

As a library, NLM provides access to scientific literature. Inclusion in an NLM database does not imply endorsement of, or agreement with, the contents by NLM or the National Institutes of Health.

Learn more: [PMC Disclaimer](#) | [PMC Copyright Notice](#)



Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention

APOCP

West Asia Organization for Cancer Prevention

Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2021 Oct;22(10):3081–3092. doi:

[10.31557/APJCP.2021.22.10.3081](https://doi.org/10.31557/APJCP.2021.22.10.3081)

Factors Affecting Delayed Presentation and Diagnosis of Breast Cancer in Asian Developing Countries Women: A Systematic Review

[Farida Briani Sobri](#)^{1,*}, [Adang Bachtiar](#)², [Sonar Soni Panigoro](#)³, [Dumilah Ayuningtyas](#)², [Hardya Gustada](#)⁴, [Patria Wardana Yuswar](#)⁵, [Aqsha Azhary Nur](#)¹, [R Cita Resti Anantia Putri](#)⁶, [Anggindita Diah Widihiyati](#)⁶

[Author information](#) [Article notes](#) [Copyright and License information](#)

PMCID: PMC8858264 PMID: [34710982](#)

Abstract

Background:

Advance in screening strategies and management had steadily

decreased the mortality rates of breast cancer. In developing countries, conducting screening and early diagnosis of breast cancers may face several problems. This systematic review aims to determine factors affecting the delayed diagnosis of breast cancer in developing countries in Asia.

Methods:

Literature research was conducted through Pubmed, ScienceDirect, Scopus, EbscoHost, Cochrane Library, and Google Scholar. The main keywords were “breast cancer”, “delayed diagnosis” and “developing countries”. Both quantitative and qualitative studies were included.

Results:

A total of 26 studies were included. The definition of delayed presentation or diagnosis varied from 1 month to 6 months. Among all the factors from patients and providers, breast symptoms and examinations consistently showed a significant contribution in reducing delayed diagnosis. Strengthened by qualitative studies, patients' knowledge and perception also had a major role in delayed diagnosis.

Conclusion:

Among Asian developing countries, breast symptoms and examination, as well as individual knowledge and perception, are the main factors related to delayed diagnosis of breast cancer.

Key Words: Asian developing countries, breast cancer, delayed diagnosis, delayed presentation, examination, knowledge

Introduction

Breast cancer is the second most common type of cancer globally, after lung cancer (Bray et al., 2018). From nearly 10 million deaths due to cancer worldwide, 6.6% are attributed to breast cancer. Significantly higher mortality-incidence ratios and lower survival rates of breast cancer in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) or developing countries have been highlighted (Panieri, 2012; da Costa Vieira et al., 2017; Rivera-Franco and Leon-Rodriguez, 2018; Francies et al., 2020).

In the last few decades, advances in screening strategies and management have steadily decreased the mortality rates of breast cancer (Kohler et al., 2015). Screening and early diagnosis hold vital roles as the best survival rates are seen in early-stage breast cancers (Richards et al., 1999). Late diagnosis leads to a longer time interval to treatment (surgery or adjuvant therapies), ultimately worsening the overall survival and recurrence rates (Bleicher et al., 2016; Eaglehouse et al., 2019).

In developing countries, conducting screening and early diagnosis may face hindrance from two main groups of factors. Patient factor groups such as socioeconomic background, family support, social stigma, and culture may influence the patients' decision to seek professional health care (Norsa'adah et al.; Iskandarsyah et al.; Poum et al.; Huo et al.; Roy et al., 2015; Kumar et al., 2019; Zhang et al.). On the other hand, affordability of service, quality of workforces and resources, compliance to available clinical guidelines in practice, and referral system are health care factors that contribute equally to patient factors (Sacerdote et al., 2013; Kumar et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2019; Ho et al., 2020; Songiso et al., 2020).

Even though multiple factors affecting delayed diagnosis in Asian developing countries have been studied, the results are heterogeneous and indecisive. Therefore, we conducted a systematic review to determine factors affecting breast cancer delayed diagnosis in Asian developing countries. We specifically chose Asia due to a common shared historical and cultural root in the region, hence avoiding overly diverse results.

Materials and Methods

Search strategy and selection criteria

This study followed MOOSE guidelines for Meta-Analyses and Systematic Reviews of Observational Studies. Literature reviews were done by multiple investigators (FB, RCRA, HG, and ADW). These reviews were conducted until November 14, 2020, on six electronic databases: Pubmed, ScienceDirect, Scopus, EbscoHost, Cochrane Library, and Google Scholar. Principally, the main keywords used were, “breast cancer”, “delayed diagnosis”, and “developing countries” (complete search strategies are listed in Supplementary Table 1). The literature that was included was in English and Indonesian languages. We also conducted manual searches for articles that were found during literature reviews. Unpublished studies or conference abstracts were not included in the search.

Selection of studies

Both quantitative and qualitative studies were included. Eligible studies that were included in this systematic review were based on the following: population, intervention, comparison, and outcome (PICO) criteria. The defined population was women over the age of 18 with breast cancer, who lived in Asian developing countries.

Interventions were defined as risk factors (naturally existing conditions). The comparison was no risk factors. The outcome was the stage of cancer (locally advanced/advanced stage vs. early stage). Studies with cancer in general, as a topic, earlier than 2010, or without available full text were excluded.

Identified articles from all databases were screened for duplication. Screening based on title and abstract were done and articles that fulfilled exclusion criteria were further excluded. In the end, eligible articles were included in a qualitative synthesis. The whole selection process was conducted by three independent investigators (FBS, RCRA, and HG). Disagreements between reviewers were reconciled through discussion. Another independent reviewer was sought if an agreement was not achieved.

