Published online 2024 January 19.

# Investigating Cancer Patients' Quality of Life During the COVID-19 Outbreak: A Study from Iran

# Mohamad Hoseini Kasnavieh<sup>1</sup>, Mohammad Veisi<sup>2</sup>, Mohammad Amerzadeh<sup>3</sup>, Hossein Hosseinifard <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Trauma and Injury Research Center, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Department of Health Management and Economics, School of Public Health, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

- <sup>3</sup>Social Determinants of Health Research Center, Research Institute for Prevention of Non-Communicable Diseases, Qazvin University of Medical Sciences, Qazvin, Iran
- <sup>4</sup>Department of Biostatics , School of Public Health, Hamadan University of Medical Sciences, Hamadan, Iran

<sup>5</sup>Hospital Management Research Center, Health Management Research Institute, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

<sup>6</sup>Department of Health Services Management, School of Health Management and Information Sciences, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author: Hospital Management Research Center, Health Management Research Institute, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran. Email: ali66tahmasebi@gmail.com

Received 2023 August 09; Revised 2023 November 28; Accepted 2023 December 09.

#### Abstract

**Background:** Cancer patients may face challenges in their regular treatments and their quality of life (QoL) due to the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak.

Objectives: The purpose of this study was to assess the QoL of cancer patients in Iran during the COVID-19 crisis.

**Methods:** We applied the EORTC (European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer) Core Quality of Life (QLQ-C30) questionnaire to measure the QoL of cancer patients in Rasoul Akram Hospital in 2021 in Tehran. Based on the inclusion criteria (a cancer diagnosis, being 18 years of age or older, and the ability to understand (but not necessarily read) the Persian language), 87 cancer patients were found to be eligible. Of these, 85 completed the questionnaire. We used SPSS to analyze the data with an independent *t* test and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

**Results:** According to the result of the analysis, the global health status (main Qol score) was  $55.49 \pm 21.27$ . We found no significant difference in the global health status scores based on any demographic variables. Regarding functional scales, the type of insurance had a significant effect on the average cognitive functioning score (P-value = 0.043), with the highest score ( $79.37 \pm 21.02$ ) for patients with Medical Service Insurance and the lowest score ( $54.76 \pm 29.99$ ) for patients without insurance. We also found that in symptom scales, age (P-value < 0.001) and the type of cancer (P-value < 0.001) had a significant impact on the average appetite loss score. **Conclusions:** The QoL of cancer patients has deteriorated during the coronavirus outbreak in terms of general health status, functional scales, and symptom scales. Cancer patients need to be supported by decision-makers and hospital managers, especially in epidemics, to cope with psychological issues related to epidemics, such as fear, anxiety, and worry, and to ensure that they receive adequate services.

Keywords: Quality of Life, Patients, COVID-19

# 1. Background

According to the World Health Organization (WHO), cancers are the second cause of death globally, which cause more than 10 million deaths and cost over a trillion dollars every year (1-5). Cancers are a diverse set of diseases that involve the abnormal and uncontrolled growth and spread of cells in different organs or tissues of the body (3). It is estimated that the incidence of cancer in Iran will increase by 42.6%, from 112,000 cases in 2016 to 160,000 cases in 2025. Cancer mortality in Iran was over 79,000

people in 2020 (6, 7). Since cancer is a chronic condition that affects people for a long time, it is very important to assess the situation of cancer patients comprehensively. This assessment should not only include the clinical and medical outcomes of the patients but also their quality of life (QoL) (8). The QoL is a key indicator of the effectiveness of cancer treatments (9). The WHO defines QoL as an individual's perception of his or her position in life within the context of his or her personal values and goals (10).

