falcão PF. Clinicians' Perceptions of Norwegian Women's Experiences of Infertility Diseases. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(3).
25. Husby GK, Haugen RS, Moen MH. Diagnostic delay in women with pain and endometriosis. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2003;82(7):649-53.
26. Singh S, Soliman AM, Rahal Y, Robert C, Defoy I, Nisbet P, et al. Prevalence, Symptomatic Burden, and Diagnosis of Endometriosis in Canada: Cross-Sectional Survey of 30 000 Women. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can*. 2020;42(7):829-38.
27. Armour M, Sinclair J, Ng CHM, Hyman MS, Lawson K, Smith CA, et al. Endometriosis and chronic pelvic pain have similar impact on women, but time to diagnosis is decreasing: an Australian survey. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10(1):16253.
28. Tewhaiti-Smith J, Semprini A, Bush D, Anderson A, Eathorne A, Johnson N, et al. An Aotearoa New Zealand survey of the impact and diagnostic delay for endometriosis and chronic pelvic pain. *Sci Rep*. 2022;12(1):4425.
29. Lukic A, Di Properzio M, De Carlo S, Nobili F, Schimberni M, Bianchi P, et al. Quality of sex life in endometriosis patients with deep dyspareunia before and after laparoscopic treatment. *Arch Gynecol Obstet*. 2016;293(3):583-90.
30. Andres MeP, Podgaec S, Carreiro KB, Baracat EC. Endometriosis is an important cause of pelvic pain in adolescence. *Rev Assoc Med Bras (1992)*. 2014;60(6):560-4.
31. Santos TM, Pereira AM, Lopes RG, Depes DeB. Lag time between onset of symptoms and diagnosis of endometriosis. *Einstein (Sao Paulo)*. 2012;10(1):39-43.
32. Riazi H, Tehranian N, Ziaei S, Mohammadi E, Hajizadeh E, Montazeri A. Patients' and physicians' descriptions of occurrence and diagnosis of endometriosis: a qualitative study from Iran. *BMC Womens Health*. 2014;14:103.
33. Hudelist G, Fritzer N, Thomas A, Niehues C, Oppelt P, Haas D, et al. Diagnostic delay for endometriosis in Austria and Germany: causes and possible consequences. *Hum Reprod*. 2012;27(12):3412-6.
34. Lamvu G, Antunez-Flores O, Orady M, Schneider B. Path to diagnosis and women's perspectives on

the impact of endometriosis pain. *Journal of Endometriosis and Pelvic Pain Disorders*. 2020;12(1):16-25.


35. Nnoaham KE, Hummelshoj L, Webster P, d'Hooghe T, de Cicco Nardone F, de Cicco Nardone C, et al. Impact of endometriosis on quality of life and work productivity: a multicenter study across ten countries. *Fertil Steril*. 2011;96(2):366-73.e8.

36. Van Niekerk L, Johnstone L, Matthewson M. Predictors of self-compassion in endometriosis: the role of psychological health and endometriosis symptom burden. *Hum Reprod*. 2022;37(2):264-73.

37. Cromeens MG, Carey ET, Robinson WR, Knafl K, Thoyre S. Timing, delays and pathways to diagnosis of endometriosis: a scoping review protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(6):e049390.

Figure 1 PRISMA flow diagram

PRISMA flow diagram



* PubMed = 204, MEDLINE = 70, EMBASE = 63, PsycINFO = 58.

406 **Table 1: Table of included studies**

First author, year, country	Study design	Participants and methods	Main finding(s)
Quantitative			
Andres, 2014, Brazil	Retrospective study	21 patients (aged 13-20) with histologically confirmed endometriosis after undergoing surgery.	Need for increased awareness of adolescent onset of endometriosis. Current imaging techniques are inadequate. Gynaecologists fail to recognise symptoms.
Armour, 2020, Australia	Cross-sectional study	409 participants (aged 18-45), 340 with endometriosis, 69 without. Recruited via survey link.	ESHRE guidelines reduced diagnostic delay from 9.9 years before 2005 to 1.5 years as of 2013 onwards. Year medical attention is sought, number of doctors seen and delayed health seeking all increase diagnostic delay.
DiVasta, 2018, United States	Cross-sectional longitudinal cohort study	670 participants (aged 12-49), 402 with self-reported endometriosis,	Need to understand changing symptom patterns and symptom base more – particularly how this may differ between an adult and