Quality assessment and data extraction

Two independent reviewers (FBS and HG) assessed the risk of bias using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) (Wells et al., 2014). Seven items were assessed for risk of bias in each included study. Every item gave a certain quantity of stars. Studies with a total of ≥ 7 stars were considered of having a low risk of bias and vice versa. In this systematic review, stars in the instrument were represented by numbers.

For data extraction, three independent reviewers (FBS, RCRA, and HG) were involved. Disagreements between reviewers were reconciled by discussion. Another independent reviewer was sought if an agreement was not achieved. Confirmation to the corresponding author was done if there were incomplete or ambiguous data. The extracted data included age at the time of diagnosis, education, economic status, residential status, marital status, age at first birth, parity, post-menopause, breast symptoms,

the regularity of self and clinical-breast examination, self and family history of breast disease, knowledge and perception of breast cancer, type of payment, first consultation provider, chances of consultation, false-negative diagnostic test, and alternative therapy or traditional medicine. Other relevant factors were also extracted. Endpoint statistical measures included were odds ratio (OR), relative risk (RR), mortality rate, survival rate, proportion, and p-value for quantitative studies and description of causal factors in qualitative studies. If OR was not stated in the studies, manual calculations were done. If the risk comparison between numerator and denominator was different, the OR was recalculated for adjustment.

Data synthesis

If there was adequate data after compilation and analysis, all the data was synthesized into a meta-analysis. A fixed-effect model was used for relatively homogeneous data, while a random-effect model was used for heterogeneous data. Test of heterogeneity is using I^2 statistics and Cochran's Q test. A funnel plot analysis is used to investigate the possibility of any publication bias in meta-analysis. No predefined subgroup analysis were planned.

Results

A total of 4,322 studies were identified at the beginning and after a thorough process (shown in [Figure 1](#)), 26 studies were included (shown in [Table 1](#)). None of the included studies had incomplete information so further confirmation to the author was not required. Further details on the steps of the study can be reviewed in Supplementary Table 1. Details of excluded studies were in Supplementary Table 2.

Figure 1.



[Open in a new tab](#)

PRISMA Diagram of the Study

Table 1.

List of Included Studies and Database

No	First Author	Publication Years	Title	Journal
1	Chintamani	2011	Patient and provider delays in breast cancer	J R Soc Med Sh Rep

			patients attending a tertiary care centre: a prospective study	
2	Bachok Norsa'adah	2011	Diagnosis delay of breast cancer and its associated factors in Malaysian women	BMC Cancer
3	Nur Aishah Taib	2011	Recognizing symptoms of breast cancer as a reason for delayed presentation in Asian women – the psycho- socio-cultural model for breast symptom appraisal: opportunities for intervention	Asian Pac Cancer Prev
4	Bachok Norsa'adah	2012	Understanding barriers to Malaysian women with breast cancer seeking help	Asian Pac Cancer Prev

5	Sumarni Mohd Ghazali	2013	Non-practice of breast self examination and marital status are associated with delayed presentation with breast cancer	Asian Pac Cancer Prev
6	Srikanthi Lakshmi Bodapati	2013	Oncologist perspective on breast cancer screening in India- results from a qualitative study in Andhra Pradesh	Asian Pac Cancer Prev
7	Nur Aishah Taib	2013	A grounded explanation of why women present with advanced breast cancer	World J Surg
8	Ario Djarmiko	2013	Profil cancer delay pada kasus kanker payudara di RS Onkologi Surabaya	Indonesia Journal o Cancer
9	Amornsak	2014	Factors	J

	Poum		associated with delayed diagnosis of breast cancer in Northeast Thailand	Epidemio
10	Aulia Iskandarsyah	2014	Psychosocial and cultural reasons for delay in seeking help and nonadherence to treatment in Indonesian women with breast cancer: a qualitative study	Health Psycholog
11	Aulia Iskandarsyah	2014	Consulting a traditional healer and negative illness perceptions are associated with non-adherence to treatment in Indonesian women with breast cancer	Psycho- Oncology
12	Sedigheh Pakseresht	2014	Stage at diagnosis and delay in	Iran Red Crescent Med J

			seeking medical care among women with breast cancer, Delhi, India	
13	Bimal Roy	2015	Pattern of delayed presentation of breast cancer patients: evidence from Rangpur Medical College Hospital, Rangpur, Bangladesh	Advances in Cancer Research and Therapy
14	Qiang Huo	2015	Delay in diagnosis and treatment of symptomatic breast cancer in China	Ann Surg Oncol
15	Namrata Thakur	2015	Delay in presentation to the hospital and factors affecting it in breast cancer patients attending tertiary care center in	Indian J Cancer

			Central India	
16	Jennifer NW Lim	2015	Barriers to early presentation of self-discovered breast cancer in Singapore and Malaysia: a qualitative multicenter study	BMJ Open
17	Gusti Ayu Resa Dyanti	2016	Faktor-faktor keterlambatan penderita kanker payudara dalam melakukan pemeriksaan awal ke pelayanan Kesehatan	Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat
18	Noor Mastura Mohd Mujar	2017	Complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) use and delays in presentation and diagnosis of breast cancer patients in public hospitals in Malaysia	Plos One

19	Khurseda Akhtar	2018	Use of alternative medicine is delaying health-seeking behavior by Bangladeshi breast cancer patients	Eur J Breast Helath
20	Safira Dhia Rahmawaty	2019	Hubungan factor-faktor treatment delay dengan kasus kanker payudara stadium lanjut di RSUD Abdul Wahab Sjahranie Samarinda tahun 2019	Jurnal Psikologi
21	Arvind Kumar	2019	Delays in diagnosis and treatment of breast cancer and the pathways of care: a mixed methods study from a tertiary cancer centre in North East India	Asian Pac Cancer Prev