The QoL is an important treatment objective, especially

Copyright © 2024, Hoseini Kasnavieh et al. This open-access article is available under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC BY 4.0) International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which allows for unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original work is properly cited.

for chronic diseases. Research on QoL is used for various purposes, such as policy-making, treatment evaluation, and descriptive and individual clinical purposes (10). The EORTC (European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer) Core Quality of Life (QLQ-C30) tool is a specific instrument developed by the European EORTC group to measure the QoL of cancer patients. Every year, more than 5 000 studies use this tool, which has been translated and validated in over 120 languages (11). Cancer patients live longer due to new treatment methods, but their QoL also changes over time. Moreover, QoL has a significant impact on the long-term survival of cancer patients. Therefore, more research is needed to understand how QoL findings can inform the care of cancer patients (12, 13).

Cancer is a growing burden that has enormous physical, emotional, and financial effects on individuals, families, communities, and health systems. Many health systems in low- and middle-income countries are not equipped to handle the high number of cancer patients and their needs. As a result, cancer patients often face delays or barriers in accessing diagnostic and treatment services for cancer (3). Stressful situations can also create problems that exacerbate these challenges and affect the QoL of cancer patients significantly (14-16). One of these situations that has caused a lot of worry and stress is the outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) (17, 18). The coronavirus outbreak has been stressful for everyone, but especially for people with cancer who are at higher risk of complications (19, 20). This stress and mental pressure caused by the coronavirus outbreak may lead cancer patients to suffer from these conditions and postpone their treatment due to fear of infection or even avoid going to the hospital and receiving care (18). Therefore, COVID-19 can negatively affect the routine treatments of cancer patients and lower their QoL (21, 22).

# 2. Objectives

To the best of our knowledge, there has been no study on the QoL of cancer patients during the Coronavirus outbreak in Iran. Therefore, we conducted this study with the aim of investigating cancer patients' QoL during the COVID-19 outbreak in an Iranian hospital.

#### 3. Methods

We measured the QoL of cancer patients who had to visit public hospitals during the COVID-19 outbreak.

We used a survey called QLQ-C30 that measures different aspects of QoL, such as physical, emotional, and social The EORTC QLQ-C30 is a disease-specific well-being. measure of QoL that evaluates the functional health, symptom burden, and HRQoL of cancer patients across different disease stages. It was developed by the EORTC, a European organization dedicated to cancer research and treatment. The original version was published in 1993, but the current version (OLO-C30 v3.0) has been in use since 1997. It has 30 items and includes 15 scales. Five scales measure how well people can do physical, role, emotional, cognitive, and social activities, and 9 scales evaluate how much people suffer from fatigue, nausea and vomiting, pain, shortness of breath, sleep problems, loss of appetite, constipation, diarrhea, financial troubles and a scale that assesses their overall health and OoL. The OLO-C30 can be supplemented with disease- or treatment-specific modules (11). The Persian version QLQ-C30 was used, as its validity and reliability have been established (11, 23). The reliability and validity of the Persian version of the QLQ-C30 questionnaire have been evaluated, and the results have shown that the Iranian version of EORTC QLQ-C30 is reliable (alpha = 76 - 93%) and valid (almost all inter-scale correlations were significant in the expected direction; Pearson's r was  $\geq$  40 in conceptually related scales and < 40 in scales with less in common) for measuring the QoL of cancer patients. Also, the content validity index (CVI) and content validity ratio (CVR) of the questionnaire were 0.94 and 0.76, respectively (11, 23, 24). We used the manuals from the EORTC QoL group website as our guide for scoring. These manuals have essential information for scoring the EORTC core questionnaire and its related modules (11). The range score of each dimension was from 0 to 100. We focused on the Dialysis Department of Rasoul Akram Hospital in Tehran, which treated both COVID-19 and cancer patients at the same time in 2021. We asked all the cancer patients who met our criteria to fill out the survey. They had to be 18 years or older, have a cancer diagnosis, and understand Persian. We had 150 eligible patients between January and February 2021, but only 85 completed the survey. At the time of the study and based on inclusion and exclusion criteria, all eligible patients (87 patients) in the study period were included in the study by census sampling method, and 85 of them completed the questionnaire. We did not exclude any patients based on their type or stage of cancer. We explained the purpose of the study to the patients and received their consent before giving them the survey. If they could not read, we read the questions to them and recorded their answers. We used