		268 controls. Recruited from 2 tertiary centres.	adolescent population. Acyclic pain appears to increase with age – potentially due to increased severity of endometriosis at surgery.
Dmowski, 1997, United States	Retrospective study	693 patients (aged 15-40), 377 with CPP symptoms, 336 infertility +/- pain. Evaluated at the Institute for the Study and Treatment of Endometriosis.	Diagnostic delays were found to be longer in women who were symptomatic earlier in life. Longer delays led to more advanced disease at laparoscopy. These findings were only significant in the pain group. Diagnostic delay steadily decreased between 1979 and 1995. Delays were longer in the pelvic pain group than the infertility group.
Ghai, 2020, United Kingdom	Retrospective cross- sectional study	101 women with surgically confirmed endometriosis recruited via written postal questionnaire.	Women often have their pain normalised and do not feel their pain is taken seriously. Misdiagnosis, menstrual cramps during adolescence, earlier symptom onset and delays between presenting with symptoms and onward referral all increased diagnostic delays. Shorter

			delays were found when women changed to a more understanding gynaecologist.
Hudelist, 2012 Austria and Germany	Cross-sectional study	171 patients (aged >18) with histologically confirmed endometriosis recruited from tertiary referral centres for diagnosis and treatment of endometriosis.	Increasing number of misdiagnoses, patient impression of not been taken seriously, normalisation of symptoms, women with cramps during adolescence, and whose mothers viewed menstruation as a negative event all experienced increased diagnostic delays. Medication use, extent of disease and main symptomatic complaint were all non-significant factors.
Husby, 2003, Norway	Cross-sectional study	261 patients with pain and endometriosis, 223 members of the Norwegian Endometriosis Association, 38 non-members.	There were no statistically significant differences in the mean diagnostic delay between 1978-2001. Delays did not differ between those with pain only and pain and infertility, additionally, there was no difference in diagnostic delay between members and non-members.

			Most of the delays were from seeing a GP to diagnosis.
Lamvu, 2020, United States, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, and the United Kingdom	Cross-sectional study	451 respondents (aged 19-60) with or without endometriosis. Recruited through 'My Endometriosis Team'.	Respondents described discussing their symptoms more than 20 times and were commonly misdiagnosed with both mental and physical conditions. About half of respondents waited over 6 years for a diagnosis while almost a quarter waited 11 or more years. Longer delay was associated with more pelvic symptoms. Many women felt doctors did not listen and that their recommendations were inconsistent with what they wanted.
Lukic, 2015, Italy	Cohort study	67 patients with deep dyspareunia diagnosed with pelvic endometriosis attending an endometriosis unit.	Women often suffer from pathology for a long time before presenting to health services. Both signs and symptoms of endometriosis need to be better recognised or women need to be clearer in describing signs and symptoms to allow diagnosis.

			Roughly two-thirds of women don't consult their GP for sexual dysfunction.
Nnoaham, 2011 (Belgium, Brazil, China, Ireland, Italy, Nigeria, United Kingdom, United States and Spain)	Multicentre cross-sectional study with prospective recruitment	1,418 premenopausal women (aged 18-45) without previous surgical diagnosis of endometriosis. 745 with endometriosis, 587 symptomatic, 86 sterilised. Recruited in hospital before surgery.	Delays were increased when state funded care was sought when compared to self-funded care or through insurance. Patients with longer delays had more pelvic symptoms and a higher Body Mass Index (BMI), even when adjusting for potential confounders. Most of the delay was due to length of time between referral from primary care to a gynaecologist. Women with endometriosis had a longer delay than symptomatic controls without endometriosis at surgery. Diagnostic delays ranged from 3.3 years to 10.7 years.
Santos, 2012, Brazil	Retrospective analytical study	262 women (aged 17-49) with surgically confirmed	Diagnostic delay differed between different age categories; however, the difference was found to be

		endometriosis. Recruited through an outpatient clinic for endometriosis and CPP.	non-significant. Women with dysmenorrhea and deep dyspareunia had a longer delay, which those with dyspareunia (not deep) and acyclic pain had a shorter delay. Women experiencing infertility experienced a longer delay than their fertile counterparts. Site and severity of disease were not significant factors.
Singh, 2020, Canada	Cross-sectional survey	2004 women (aged 18-49) were recruited via email using 3 independent survey sampling panels.	Delays in health seeking were longer than physician-related delays. On average women saw 3 different physicians before receiving a diagnosis. The odds of receiving a diagnosis of endometriosis were highest when women experienced infertility, cyclic pelvic pain or cramping, and pelvic pressure.
Soliman, 2017, United States	Cross-sectional study	683 respondents (aged 18-29) recruited from 3	Younger age at symptom onset and white ethnicity were associated with a longer diagnostic delay. Patients with

		market research panels.	constipation, bloating or diarrhoea were diagnosed sooner than those with pain during sex. Delays were also shorter among women having a diagnostic procedure, women seen by a gynaecologist and women diagnosed via non-surgical methods.
Staal, 2016, Netherlands	Retrospective cross-sectional study	47 patients (aged 14-29) diagnosed with endometriosis by surgery or MRI.	Diagnostic delay was shorter for patients who consulted their GP due to subfertility rather than pain. A longer delay from presenting to a GP to referral was experienced by patients who were a young age when they developed symptoms, misdiagnosed or their symptoms were normalised – the same delays were not experienced between referral to a gynaecologist and diagnosis.
Tewhaiti-Smith 2022, New Zealand	Cross-sectional study	800 respondents (aged 18-74),	Diagnostic delay was longer in patients with endometriosis than those experiencing CPP.

