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Abstract

Title. Diagnostic delay in lung cancer: a qualitative study

Aim. This paper is a report of a study to identify factors influencing delay in reporting symptoms of lung cancer.

Background. Lung cancer accounts for approximately 5% of deaths in the Western world. For up to 80% of patients, their disease is inoperable because it has been diagnosed too late. This suggests that reducing diagnostic delay could reduce mortality.

Methods. This qualitative study was conducted from July 2005 to May 2006 in community and hospital settings in the United Kingdom. A purposive sample of people diagnosed with lung cancer in the previous 6 months (n = 18), and two 18-month survivors took part in individual interviews.

Findings. Participants reported a range of interrelating factors that influenced delay in reporting symptoms of lung cancer. Barriers to symptom reporting included symptom experience, lack of knowledge and fear. Blame and stigma because of smoking were also prevalent influences, as well as cultural factors, non-standard patterns of healthcare utilization and underlying stoical attitudes. The only factor to emerge as helpful in overcoming delay was the role families played.

Conclusion. Lack of knowledge and awareness about lung cancer could be addressed by better education of the public. Social marketing is a way of developing education messages which tackle cultural influences on treatment-seeking delay. Nurses have a potential role in developing and disseminating those messages.
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Introduction

Lung cancer incidence and mortality

Lung cancer is one of the main causes of cancer death in the Western world. For 80% of people with lung cancer, their disease is inoperable because it has been diagnosed too late. The UK lung cancer 5-year survival rates (7%) are lower than those in Europe (16%) (Cancer Research UK 2007a). This variation in mortality is attributed partly to differences in patient delay in symptom reporting. Reported patient delay ranges from 7 days in Italy and 6 months in the USA (Jensen et al. 2002). In a striking comparison, Corner et al. (2005) revealed a delay of over a year in the UK. Poor UK lung cancer survival rates may be further compounded by lower rates of surgical resection (10% in the UK compared to 28% in the US) (Corner et al. 2006) and chest X ray (Rogers 2006).

In the UK, national inequalities in lung cancer incidence and survival are compounded by deprivation. Possible
explanations include higher smoking levels (Cancer Research UK 2007a) and barriers to accessing health services (Tod et al. 2001). There is now recognition of the need to address this unfavourable picture in the UK. One strategy is to address the delay that may occur between patients noticing symptoms and reporting them to a doctor:

If lung cancer could be detected sooner then survival could improve without advances in therapeutic armoury. (National Cancer Research Institute 2006, p. 21)

Initial work by Corner et al. (2005, 2006) indicates that interpretations of symptoms and broader social factors may delay diagnosis. One UK lung cancer study that suggests delay is explained by blame and stigma, but more evidence is required (Chapple et al. 2004). This study aims to further explore and explain delay, particular prediagnostic delay, in lung cancer and to consider the implications for public education and nursing.

The study

Aim

The aim of the study was to identify factors influencing delay in reporting symptoms of lung cancer.

Design

A qualitative approach was adopted, using semi-structured individual interviews and framework analysis techniques to interpret the data (Ritchie & Spencer 1994, Ritchie et al. 2003).

Participants

The study took place from July 2005 to May 2006 in a deprived health district in the north of the UK with high rates of lung cancer. Participants were recruited through a respiratory physician and lung cancer nurse specialists, who contacted interviewees on our behalf.

Purposive sampling was used to recruit 20 patients who varied in age, sex, geographical location, lung cancer history (e.g. type of cancer and symptoms) and smoking history (Table 1). Eighteen had had a diagnosis of lung cancer within the past 6 months and two were 18-month survivors. There were eight women and 12 men, ranging from 47 to 81 years of age. Nine patients were ex-smokers who had smoked for between 7 months and 33 years; three were lifelong non-smokers.