Demographic Status	Variables	No. (%)
Sev	Female	60 (70.6)
	Male	25 (29.4)
	$\leq$ 40	13 (15.3)
	41 - 50	16 (18.8)
Age (y)	51 - 60	20 (23.5)
	61 - 70	22 (25.9)
	≥ 71	14 (16.5)
	Without insurance	7 (8.2)
Insurance type	Social security	57 (67.1)
	Medical service	21 (24.7)
	$\leq$ 12	50 (58.8)
Duration of cancer diagnosis (mo)	13 - 60	20 (23.5)
	> 61	15 (17.6)
	Blood	11 (12.9)
	Lung	11 (12.9)
Cancer type	Breast	31 (36.5)
cuncer type	Glands	5 (5.9)
	Genital area	15 (17.6)
	Head	12 (14.1)

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Patients

SPSS (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA) to analyze the data with an independent *t*-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

#### 4. Results

We studied 85 cancer patients visiting the hospital for chemotherapy. The mean (standard deviation) of their age was  $54.42 \pm 14.76$  years. The median of the disease's duration in the patients was 12 months; the first quartile and third quartile were 7 months and 30 months, respectively. Moreover, 70.6% (60 people) of the patients were female, and 29.4% (25 people) were male. shows the other demographic characteristics of the patients.

Table 2 shows the indicators of descriptive statistics related to the QoL of cancer patients based on the EORTC QLQ-C30 questionnaire. The patients' average (standard deviation) QoL in the dimension of global health status was  $55.49 \pm 21.27$ . In functional scales, the average cognitive functioning score had the highest ( $74.31 \pm 22.79$ ) value, and emotional functioning had the lowest ( $56.76 \pm 28.01$ ) value. In the symptom scales, the average score of financial difficulties was the highest ( $62.75 \pm 35.04$ ), and nausea and vomiting were the lowest ( $49.54 \pm 23.10$ ).

Table 3 shows descriptive indicators and results of independent *t*-test and ANOVA to compare patients' average quality of working life in global health status and functional scales. The global health status scores did not vary significantly by any demographic factors. However, the type of insurance had a significant effect on the average cognitive functioning scores in the functional scales (P-value = 0.043). Patients with Medical Service insurance had the highest (79.37 ± 21.02) cognitive functioning, while patients without insurance had the lowest (54.76 ± 29.99). The average scores of other dimensions based on demographic characteristics were not statistically significant.

Table 4 shows the descriptive indicators and results of independent *t*-test and ANOVA to compare patients' average quality of working life in the symptom scales dimension. According to Table 4, The patient's age (P-value < 0.001) and type of cancer (P-value < 0.001) had a significant impact on the average score of appetite loss. Therefore, the average score of appetite loss was the highest in patients under 40 years (51.28  $\pm$  35) and the highest in patients with head cancer (61.11  $\pm$  34.33). The difference between the average of other dimensions of symptom scales based on demographic characteristics was not statistically significant.

# 5. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the QoL of cancer patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. We used version 3 of the QLQ-30 questionnaire, a specific instrument developed by the European EORTC group, to measure the QoL of cancer patients. This questionnaire is widely employed in many studies around the world every year (11). Besides the fear and anxiety caused by the coronavirus, cancer patients have postponed receiving some of their services due to the epidemic conditions and the healthcare system's lack of complete response capacity. Therefore, this issue can easily change patients' QoL suffering from chronic cancer conditions (18). Although the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on cognitive and emotional vulnerability (17), mental health (25), and challenges related to health and treatment conditions (26) of cancer patients in Iran has been investigated, the QoL of these patients during the COVID-19 pandemic has not been paid much attention.