22	Huaguo Zhang	2019	Patient delay and associated factors among Chinese women with breast cancer: a cross- sectional study	Medicine
23	Mehreen Baig	2019	Factors influencing delayed presentation of breast cancer at a tertiary care hospital in Pakistan	Cancer Reports
24	Uzma Shamsi	2020	Patient delay in breast cancer diagnosis in two hospitals in Karachi, Pakistan: preventive and life-saving measures needed	JCO Global Oncol
25	Shivaraj Nailur Somana	2020	Time interval between self- detection of symptoms to treatment of breast cancer	Asian Pac Cancer Prev
26	Solikhah	2020	Breast cancer	BMC

Solikhah	stigma among Indonesian women: a case study of breast cancer patients	Women's Health
Open in a new tab		

Most of the studies were conducted in Malaysia and India. The definitions of delayed diagnosis varied from 1 month to 6 months (shown in [Table 2](#)). From 14 quantitative studies, 12 were cross-sectional studies and the other two were observational ones. Out of 12 cross-sectional studies, 5 of them had a high risk of bias, while the rest had a low risk of bias (shown in [Table 3](#)). Factors related to delayed diagnosis were summarized into socioeconomic status, maternity status, breast symptoms and examinations, healthcare-related, patients' knowledge and perceptions, and other factors as seen in [Table 4](#). None of those factors were found to be strongly related to delayed diagnosis of breast cancer, but breast symptoms and examinations, and patient knowledge and perception, were major contributors. Results from qualitative studies, as shown in [Table 5](#), validate the information on how different those factors were between the various study settings.

Table 2.

Characteristics of Included Studies

No	First Author	Publication Year	Country	Study Design
----	--------------	------------------	---------	--------------

1	Chintamani	2011	India	Qualitative study
2	Bachok Norsa'adah	2011	Malaysia	Cross- Sectional study
3	Nur Aishah Taib	2011	Malaysia	Qualitative study

4	Bachok Norsa'adah	2012	Malaysia	Qualitative study
---	----------------------	------	----------	----------------------

5	Sumarni Mohd Ghazali	2013	Malaysia	Cross- sectional study
6	Srikanthi Lakshmi Bodapati	2013	India	Qualitative study
7	Nur Aishah Taib	2013	Malaysia	Qualitative study

8	Ario Djarmiko	2013	Indonesia	Qualitative study
9	Amornsak Poum	2014	Thailand	Cross- sectional study

10	Aulia Iskandarsyah	2014	Indonesia	Qualitative study
11	Aulia Iskandarsyah	2014	Indonesia	Observational study
12	Sedigheh Pakseresht	2014	India	Cross- sectional study
13	Bimal Roy	2015	Bangladesh	Cross- sectional study

No	First Author	Publication Year	Country	Study Design
14	Qiang Huo	2015	China	Cross-sectional study
15	Namrata Thakur	2015	India	Qualitative study
16	Jennifer NW Lim	2015	Multicenter (Malaysia & Singapore)	Qualitative study

- | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|------|-----------|------------------------------|
| 17 | Gusti Ayu
Resa Dyanti | 2016 | Indonesia | Qualitative
study |
| 18 | Noor
Mastura
Mohd Mujar | 2017 | Malaysia | Cross-
sectional
study |

19	Khurseda Akhtar	2018	Bangladesh Cross-sectional study
----	-----------------	------	----------------------------------

20	Safira Dhia Rahmawaty	2019	Indonesia	Qualitative study
21	Arvind Kumar	2019	India	Cross- sectional study

22	Huaguo Zhang	2019	China	Cross- sectional study
23	Mehreen Baig	2019	Pakistan	Observational study

24	Uzma Shamsi	2020	Pakistan	Cross- sectional study
----	----------------	------	----------	------------------------------

No	First Author	Publication Year	Country	Study Design
25	Shivaraj Nallur Somana	2020	India	Cross-sectional study

26	Solikhah Solikhah	2020	Indonesia	Qualitative study
----	----------------------	------	-----------	----------------------

[Open in a new tab](#)

Table 3.

Assessment of Risk of Bias of the Quantitative Study (Cross-Sectional)

No	Study	Selection				Cc
		RS	SS	NR	AE	
1	Norsa'adah, 2011	1	1	0	2	
2	Ghazali, 2013	1	1	1	1	
3	Mujar, 2013	1	1	0	2	
4	Poum, 2014	0	0	1	0	
5	Pakseresht, 2014	1	0	0	2	
6	Roy, 2015	0	0	1	1	
7	Huo, 2015	1	0	0	1	
8	Akhtar, 2018	1	1	0	1	
9	Kumar, 2019	1	1	1	1	
10	Zhang, 2019	1	1	0	2	

11	Shamsi, 2020	1	1	0	2
12	Somana, 2020	1	1	0	2

[Open in a new tab](#)

* 1 representing 1 star; RS, Representativeness of the samples; SS, sample size; NR, non-respondents; AE, ascertainment of the exposure; C, comparability; AO, assessment of the outcome; ST, statistical test

Table 4.