Data collection

Interview schedules for the semi-structured individual interviews were developed with reference to previous qualitative literature on delay (Corner et al. 2005, Chapple et al. 2004). Patients were interviewed at home, lasted between 30 and 60 minutes, and interviews were audi-taped and transcribed. Field notes were taken during and after the interviews. Partners or a friend participated in the interview at the request of 12 participants.

Ethical considerations

The study was approved by a health service research ethics committee. Written and oral information about the study was given to potential participants, with opportunities to ask questions before being interviewed. We informed participants that their interview data would be anonymized and that, although direct quotes might be used in reporting the data, any identifying details would be deleted. Consent forms were signed and the tapes were destroyed at the end of the study.

Data analysis

Transcripts were anonymized and entered into QSR NVIVO, a computer software package for managing qualitative data. They were analysed using framework analysis techniques of familiarization, developing a thematic framework, indexing, charting, and mapping and interpretation (Ritchie & Spencer 1994, Ritchie et al. 2003). The interviews and analysis were conducted independently by two of the authors (AMT and JC), who during the analysis process to discuss the emerging findings and any differences in interpretation.

Findings

Symptom experience

There was wide variation in symptoms and therefore no clear symptom profile emerged (Table 1). Symptoms were often minor and unspecific:

But in the early days there was a very little cough. I coughed occasionally, but the cough didn’t really give me a clue. (Patient 12)

He didn’t seem as fit as he was and you couldn’t have put your finger on anything, but just didn’t seem as fit as he had been. (Wife of patient 16)

Some participants thought that lung cancer was different from other cancers which had clear symptoms detectable through physical self-examination:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age/gender</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Symptom profile</th>
<th>Symptom to reporting delay</th>
<th>Delay from symptom to diagnosis</th>
<th>Courses of antibiotics</th>
<th>Smoking status</th>
<th>Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47/Female</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Breathless, loss of appetite, voice problems</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gave up on diagnosis</td>
<td>Shop worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>81/Male</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>Shoulder pain, breathless</td>
<td>48 months</td>
<td>48 months</td>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>Ex-smoker 25 years</td>
<td>Miner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>63/Female</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Chest pain, arm pain, facial rash and swelling, palpitations</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-smoker</td>
<td>Cleaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>58/Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Cough, recurrent chest infections</td>
<td>48 months</td>
<td>60 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ex-smoker 21 years</td>
<td>Engineer, factory manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>54/Female</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Slight breathlessness</td>
<td>None, CXR at diabetic check up</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Current smoker</td>
<td>National Health Services (NHS) clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>64/Female</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Haemoptysis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ex-smoker 1 year</td>
<td>Shop assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>57/Male</td>
<td>Divorced (living with partner)</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
<td>None, picked up on CXR at A&amp;E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Ex-smoker 3 years</td>
<td>Publican (living above the pub)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>77/Female</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>No related symptoms. Pain in left buttock</td>
<td>None, picked up on CXR at OPD</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Non-smoker</td>
<td>Nursing Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9*</td>
<td>81/Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Breathless (COPD) for 6 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None (recently)</td>
<td>Ex-smoker 33 years</td>
<td>Miner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10*</td>
<td>59/Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Pains down right side of trunk, tiredness, breathless</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>3 (1 for ear infection)</td>
<td>Ex-smoker 7 months</td>
<td>Senior Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11*</td>
<td>72/Female</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Cough, squeaky voice, difficulty swallowing</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gave up on reporting symptoms</td>
<td>Nursery nurse and shop assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12*</td>
<td>68/Male</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>Discomfort in left hand side of body</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-smoker</td>
<td>Fitter in a power station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>64/Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Irritable persistent cough, breathlessness, haemoptysis</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ex-smoker, 25 years</td>
<td>Decorator, then security guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Age/gender</td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Symptom profile</td>
<td>Symptom to reporting delay</td>
<td>Delay from symptom to diagnosis</td>
<td>Courses of antibiotics</td>
<td>Smoking status</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14*</td>
<td>51/Male</td>
<td>Divorced (but living with fiancé)</td>
<td>Collapse</td>
<td>None, picked up on CXR through A&amp;E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Stopped for 17yrs, started again 2yrs ago</td>
<td>Production manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15*</td>
<td>68/Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Pins and needles in arm and chest. Loss of power in hand. Gruff voice for about 9 months</td>
<td>9 month delay in reporting voice disturbance</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Current smoker</td>
<td>Railway vehicle builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>67/Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Blackout, speech loss, right sided weakness, fits.</td>
<td>None-picked up on CXR through A&amp;E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>At least one</td>
<td>Ex-smoker, 25 years</td>
<td>RAF officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>63/Female</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Stomach pain, anaemic, diagnosed with bowel cancer</td>
<td>None. Routine chest x ray following bowel cancer surgery</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Current smoker</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18*</td>
<td>69/Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Increasing cough</td>
<td>None (GP referred for CXR straight away)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Smoker for 55 years</td>
<td>British rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>65/Female</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Irritable persistent cough</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gave up on diagnosis</td>
<td>NHS clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>65/Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Fatigue, slight cough, reduced energy and activity</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Ex-smoker 33 years</td>
<td>Television engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CXR, Chest X-Ray; COPD, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease; GP, general practitioner.