Examining the QoL of a number of cancer patients in Iran during the COVID-19 pandemic indicated that the overall score of their general health status was 55.5. If

Table 2. The Average Score of Dimensio	ns Related to the QoL of Cancer Patients
--	--

Dimensions	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean ± SD
Global health status	85	8.33	100.00	55.49 ± 21.27
Functional scales				
Physical functioning	85	20.00	100.00	$65.33 \pm 20.80$
Role functioning	85	0.00	100.00	$67.84 \pm 25.82$
Emotional functioning	85	0.00	100.00	$56.76 \pm 28.01$
Cognitive functioning	85	0.00	100.00	74.31±22.79
Social functioning	85	0.00	100.00	$62.55\pm28.97$
Symptom scales				
Fatigue	85	0.00	88.89	$49.54\pm23.10$
Nausea and vomiting	85	0.00	100.00	$20.00\pm24.23$
Pain	85	0.00	100.00	$42.55 \pm 27.03$
Dyspnea	85	0.00	100.00	$20.39\pm24.72$
Insomnia	85	0.00	100.00	$38.04 \pm 32.59$
Loss of appetite	85	0.00	100.00	34.51± 33.51
Constipation	85	0.00	100.00	29.41± 31.88
Diarrhea	85	0.00	100.00	$20.78 \pm 25.71$
Financial difficulties	85	0.00	100.00	$62.75\pm35.04$

Table 3. The Pa	ttients' Quality o	of Working Life	e in Global Healtl	h Status and Fu	nctional Scales	with Demograp	ohic Factors							
Maniaklas		z	Global Hea	dth Status	Physical Fu	nctioning	Role Fun	ttioning	EmotionalF	unctioning	Cognitive Fu	nctioning	Social Fur	ctioning
Valiables														
	Female	60	56.II ± 20.69	023.0	$64.33 \pm 20.12$	0.406	69.17± 24.52	298.0	55.97± 27.45	009.0	$74.44 \pm 23.26$	0.005	63.61± 27.01	1020
yex	Male	25	54±22.96	6/010	67.73 ± 22.58	0.490	64.67±29	0.40/	58.67 ± 29.8	0.089	74 ± 22.09	c56.0	$60 \pm 33.68$	0.004
	< 40	13	62.82 ± 17.55		$69.74 \pm 16.47$		$60.26 \pm 26.82$		58.33 ± 29.07		78.21± 18.49		$73.08 \pm 19.88$	
	4150	16	$59.9 \pm 24.95$		70 ± 21.22		76.04± 22.75		58.85±28.78		76.04 ± 30.41		$65.63 \pm 26.15$	