Factors Affecting Delayed Diagnosis of Breast Cancers Based on Included Quantitative Studies

Factors associated	Author, year	OR (95%CI)	p-value	Risk of bias
Socioeconomic status				
Age at diagnosis				
>45 years	Kumar et al, 2019	OR 1.21 (0.72-2.06)	0.468	Low
	Somanna et al, 2019	OR 0.69 (0.38-1.28)		High

>50 years	Mujar et al, 2017	OR 1.21 (0.72-2.02)	0.47	Low
	Parakseresht et al, 2014	OR 1.09 (0.58-2.04)	0.784	High
	Roy et al, 2015	OR 12.57 (3.63-43.58)	0.013	High
Age (numeric)	Zhang et al, 2019	OR 1.03 (1.00-1.06)	0.049	Low
	Akhtar et al, 2018	OR 0.84 (0.45-1.58)	0.589	High
Formal Education				
High education	Kumar et al, 2019	OR 0.53 (0.26-1.07)	0.07	Low
	Roy et al, 2015	OR 0.06 (0.01-0.37)	0.018	High
	Akhtar et al, 2015	OR 0.83 (0.44-1.55)	0.551	High
Moderate education	Kumar et al, 2019	OR 0.77 (0.41-	0.82	Low

		1.44)		
	Mujar et al, 2017	OR 0.98 (0.48-1.98)	0.959	Low
	Roy et al, 2015	OR 0.60 (0.15-2.46)	0.478	High
Low education	Kumar et al, 2019	OR 1.07 (0.45-2.50)	0.145	Low
	Mujar et al, 2017	OR 2.01 (0.71-5.65)	0.185	Low
Economic status				
Moderate income vs low income	Poum et al, 2014	OR 2.83 (1.01-7.95)	0.04	High
	Roy et al, 2015	OR 0.05 (0.01-0.25)	<0.01	High
	Somanna et al, 2019	OR 1.17 (0.44-3.08)	0.746	High
High income vs low income	Mujar et al, 2017	OR 0.64 (0.37-1.10)	0.108	Low

Unemployed	Roy et al, 2015	OR 0.08 (0.01-0.85)	0.03	High
	Shamsi et al, 2020	OR 0.38 (0.13-1.11)		Low
	Mujar et al, 2017	OR 0.68 (0.40-1.17)	0.174	Low
	Akhtar et al, 2018	OR 0.93 (0.40-2.13)	0.859	High
	Parakseresht et al, 2014	OR 0.96 (0.22-4.17)	0.958	High
		OR (95%CI)	p-value	Risk of bias
Residential status				
Urban vs Rural	Huo et al, 2015	OR 0.71 (0.56-0.89)	0.004	Low
	Parakseresht et al, 2014	OR 0.54 (0.29-1.02)	0.057	High
	Roy et al, 2015	OR 0.68 (0.20-2.33)	0.758	High

Akhtar et al, 2018 OR 0.72 (0.38-1.35) 0.309 High

Somanna et al, 2019 OR 1.18 (0.65-2.18) 0.582 High

Marital status

Unmarried

Ghazali et al, 2013 OR 1.93 (0.66-5.64) 0.229 Low

Muhar et al, 2017 OR 1.27 (0.73-2.22) 0.387 Low

Pakseresht et al, 2014 OR 1.75 (0.87-3.53) 0.12 High

Roy et al, 2015 OR 0.81 (0.12-5.42) 0.826 High

Akhtar et al, 2018 OR 1.11 (0.53-2.34) 0.778 High

Divorced/Widowed

Ghazali et al, 2013 OR 2.67 (1.30-5.50) 0.008 Low

Roy et al, 2015 OR 1.51 0.501 High

		(0.45- 5.06)		
Age at first birth				
>20	Poum et al, 2014	OR 0.29 (0.13- 0.65)	0.003	High
21-25 years old	Kumar et al, 2019	OR 0.36 (0.19- 0.66)	0.001	Low
25-38 years old	Kumar et al, 2019	OR 1.08 (0.53- 2.21)	0.839	Low
Parity				
Less than 3 delivery	Poum et al, 2014	OR 0.92 (0.41- 2.05)	0.85	High
	Parakseresht et al, 2014	OR 1.27 (0.65- 2.48)	0.479	High
Postmenopause	Huo et al, 2015	OR 0.79 (0.63- 0.97)	0.026	Low
Breast symptoms and examination				
Breast symptoms				
Presence of any breast symptoms	Poum et al, 2014	OR 0.36 (0.16- 0.80)	0.01	High
	Mujar et al,	OR 0.46	0.033	Low

	2017	(0.22-0.95)		
	Akhtar et al, 2018	OR 1.12 (0.51-2.46)	0.774	High
Nipple discharge (vs Breast mass)	Huo et al, 2015	OR 0.32 (0.14-0.73)	0.007	Low
Breast ulcer	Norsa'adah et al, 2011	OR 0.17 (0.04-0.62)	0.008	Low
Pain	Zhang et al, 2019	OR 0.19 (0.05-0.79)	0.023	Low
Factors associated	Author, year	OR (95%CI)	p-value	Risk of bias
Breast self-examination				
Never	Ghazali et al, 2013	OR 2.19 (1.09-4.38)	0.028	Low
Irregular	Ghazali et al, 2013	OR 1.18 (0.53-2.64)	0.686	Low
Clinical Breast Examination	Zhang et al, 2019	OR 0.06 (0.01-0.59)	0.015	Low
	Norsa'adah et al, 2011	OR 0.45 (0.25-0.81)	0.008	Low