*Denotes partner or friend present at the interview.
You do get more publicity for breast cancer and testicular cancer with men... but I've never heard anything about checking for lung cancer or that type of thing. (Patient 12)

There was a tendency to attribute symptoms to other acute and chronic conditions.

I'd got this irritating cough and... where I (was) working they'd just put air conditioning in and going and I put it down to that. (Patient 12)

It was just getting older, you know? (Patient 16)

This tendency was exaggerated in those who did not smoke.

So you just put it down to the weather, your age, physical exertion, nothing new. I mean, all of your friends said to me, “But he doesn’t smoke”. (Wife of Patient 16)

Knowledge

Knowledge and awareness of lung cancer symptoms and treatments was poor, and available information focused on other cancers. Any lung cancer information was smoking-related.

There’s an awful lot of publicity about breast cancer, about testicular cancer, about prostate cancer, but the only publicity around lung cancer is... If you smoke, you get lung cancer. If you don’t smoke you’re going to be all right. (Patient 19)

Some had no idea what symptoms to expect, while others expected lung cancer symptoms to be severe and extreme. This expectation conflicted with experience.

I thought probably it was an infection. I didn’t think it was anything very serious really because I didn’t feel ill. (Patient 12)

I would have expected to start losing weight as a first symptom and expected a cough, but I haven’t had a cough. (Patient 5)

Participants did not have accurate knowledge of lung cancer risk and saw themselves as more at risk of other cancers.

Well, I smoked, but I didn’t think I’d be at risk, no. (Patient 11)

You’re more likely to think of yourself getting breast cancer than lung cancer, even as a smoker. (Patient 1)

Two participants believed that after they gave up smoking their risk of lung cancer would be nil. This belief prompted them to ignore symptoms.

I mean, I gave up 25 years ago so you almost forgot that you ever were a smoker. (Patient 16)

If he’d been a smoker and he was getting breathless and he...his irritating cough had got worse it would be different.... We might well have said, “Hang on, you’d better get this looked at.” I think everybody associates lung cancer with smoking and if you don’t smoke they assume you’re not at risk. (Wife of Patient 16)

Fear

Fear was fostered by a lack of knowledge of treatments and strong fatalistic beliefs. Fear of death and a cancer diagnosis delayed reporting of symptoms.

They are frightened, aren’t they, you know, of the outcome. (Patient 6)

He admitted he (was) frightened. (Wife of Patient 15)

Current information campaigns were seen to contribute to fatalistic views as they focused on death rather than treatment.

Fear of a medical consultation and being seen as a time-waster further prompted delay, especially where people had previous bad experiences.

The way I was treated during the tests it was as if I was cheating, and I lost any confidence I had for doctors. (Patient 2)

Doctors are very busy people. We’re always being told, “Don’t waste the doctor’s time”. (Patient 16)

Blame and stigma

The findings revealed a prevailing expectation that people with lung cancer would experience blame and stigma.