Age (y)	51-60	20	59.17±24.32	0.155	67 ± 22	0.517	6833±29.07	0.525	$62.5 \pm 29.68$	0.615	74.17± 21.27	0.941	55.83 ± 32.12	0.474
	61-70	77	47.35 ± 15.51		61.21±22.5		$68.94 \pm 26.38$		48.86 ± 28.32		72.73 ± 20.92		58.33± 31.6	
	≥ 71	14	$51.19 \pm 20.89$		$60 \pm 19.74$		$63.1 \pm 22.81$		$57.14 \pm 24.21$		71.43± 23.96		$65.48 \pm 30.29$	
	Without insurance	7	<b>48.81</b> ± 16.96		<b>59.05</b> ± 22.58		57.14 ± 31.71		42.86±28.23		$54.76 \pm 29.99$		54.76 ± 12.6	
Insurance	Social security	57	56.43±21.88	0.673	$66.08 \pm 20.56$	0.705	$68.42 \pm 25.91$	0.513	$57.89 \pm 28.5$	0394	74.85±21.62	0.043	$64.04 \pm 27.24$	0.707
~16	Medical service	21	55.16±21.32		<b>65.4 ± 21.56</b>		$69.84 \pm 23.93$		58.33 ± 26.61		79.37±21.02		61.11±37.02	
	21	50	57 ± 21.39		66.13±20.11		68 ± 25.83		56.17 ± 27.08		<b>76±21.6</b>		65.33± 27.53	
Duration (months)	13-60	20	54.17±25.58	0.715	63.67± 25.91	0.903	72.5 ± 26.09	0.438	62.92 ± 31.7	0.427	74.17± 21.27	0.576	59.17±34.4	0.571
	> 61	15	$52.22 \pm 14.25$		$64.89 \pm 16.23$		61.11±25.72		$50.56 \pm 26.06$		$68.89 \pm 28.78$		$57.78 \pm 26.63$	
	Blood	п	$53.79 \pm 18.77$		$64.85 \pm 17.66$		$56.06 \pm 21.44$		$60.61 \pm 25.84$		$80.3\pm17.98$		66.67± 29.81	
	Lung	п	$59.85 \pm 21.99$		$63.64 \pm 18.22$		69.7±27.71		60.61± 33.35		78.79±19.85		$62.12 \pm 35.82$	
Cancer type	Breast	31	$62.1 \pm 22.75$	0.131	$69.46 \pm 20.35$	0.648	71.51± 22.85	0.130	$61.56 \pm 25.15$	0.449	77.42 ± 22.99	0.368	$67.2 \pm 24.9$	0.667
	Glands	5	51.67 ± 16.03		$66.67 \pm 8.16$		$80 \pm 21.73$		56.67±19.9		70±27.39		$66.67 \pm 11.79$	
	Genital area	15	51.11± 22.68		$64.89 \pm 25.38$		$74.44 \pm 28.78$		52.78±32.83		71.11±23.12		$52.22 \pm 36.66$	
	Head	17	<b>43.06 ± 13.69</b>		56.67 ± 24.7		$54.17 \pm 28.54$		$42.36 \pm 28.08$		$62.5 \pm 25.75$		58.33 ± 27.06	