History of breast disease	Huo et al, 2015	OR 0.70 (0.49-1.01)	0.058	Low
Family history with breast cancer	Mujar et al, 2017	OR 1.25 (0.68-2.27)	0.486	Low
Healthcare-related factors				
Healthcare accessibility				
Low utilization	Akhtar et al, 2018	OR 1.73 (0.82-3.64)	0.15	High
Long distance (>2 km)	Somanna et al, 2019	OR 1.03 (0.52-2.04)	0.941	High
Long distance (>10 km)	Kumar et al, 2019	OR 0.93 (0.49-1.75)	0.814	Low
Long traveling time (>60 min)	Poum et al, 2014	OR 2.66 (1.17-6.04)	0.01	High
Self-payment (vs insurance)	Poum et al, 2014	OR 1.42 (0.32-6.24)	0.64	High
	Somanna et al, 2019	OR 0.51 (0.10-2.62)	0.424	High
First consultation to nonphysician (vs	Poum et al, 2014	OR 1.39	0.69	High

physician)		(0.26-7.21)		
Physician consult >2 times to surgeon	Poum et al, 2014	OR 2.93 (1.33-6.44)	0.007	High
False-negative diagnostic test	Norsa'adah et al, 2011	OR 5.32 (2.32-12.21)	<0.001	Low
Alternative therapy/ traditional medicine	Norsa'adah et al, 2011	OR 1.77 (1.06-2.94)	0.029	Low
	Mujar et al, 2017	OR 2.58 (1.59-4.17)	<0.001	Low
	Roy et al, 2015	OR 8.25 (2.52-27.16)	0.012	High
	Akhtar et al, 2015	OR 4.35 (2.21-8.59)	<0.001	High
Patient knowledge and perception				
Good literacy on breast cancer symptoms	Zhang et al, 2019	OR 0.72 (0.64-0.80)	<0.01	Low
	Pakseresht et al, 2014	OR 0.81 (0.43-1.52)	0.506	High
	Somanna et	OR 0.49	0.03	High

	al, 2019	(0.26-0.93)		
Patient good perception	Akhtar et al, 2018	OR 0.43 (0.09-2.10)	0.298	High
	Zhang et al, 2019	OR 0.87 (0.81-0.94)	<0.01	Low
Negative attitude	Norsa'adah et al, 2011	OR 2.09	0.016	Low
Factors associated	Author, year	OR (95%CI)	p-value	Risk of bias
Mental upset	Akhtar et al, 2018	OR 0.78 (0.36-1.65)	0.5	High
Other factors				
Smoking status				
Current smoker	Kumar et al, 2019	OR 1.54 (0.78-3.05)	0.215	Low
Non-smoker	Poum et al, 2014	OR 0.15 (0.02-1.03)	0.06	High
Sufficient physical activity	Kumar et al, 2019	OR 0.44 (0.23-	0.01	Low

		0.83)		
Family support	Zhang et al, 2019	OR 0.91	0.013	Low
		(0.84-0.98)		
	Akhtar et al, 2018	OR 3.37	<0.01	High
		(1.65-6.89)		

Open in a new tab

Table 5.

Summary of the Qualitative Studies and Other Types of Studies

No	Titles	First Author	Year	Type of Study
1	Patient and provider delays in breast cancer patients attending a tertiary care center: a prospective study	Chintamani	2011	Qualitative Study

- | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|------|-------------------|
| 2 | Recognizing symptoms of breast cancer as a reason for delayed presentation in Asian women--the psycho-socio-cultural model for breast symptom appraisal: opportunities for intervention | Nur Aishah Taib | 2011 | Qualitative Study |
| 3 | Understanding barriers to Malaysian women with breast cancer seeking help | Bachok Norsa'adah | 2012 | Qualitative Study |
| 4 | Oncologist perspectives on breast cancer screening in India- results from a | Srikanthi Lakshmi Bodapati | 2013 | Qualitative Study |

qualitative
study in
Andhra
Pradesh

- | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|------|-------------------|
| 5 | A grounded explanation of why women present with advanced breast cancer | Nur Aishah Taib | 2013 | Qualitative Study |
| 6 | Profil cancer delay pada kasus kanker payudara di RS Onkologi Surabaya | Ario Djatmiko | 2013 | Qualitative Study |
| 7 | Psychosocial and cultural reasons for delay in seeking help and nonadherence to treatment in Indonesian women with breast cancer: a qualitative study | Aulia Iskandarsyah | 2014 | Qualitative Study |

8	Consulting a traditional healer and negative illness perceptions are associated with non-adherence to treatment in Indonesian women with breast cancer	Aulia Iskandarsyah	2014	Observational Study
9	Delay in presentation to the hospital and factors affecting it in breast cancer patients attending tertiary care center in Central India	Namrata Thakur	2015	Qualitative Study
10	Barriers to early	Jennifer NW Lim	2015	Qualitative Study

presentation
of self-
discovered
breast cancer
in Singapore
and Malaysia:
a qualitative
multicentre
study

11	Faktor – faktor keterlambatan penderita kanker payudara dalam melakukan pemeriksaan	Gusti Ayu Resa Dyanti	2016	Qualitative Study
----	--	--------------------------	------	----------------------

	awal ke pelayanan kesehatan			
12	Hubungan faktor – faktor treatment delay dengan kasus kanker payudara stadium lanjut di RSUD Abdul Wahab Sjahranie Samarinda tahun 2019	Safira Dhia Rahmawaty	2019	Qualitative Study
13	Factors influencing delayed presentation of breast cancer at a tertiary care hospital in Pakistan	Mehreen Baig	2019	Observational Study
14	Breast cancer stigma among Indonesian women: a case	Solikhah Solikhah	2020	Qualitative Study

study of breast
cancer
patients

[Open in a new tab](#)

Meta-analysis was not possible due to the varying definitions of the delayed diagnosis (some studies used three months as a cutoff, while others used six months or more), uneven distribution of the location of the studies (mainly in Southeast Asia and South Asia), and high risk of bias in the majority of the studies.