Whenever you see warnings about cancer, there’s always a cigarette there. I don’t think I’ve seen a warning where there hasn’t been a cigarette, and I think that’s wrong. (Patient 13)

Non- or ex-smokers delayed in reporting symptoms because of an expectation, based on previous experience, that they would be stigmatized as a smoker and blamed for their illness.

They keep asking have I smoked? Have I drunk? It’s mainly have I smoked... anytime? I (said), “No.” The only thing I have (performed) is gone into bingo, where there’s been smoke. (Patient 3)

Culture

A number of cultural issues were cited in relation to delay in lung cancer symptom reporting in local communities. For example, great value was placed on stoicism, not complaining and “putting on a brave face”.

He was out with some friends and I picked him up and he said he’d blacked out and I said, “You did what?” He said, “I blacked
out.” I said, “Well, I think you ought to get checked out at the hospital.” (He replied) “Oh there’s nothing wrong with me. You fuss”. (Patient 16)

Stoicism was present in older, male participants and those who had worked in traditional industries such as coal mining and steel, and at the railway plant.

Men don’t like to know, generally. They don’t like to fuss. Going to the doctors is fussy. It’s a sign of weakness…. They don’t want to know. (Wife of Patient 16)

Lifelong patterns of poor healthcare utilization in these communities contributed to participants not using primary care services. For example, those who could remember pre-National Health Services (NHS) health care, where people had to pay to see a doctor, also reported reluctance to see a general practitioner (GP) unless symptoms were severe.

It had to be something really seriously wrong to make you go. The pair of us has very rarely been to the doctor, very rare all our working lives. (Patient 15)

There was also a tradition of accessing health care at work from the ‘pit doctor’ or ‘railway doctor’.

If you were sick…. We had a doctor come in and so we had all this first class health stuff…. Not your own doctor, but the railway doctor. (Patient 15)

Media messages interacted with cultural tendencies to reinforce the belief that people should not use primary care services unless a problem was extreme.

You don’t want to waste the doctor’s time because the message is you don’t need a doctor for 95% of things that are wrong with you. You know, you phone NHS Direct (telephone health advice service), you talk to a pharmacist and you say, “I’ve got this niggling cough,” and he gives you cough medicine. (Patient 16)

Families were key facilitators in noticing symptoms and overcoming delay by picking up early signs. Family members also legitimised and encouraged reporting by, for example, making them an appointment with their GP. Relatives arbitrated for the patient if symptoms were not being investigated.

My daughter says, “You’re coughing a lot, aren’t you”? I says, “I am, lately”. She says “I’ve phoned the doctor up anyway and you’re booked in for Thursday, half-past nine”. (Patient 18)

My daughter-in-law got on to him on the phone: “You’d better come and see my father-in-law, who’s pretty bad”. (Patient 2)

Discussion

Study limitations

As this was a small qualitative study, any claims of generalizability should be made with caution. However, the findings are a starting point from which to understand diagnostic delay, develop educational interventions for the public and healthcare professionals and support reflection on practice.

As the study was conducted in one locality, this limits the transferability of the findings further. However, it was conducted in an area of social deprivation with high levels of lung cancer, and the findings may be transferable to similar communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of social marketing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aims at a ‘social good’ (rather than commercial benefit) with specific behavioural goals clearly identified and targeted e.g. early reporting of chest symptoms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Involves a systematic process phased to address short, medium and long-term issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Includes a range of marketing techniques and approaches (a marketing mix) behaviour goals, relevant to improving health and reducing health inequalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1  Elements and stages of social marketing. Adapted from: National Social Marketing Centre 2006.**
The sample was limited in terms of ethnicity. No patients from black and ethnic minority groups were recruited, but this reflects the demographics of the study location. Further research is required to explore the influences in other ethnic groups.