Hoseini Kasnavieh M et al.

Variables Fêmé Sex			Earlie									-								
Sex Femi		N	finer	gue	Nausea and	Vomiting	Pai	Ē	Dysp	nea	Insor	nnia	Loss of A	ppetite	Constij	ation	Diarr	thea	Financial D	oifficulties
Fema Sex																				
	ale	0	49.81± 21.21	230 0	18.61± 24.76	910	41.67± 27.01	0.644	21.11± 26.01	0000	36.11± 31.47	0.00	32.78 ± 32.18	194.0	29.44± 31.94	000 0	18.89 ± 24.06	302.0	61.11± 34.81	000
Male	5	<u>ب</u>	48.89± 27.59	1000	23.33± 23.07		44.67± 27.52		18.67± 21.69	0000	42.67± 35.38	5	38.67± 36.87	*0**0	29.33± 32.38	005.0	25.33± 29.31	6670	66.67± 36	6000
VI	40 B		52.14± 21.46		20.51± 21.68		34.62± 26.75		15.38± 17.3		46.15± 34.8		51.28 ± 35		30.77± 34.59		23.08± 25.04		66.67± 33.33	
41 - 5	50 If	9	40.97± 22.12		16.67± 25.09		38.54± 26.33		14.58± 17.08		31.25± 33.26		8.33± 14.91		22.92± 29.11		18.75± 27.13		60.42 ± 34.89	
Age (y) 51-6	20 21	0	47.78 ± 26.27	0.467	21.67± 29.67	0.932	51.67± 26.98	0.377	16.67± 20.23	0367	31.67± 29.57	0.611	25± 28.36	< 0.01	38.33± 37.89	0.655	18.33± 25.31	0.8.22	66.67± 34.2	0.634
61 - 71	2		54.55 ± 18.75		18.18± 22.95		44.7± 29.72		27.27± 33.55		42.42± 32.82		48.48 ± 35.23		27.27± 31.93		25.76± 28.97		66.67± 32.53	
ΛI	и	4	51.59 ± 27.08		23.81± 21.4		38.1± 23.05		26.19 ± 26.73		40.48± 35.03		40.48± 32.5		26.19 ± 23.31		16.67 ± 21.68		50± 42.87	
With insur	hout 7 rance		53.97± 17.48		26.19± 25.2		45.24± 20.89		23.81± 31.71		47.62 ± 26.23		47.62± 26.23		28.57± 29.99		38.1± 29.99		85.71± 17.82	
Insurance Socia type secur	al 5. rity	1	49.12± 25.97	0.872	19.88 ± 25.09	0.757	43.57 ± 27.59	0.770	20.47± 25.78	806.0	36.84± 33.14	0.716	33.33± 35.07	0.563	28.07± 33.21	0.813	18.13 ± 21.89	0.146	61.99± 33	0.168
Medi	lical 21 lice		49.21± 15.94		18.25± 22.3		38.89± 28.05		19.05± 19.92		38.1± 33.81		33.33± 31.62		33.33± 29.81		22.22± 32.2		57.14 ± 42.35	
VI	12 51	0	50.22± 22.36		20± 24.28		41± 25.47		22.67± 26.46		39.33± 34.13		36± 36.17		29.33 ± 32.74		23.33± 28.77		6133± 36.49	
Duration <sup>13-6</sup>	50 21	0	48.33± 26.56	0.948	17.5± 19.85	0.784	45± 33.81	0.821	13.33± 19.94	0.348	33.33± 28.61	0.764	26.67± 29.81	0.455	26.67± 33.51	0.832	13.33 ± 19.94	0334	61.67 ± 32.94	0.760
> 6	51 IE		48.89± 22.14		23.33± 30.08		44.44 ± 23.29		22.22± 24.12		40± 33.81		40± 28.73		33.33 ± 28.17		22.22± 20.57		68.89± 34.43	
Bloot	пр		59.6± 21.24		33.33± 22.36		53.03± 20.84		21.21± 26.97		30.3± 23.35		45.45± 34.23		36.36± 23.35		36.36± 17.98		60.61± 35.96	
Lung	ы Ш		44.44± 22.77		13.64 ± 17.98		33.33± 29.81		24.24± 15.57		45.45± 37.34		48.48 ± 40.45		27.27 ± 29.13		30.3± 34.82		66.67± 33.33	
Breat	1st 31		45.88± 21.03		16.13± 23.37	100	36.56± 24.5	0.356	16.13± 24.15	0650	35.48± 30.95	0 305	18.28± 22.51	100.0	26.88± 34.87	0 035	18.28± 28.33	0138	6129± 3559	0.672
type	5 sbr		46.67± 22.77	4	23.33± 19		40± 14.91	2	20± 18.26		40± 43.46		33.33± 23.57		20± 18.26	14	20± 18.26	0	40± 43.46	
Geni	ital 15		45.93± 30.82		15.56± 20.38		46.67± 35.19		17.78± 21.33		28.89± 24.77		28.89± 33.01		33.33± 35.63		11.11± 16.27		64.44± 40.76	
Head	а р	7	60.19± 16.72		27.78 ± 35.06		52.78 ± 25.46		30.56± 36.12		55.56± 41.03		61.11± 34.33		30.56± 36.12		16.67 ± 22.47		72.22± 23.92	

Hoseini Kasnavieh M et al.