Discussion

This systematic review was the first one to summarize factors associated with delayed diagnosis of breast cancers in Asian developing countries. Clinicians and stakeholders can use the information gained from this study, to design preemptive models against elements that cause the delay.

The inclusion of qualitative research strengthened this study by enhancing information obtained through quantitative research. It gave a more unquantified perspective on how patients' perception, fear of cancer diagnosis, knowledge, and healthcare accessibility played an important role in preventing delayed diagnosis of breast cancer. On the other hand, the weakness of this study was the unfeasibility of conducting a meta-analysis due to the aforementioned reasons.

The risk of publication bias was relatively low because some factors in the included studies were not statistically significant, yet the

studies were still published. However, most of the included studies had a high risk of bias, especially in the aspect of patient selection, and thus might have led to selection bias. We hypothesized that the high risk of selection bias was probably caused by the difficulty in collecting accurate pre-diagnosis information from patients. Moreover, the information was collected retrospectively, causing a risk of recall bias. Some studies had a sample size that was insufficient, so the data did not necessarily represent the population. On the other hand, confounder analysis was addressed adequately. Although strength of evidence for each factor related to breast cancer delayed diagnosis are various, we had seen some tendency as will be discussed further in this section.

Three months as the cut-off to define delayed diagnosis was mostly used in included studies. The previous meta-analysis clarified that globally, a delay (defined as the delay from the onset of symptoms to the start of treatment) of more than three months was strongly related to a poor survival rate (Richards et al., 1999).

Principally, reasons for a delay in diagnosis were grouped into patients' and providers' delays. However, we found some factors fell into a "grey area". For example, a patient's visit to a non-physician at the time of the onset of symptoms can be influenced by the patient's perception. However, it also can be caused by the low quality of available health providers or the long distance to the nearest provider. Thus, both factors should be carefully investigated when optimizing the screening and early diagnosis of breast cancers.

A past systematic review reported that single marital status and advanced age were the only sociodemographic factors that seemed to be strongly associated with patient delay (Richards et al., 1999). However, further studies have been shown to obtain contradictory results (Rivera-Franco and Leon-Rodriguez, 2018). Meanwhile,

higher formal education and socioeconomic status could reduce delayed diagnosis, even though several studies, contrastingly, did not report similar results (Bodapati and Babu, 2013; Lim et al., 2015; Roy et al., 2015; Dyanti and Suariyani, 2016; Solikhah et al., 2020). Residential status and distances to healthcare facilities were also among factors related to delayed diagnosis in breast cancer (Bodapati and Babu, 2013; Thakur et al., 2015). Among maternity status, age at first birth significantly reduced delayed diagnosis, but its categorization (>20 years old and 21–25 years old) was not well related to breast cancer's biomolecular background (Poum et al., 2014; Kumar et al., 2019). Menopausal status that strongly affected delayed diagnosis of breast cancer might be explained by less breast mass density in postmenopausal women which allows for early detection during breast self-examination (BSE) or clinical breast examination (CBE).

In our opinion, the delay from the provider is rooted in two stages. The first stage is primary health care. Ideally, every country should have a breast cancer screening program that is bound by the law to reinforce the screening uptake. Since approximately one-third of Asian countries have been categorized as low- and lower-middle-income countries, screening modalities should be tailored according to the economic capability of the country (World Bank, 2020). One excellent example is the recommendation from World Health Organization (WHO) that such countries may attempt screening by CBE for women aged 50–69 years old if mammography is too expensive and not feasible (World Health Organization, 2014). Moreover, the primary healthcare providers' CBE skills should be assessed and evaluated periodically. To ensure non-substandard CBE skills, the associated educational institution can aid in the form of hands-on training or other kinds of knowledge-sharing sessions. A clear referral system with geographically accessible secondary or tertiary healthcare facilities is also needed.

The second stage of provider delay is the referral stage. The problem at this stage stems from the inability of secondary healthcare to provide an accurate and quick diagnosis of breast cancer due to a lack of skills or facilities/resources. Therefore, both institutional and healthcare centers must be improved to rectify this problem. An initiative from the government for equal distribution of secondary and tertiary healthcare providers (e.g., general surgeons or surgical oncologists) and healthcare facilities are also required. Overall, while funding systems may initially become a problem in developing countries, a well-executed established system can serve as a driving force for physicians to act according to the clinical guidelines. Eventually, proper and on-time screening and diagnosis can bring down delayed diagnosis cases and overall cost.

The Government's commitment holds incredible importance in the timely management of cancer in general. As an example, the law in Brazil states that the time from diagnosis to treatment of breast cancer should be less than 60 days (Ferreira et al., 2020). In the United Kingdom, suspected cases of colorectal cancer have to be referred within two weeks (Thomas and Burnet, 2001). While they have flaws, those programs showed the willingness of regulators to be involved in the management of cancer. On the other hand, a system that is too strict and non-adaptive may cause further delays. An example of this is the referral system in Indonesia, which is based on the authors' experience. The waiting time for diagnosis of individuals suspected to have breast cancer is unnecessarily prolonged due to the inability of patients to be referred directly to a cancer center or similar health facility with definitive diagnostic capabilities, because of administrative reasons from National Health Insurance. This also hampers the physician's ability to quickly perform the required diagnostic procedures. For instance, a biopsy cannot be performed in the same visit as initial laboratory and radiologic workups due to a "cost package limit".

An important finding in this systematic review was that the presence of breast symptoms (any symptoms including breast mass, ulcer, or pain and nipple discharge) was consistently related to less delayed diagnosis, both in quantitative and qualitative studies (Norsa'adah et al., 2011; Poum et al., 2014; Huo et al., 2015; Lim et al., 2015). However, because symptomatic breast cancer may be indicative of a more advanced stage of cancer, other factors that can encourage individuals to get diagnosed early should be explored.