Discussion of findings

Lung cancer presents a serious challenge in the UK in comparison to some other Western countries because of high mortality rates, late presentation and diagnostic delay. Our data illustrate how delays can occur before reporting symptoms to primary care practitioners. Issues that emerged as contributing to diagnostic delay include:

- The absence in lung cancer of a tangible symptom, like a lump, that would aid detection through self-examination.
- A belief that non- and ex-smokers would not get lung cancer. This created a lack of symptom vigilance and fostered the tendency to attribute symptoms to erroneous causes.
- A tendency to explain symptoms away because they were not as severe as expected, or because of environmental or other health issues.
- Cultural factors that contributed to delay in symptom reporting, most notably stoical attitudes and non-standard patterns of healthcare utilization.
- Family members are major facilitators to symptom referral.

What is already known about this topic

- Lung cancer accounts for approximately 5% of deaths in the Western world.
- The high mortality rate is, in part, attributed to delay in reporting symptoms and obtaining a diagnosis.
- Rates of surgical intervention and survival in lung cancer are lower in the United Kingdom (UK) than other developed countries including Europe and the United States of America (USA).

What this paper adds

- Lack of public knowledge of lung cancer risk and symptoms interacts with fear, blame and stigma as barriers to reporting lung cancer symptoms.
- Cultural influences may contribute to delay and families have a potential role to help overcome delay.
- New educational strategies are required for the public to overcome diagnostic delay, and nurses have the potential to have a key role in developing and implementing this education.

The study was conducted in an area of high risk and incidence of lung cancer. However, these findings have international relevance as they indicate the value of critiquing public health campaigns used in populations experiencing social and healthcare inequalities. The study highlights issues influencing effective public education in such populations. Low knowledge levels were additionally compromised by the focus of public health campaigns on smoking and death, thereby affirming a fatalistic attitude. This confused people and limited their understanding of risk. Blame and stigma were also reinforced by the stress on smoking, and participants were not aware that advantage can be gained from early symptom reporting.

Our findings illustrate a point of wider application, that is, how social inquiry can help to understand health inequalities. The study supports other research indicating that people self-manage symptoms for many months before reporting them to their GP (Corner et al. 2005, 2006). This illustrates how cultural mores of strength and stoicism, bound up in the study area’s industrial past, promote independence and self-management. This tendency adds to diagnostic delay and existing inequalities in healthcare utilization.

A recent UK survey revealed that up to 50% of smokers and 27% of adults generally consider cancer risk to be a matter of luck rather than lifestyle (Cancer Research UK 2007b). The survey, together with this study, strengthens the call to develop new educational interventions to address diagnostic delay. The contribution of family members in reducing delay also needs to be acknowledged and fostered in education of the public.

Our study highlights the need for those working in primary care to be vigilant for symptoms that might indicate lung cancer in high risk populations. Nurses involved in chronic disease and lifestyle management are in a prime position to play a role in this. Partnership working between GPs, practice nurses and pharmacists could be central in picking up these early symptoms.

Social marketing

Social marketing is a potential approach to addressing public and professional awareness and education about lung cancer symptoms and symptom reporting. Social marketing uses concepts, techniques and theories used in commercial marketing to promote socially important behaviour change, for example smoking cessation and healthy eating (Figure 1). The goal in social marketing is social, not commercial, benefit (National Social Marketing Centre 2006). In the case of lung cancer, this approach can be used to generate messages that are acceptable and accessible to high risk
communities to promote early detection and reporting of lung cancer symptoms. Similar approaches can be used to develop educational resources for healthcare professionals, including nurses.

Conclusion

Our findings reveal the complexity of factors influencing symptom-reporting in lung cancer in high risk populations and illustrates the need for public and professional educational strategies to address these factors. They also raise a number of points of broader international importance, for example that public education campaigns can worsen health inequalities if misinterpreted. Social marketing provides a potential vehicle for developing public messages that tackle the complex and cultural barriers to symptom reporting identified in this study.
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