		620 with endometriosis, 180 with CPP. Recruited using social media, flyers, and through targeted dissemination.	On average women saw 4.8 doctors before they were diagnosed with endometriosis. Year of first doctors visit was negatively correlated with the number of doctors consulted suggesting health-seeking delays are reducing over time. Overall diagnostic delay was reduced by 6.5 years by the introduction of guidelines.
Van Niekerk, 2022, Australia, Oceania, United Kingdom and North America	Cross-sectional study	318 women (23 of whom with symptoms of perimenopause, 35 in medical menopause and 7 in surgical menopause). Recruited via online advertising on social media.	Longer diagnostic delays, number of endometriosis-related symptoms, depression, anxiety, pain after sexual intercourse and during urination were all negative predictors of self-compassion. Women with longer diagnostic delays were found to have higher levels of endometriosis-related distress are likely to report lower levels of self-compassion and would benefit from early engagement in psychological

			interventions.
Qualitative			
As-Sanie, 2019, United States	Qualitative study – interactive discussion	Interdisciplinary group of expert researchers, clinicians, and patients put together the The Society for Women's Health Research.	Identified themes impacting diagnostic delay through guided interactive discussion. These included diagnostics, barriers to diagnosis, the future of diagnostics, treatment, barriers to treatment and the future of treatment – with several subthemes including stigma and understanding.
Ballard, 2006, United Kingdom	Qualitative, interview-based study	32 women (aged 16-47) attending a pelvic pain clinic. 28 diagnosed with endometriosis.	Delays occur at every stage of the diagnostic pathway. Delays occur at both the patient-level and medical-level, with normalisation being a common factor. Others include stigma, non-specific testing, and improper use of treatments.
DiBenedetti, 2018, United States	Qualitative cross-sectional study with an interview	16 women (aged 24-48), 11 with endometriosis and 5 healthy	A painful periods screening tool was developed to aid in the recognition of pathological symptoms of endometriosis. The tool was found have face

	element	controls. Recruited via 2 qualitative research facilities.	validity and content validity, clearly and concisely able to assess core symptoms and distinguish between normal and pathological symptoms.
Fernandes 2020, Norway	Qualitative interview- based study	13 doctors- 8 gynaecologists and 5 General Practitioners (GP's) identified via google search.	Patients attending clinic often feel embarrassed and disbelieved regarding symptoms. Doctors do not like to take responsibility for diagnosis due to not being specialised in women's health issues. Diagnosis is often delayed due to multiple misdiagnoses.
Riazi, 2014, Iran	Qualitative interview- based study	12 endometriosis patients (aged 22-37) and 6 gynaecologists	Dyspareunia was noted as one of the most important symptoms of the disease. Women's recognition of this symptom is often delayed due to delayed marriage (and so delayed intercourse). Beliefs around dysmenorrhoea being normal and common during virginity also delay diagnosis. From a medical viewpoint, unreliability of diagnostic

			markers, misdiagnosis and mismanagement all increase diagnostic delay.
Van der Zanden, 2022, Netherlands	Qualitative focus group-based study	23 women (aged 29-45) placed in 6 focus groups. Recruited by social media, through a patient interest group and through a centre of expertise in endometriosis	Health-seeking behaviour is often influenced by peers, normalisation leads to delays. Non-discriminatory tests, being referred to the wrong specialist and given pain medication without proper indication for use were all attributed to diagnostic delays. Referral was faster in women with menstruation specific complaints. Not all doctors have equal knowledge and some women received incomplete examination.

Figure 2: Schematic representation of global average diagnostic delay




Table 2: The main themes and sub-themes relating to diagnostic delay

	Main theme	Contributing factors (sub-themes)
1	Access to healthcare	Physical access to care, financial barriers, stigma, embarrassment, not being aware of endometriosis, religious beliefs, and normalisation of symptoms.
2	Knowledge limitations	Poor recognition of symptoms (patients and HCP), HCP thinking endometriosis is a 'rare' disease, inability to define between normal and pathological symptoms (patients and HCP), lack of awareness and lack of training and evidence available to HCP.
3	Misdiagnosis	Differential presentation of symptoms between women, atypical symptoms, comorbidities, communication challenges between different HCP, lack of specificity of testing, lack of definitive diagnostic testing, and use of non-definitive tests.
4	Stigmatisation	Stigma, normalisation, dismissal, patient unable to properly verbalise pain and/or symptoms causing communication challenges between patient and HCP, and lack of patient assertiveness.
5	Method of diagnosis	Hesitation to refer for more invasive, definitive tests, age, HCP uncomfortable with requirement to perform physical exam (particularly adolescents), and perceived need for surgical over clinical diagnosis in some health systems.
6	Lack of guidelines	No screening tools available, inconsistency in available PROMs and guidelines, poor interdisciplinary handling of patients, and need for involvement of multiple HCP.

457

458

459 **Figure 3: Pathways to diagnostic delay**




Figure 4: Thematic map of interactions between themes and subthemes





Figure 4: The socio-ecological model of endometriosis

How each 'theme' relates to the Socio-Ecological Model



486

487

488

489

490

491

492