Breast cancer detection through BSE, although not routinely done, was among the most effective methods for early detection of breast cancer (Ghazali et al., 2013; Dyanti and Suariyani, 2016). CBE is also important for the early detection of breast cancers as it significantly reduced delay in diagnosis and presentation (Norsa'adah et al., 2011; Huo et al., 2015). Both of them should be the main strategies in breast cancer detection in developing countries as conducting BSE and CBE do not require many resources. Therefore, health campaigns to educate women to understand the importance of BSE should be done massively and repetitively. Health workers' skills to perform CBE appropriately, as well as their ability to detect suspicious cancers that need to be referred during CBE, must be nourished and refreshed through workshops and continuous medical educations (CMEs). In short, public health strategies should be developed to optimize both BSE and CBE.

Patients' knowledge and perception, or a good literacy on breast cancer, especially about its symptoms, are related to less delayed diagnosis. From qualitative evidence, those factors were known to influence the act of seeking a professional health provider and avoiding alternative therapy, in addition to a less negative attitude toward medical services. Psychosocial factors, such as the perception of fear, denial, embarrassment, ignorance, and emotional burdens

were reinforcing factors that need support and motivation from close relatives and the environment (Norsa'adah et al., 2012; Bodapati and Babu, 2013; Iskandarsyah et al., 2014; Huo et al., 2015). In most Asian countries, family bonds along with husbands' or fathers' decisions have a strong impact on women's actions (including health issues); therefore, education on the importance of breast cancer screening and early diagnosis should reach all family members and community members.

Health service quality is another key factor in the prevention of delayed diagnosis. Still, the interpretation of quality was varied among studies, such as competency of health workers, time and distance to reach healthcare services, and quality of the diagnostic test. In addition, there was a tendency in Asian cultures to visit alternative or traditional medicine (Norsa'adah et al., 2011; Ghazali et al., 2013; Thakur et al., 2015). The intention to visit alternative therapy may have arisen from either personal preferences or due to unsatisfied services received from a previous healthcare provider (Norsa'adah et al., 2012; Thakur et al., 2015; Akhtar et al., 2018).

Further meta-analyses should be conducted whenever more data are available. On the other hand, high-quality observational studies may be undertaken to obtain specific information on how to optimize breast cancer detection. It ought to have an adequate sample size and consider both patient and provider factors so that the data is more comprehensive. More evidence is needed because different approaches to prevent the delayed diagnosis of breast cancers should be considered in developing countries as compared to high-income countries. Furthermore, to improve patients' knowledge and perception, every country should conduct individualized anthropological research to discover an appropriate communication, information, and education model which takes into account the local culture.

In conclusion, among Asian developing countries, breast cancer symptoms and examinations, as well as individual knowledge and perception, are the main factors related to delayed diagnosis of breast cancer. Socioeconomic, maternity, and health service quality have various impacts on the delayed diagnosis of breast cancers, and thus need specific approaches, tailored to the local public health situation.

Author Contribution Statement

FBS, AB, SSP, DA, HG, PWY, AAN, RCRAP, and ADW contributed equally to the process of drafting the protocol. Both RCRAP and ADW contributed equally for developing the search strategy and running the search. FBS, RCRAP, and HG selected studies for inclusion and extracting data. The risk of bias was assessed by FBS and HG. All authors carried out and interpreted the analysis. FBS, PWY, and HG wrote the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We declare no funding statements and no conflict of interest in this study. We did not acquire ethical approval for present study because in this study data was retrieved and synthesized from the already published studies (secondary data analysis). Data are available by request to the corresponding author. No prior registration was made for this systematic review. The authors thank Niranjana Rasanathan for her help in proofreading the manuscript.

Statement conflict of interest

None declared.

References

1. Akhtar K, Akhtar K, Rahman MM. Use of alternative medicine is delaying health-seeking behavior by Bangladeshi breast cancer patients. *Eur J Breast Health*. 2018;14:166–72. doi: 10.5152/ejbh.2018.3929. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
2. Bleicher RJ, Ruth K, Sigurdson ER, et al. Time to surgery and breast cancer survival in the United States. *JAMA Oncol*. 2016;2:330–9. doi: 10.1001/jamaoncol.2015.4508. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
3. Bodapati SL, Babu GR. Oncologist perspectives on breast cancer screening in India- results from a qualitative study in Andhra Pradesh. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev*. 2013;14:5817–23. doi: 10.7314/apjcp.2013.14.10.5817. [[DOI](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
4. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, et al. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2018;68:394–424. doi: 10.3322/caac.21492. [[DOI](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
5. da Costa Vieira RA, Biller G, Uemura G, Ruiz CA, Curado MP. Breast cancer screening in developing countries. *Clinics*. 2017;72:244–53. doi: 10.6061/clinics/2017(04)09. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
6. Dyanti GAR, Suariyani NLP. Faktor-faktor keterlambatan penderita kanker payudara dalam melakukan pemeriksaan awal ke pelayanan kesehatan. *Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat*. 2016;11. [[Google Scholar](#)]

7. Eaglehouse YL, Georg MW, Shriver CD, Zhu K. Time-to-surgery and overall survival after breast cancer diagnosis in a universal health system. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2019;178:441–50. doi: 10.1007/s10549-019-05404-8. [[DOI](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
8. Ferreira NAS, Schoueri JHM, Sorpreso ICE, Adami F, dos Santos Figueiredo FW. Waiting time between breast cancer diagnosis and treatment in Brazilian women: an analysis of cases from 1998 to 2012. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17:4030. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17114030. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
9. Francies FZ, Hull R, Khanyile R, Dlamini Z. Breast cancer in low-middle income countries: abnormality in splicing and lack of targeted treatment options. *Am J Cancer Res*. 2020;10:1568–91. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
10. Ghazali SM, Othman Z, Cheong KC, et al. Non-practice of breast self examination and marital status are associated with delayed presentation with breast cancer. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev*. 2013;14:1141–5. doi: 10.7314/apjcp.2013.14.2.1141. [[DOI](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
11. Ho PJ, Ow SGW, Sim Y, et al. Impact of deviation from guideline recommended treatment on breast cancer survival in Asia. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10:1330. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-58007-5. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
12. Huo Q, Cai C, Zhang Y, et al. Delay in diagnosis and treatment of symptomatic breast cancer in China. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2015;22:883–8. doi: 10.1245/s10434-014-4076-9. [[DOI](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
13. Iskandarsyah A, de Klerk C, Suardi DR, et al. Psychosocial and cultural reasons for delay in seeking help and nonadherence

to treatment in Indonesian women with breast cancer: a qualitative study. *Health Psychol.* 2014;33:214–21. doi: 10.1037/a0031060. [[DOI](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

14. Kohler BA, Sherman RL, Howlader N, et al. Annual report to the nation on the status of cancer, 1975-2011, featuring incidence of breast cancer subtypes by race/ethnicity, poverty, and state. *J Nat Cancer Instit.* 2015;107:djv048–djv. doi: 10.1093/jnci/djv048. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

15. Kumar A, Bhagabaty SM, Tripathy JP, et al. Delays in diagnosis and treatment of breast cancer and the pathways of care: a mixed methods study from a tertiary cancer centre in North East India. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2019;20:3711–21. doi: 10.31557/APJCP.2019.20.12.3711. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

16. Lim JNW, Potrata B, Simonella L, et al. Barriers to early presentation of self-discovered breast cancer in Singapore and Malaysia: a qualitative multicentre study. *BMJ Open.* 2015;5:e009863–e. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009863. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

17. Norsa'adah B, Rahmah MA, Rampal KG, Knight A. Understanding barriers to Malaysian women with breast cancer seeking help. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2012;13:3723–30. doi: 10.7314/apjcp.2012.13.8.3723. [[DOI](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

18. Norsa'adah B, Rampal KG, Rahmah MA, Naing NN, Biswal BM. Diagnosis delay of breast cancer and its associated factors in Malaysian women. *BMC Cancer.* 2011;11:141. doi: 10.1186/1471-2407-11-141. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

19. Panieri E. Breast cancer screening in developing countries. *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaeco*. 2012;26:283–90. doi: 10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2011.11.007. [[DOI](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
20. Poum A, Promthet S, Duffy SW, Parkin DM. Factors associated with delayed diagnosis of breast cancer in Northeast Thailand. *J Epidemiol*. 2014;24:102–8. doi: 10.2188/jea.JE20130090. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
21. Richards MA, Westcombe AM, Love SB, Littlejohns P, Ramirez AJ. Influence of delay on survival in patients with breast cancer: a systematic review. *Lancet*. 1999;353:1119–26. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(99)02143-1. [[DOI](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
22. Rivera-Franco MM, Leon-Rodriguez E. Delays in breast cancer detection and treatment in developing countries. *Breast Cancer Basic Clin Res*. 2018;12. doi: 10.1177/1178223417752677. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
23. Roy B, Naher S, Sarkar P, Alam S, Hanifa A. Pattern of delayed presentation of breast cancer patients: evidence from Rangpur Medical College Hospital, Rangpur, Bangladesh. *Adv Cancer Res Ther*. 2015;2:1–6. [[Google Scholar](#)]
24. Sacerdote C, Bordon R, Pitarella S, et al. Compliance with clinical practice guidelines for breast cancer treatment: a population-based study of quality-of-care indicators in Italy. *BMC Health Services Res*. 2013;13:28. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-13-28. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

25. Solikhah S, Matahari R, Utami FP, Handayani L, Marwati TA. Breast cancer stigma among Indonesian women: a case study of breast cancer patients. *BMC Womens Health*. 2020;20:116. doi: 10.1186/s12905-020-00983-x. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
26. Songiso M, Pinder LF, Munalula J, et al. Minimizing delays in the breast cancer pathway by integrating breast specialty care services at the primary health care level in Zambia. *JCO Global Oncol*. 2020;2020:859–65. doi: 10.1200/GO.20.00083. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
27. Thakur NA, Humne AY, Godale LB. Delay in presentation to the hospital and factors affecting it in breast cancer patients attending tertiary care center in Central India. *Indian J Cancer*. 2015;52:102–5. doi: 10.4103/0019-509X.175602. [[DOI](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
28. Thomas S, Burnet N. Two week rule for cancer referrals Reducing waiting times from diagnosis to treatment might be more effective. *BMJ*. 2001;323:864. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
29. Wells G, Shea BJ, O'Connell J. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. Ottawa Health Research Institute. 2014:7. [[Google Scholar](#)]
30. World Health Organization. WHO position paper on mammography screening, Switzerland. World Health Organization: 2014. [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
31. Zhang H, Wang G, Zhang J, Lu Y, Jiang X. Patient delay and associated factors among Chinese women with breast cancer. *Medicine*. 2019;98:e17454–e. doi:

10.1097/MD.00000000000017454. [[DOI](#)] [[PMC free article](#)]
[[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

Articles from Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention : APJCP are
provided here courtesy of **West Asia Organization for Cancer
Prevention**