# 34, 35).

Besides the problems of receiving services during the pandemic and viral outbreak, cancer patients have a higher psychological vulnerability and suffer from problems such as mental anxiety (18), fear (20), and worry (19). They can be a factor in reducing the general health status score and overall reduction of the OoL. Therefore, during a pandemic such as COVID-19, reducing the factors that cause worry, anxiety, fear, and other psychological symptoms is necessary to control the decrease in cancer patients' QoL and support them. In the functional scale, the scores of each situation ranged from 56.8 on the emotional scale to 74.3 on the cognitive scale. The pandemic conditions caused much psychological pressure on people, particularly cancer patients. Therefore, cancer patients postpone their treatments due to fear, worry, and anxiety. These patients also reduced their social life due to the fear of contracting COVID-19 (17, 18, 25, 26). Therefore, this situation can be aggravated for a cancer patient who suffers from a chronic illness and related challenges in emotional functioning. Although the evidence in emotional functioning before the pandemic is diverse, and we cannot conclude that the pandemic has worsened the emotional functioning situation (28, 36). This shows that cognitive functioning during the pandemic has been negatively affected (28,36). Comparing QoL during the pandemic with other times in cancer patients, a relatively noticeable decrease is seen in other functional states, including physical, role, and social functions. Although functional scales and general health status in cancer patients during the pandemic in Iran show lower numbers compared to Denmark (34), the evidence indicates that functional scales and the average health status score during the COVID-19 pandemic have decreased. A significant part of this decrease is significant (19, 21, 37).

Symptomatic scales in the QLQ-C30 questionnaire, unlike the functional scales, indicate the deterioration of the QoL of cancer patients. The worst situation in symptom scales was financial difficulties, and the best situation was nausea and vomiting. Diarrhea and shortness of breath have shown almost similar numbers. Similarly, in the German and Ethiopian samples, cancer patients have shown lower mean scores of nausea, vomiting, and diarrhea in functional scales, so the QoL is less affected in this respect. In this sample, although in Ethiopia, like our study, the highest score was related to financial difficulties, in the German sample, the highest score and the worst symptom scale in cancer patients was related to insomnia. However, financial difficulties have also been significantly high (38).

A similar study in Iran indicates that before the COVID-19 pandemic, all symptom scales were significantly better in cancer patients compared to the time of the pandemic. This does not show a better situation even on 1 scale during the COVID-19 pandemic (36). The condition of Iranian patients compared to cancer patients in Denmark during the COVID-19 pandemic has been much worse in functional scales. In Danish cancer patients, the worst condition was fatigue, followed by insomnia, while in Iranian patients, the worst condition was financial difficulties, followed by fatigue. In the Danish sample, the best symptom scales included nausea, vomiting, and financial difficulties. While financial difficulties in Iranian cancer had the worst condition on symptom scales patients with a score of nearly 63, in Danish patients, it showed a number less than 6, which was one of the best conditions.

In the Danish sample of symptom scales, the highest value was about 30, and the lowest was 5. In comparison, the highest in the Iranian sample was about 63, and the lowest was 20 (32). In comparing the QoL of cancer patients before the pandemic in Germany to Ethiopia, there were significant differences in functional scales and symptom scales in favor of the German sample (36). Therefore, the evidence indicates that cancer patients in developed countries experience a better QoL than in developing countries. Several symptom scales have significantly deteriorated during the COVID-19 pandemic (21). The results indicate that no demographic variables had a relationship with functional scales and general health status in cancer patients. In this case, the difference in sex, age, duration, and type of cancer did not significantly affect the functional scales and the general health status of cancer patients. Although the effects of some variables were significant in similar studies, most had little effect on functional scales and general health status (37-39). Among the examined variables, only having or not having insurance affected the difference in cognitive performance, and people without insurance had the lowest cognitive scale. Since the lower limit of this scale was the lowest among cancer patients, it is necessary to review and reform the insurance status of cancer patients to improve their QoL. There is evidence of the effect of the insurance coverage status on the QoL in cancer patients, which confirms the present study's results (40, 41).

Among the symptom scales, the difference in the age of the patients and the type of cancer significantly

affected the difference in the loss of appetite score. The difference in other variables did not significantly affect other symptom scales. The study of cancer patients before the COVID-19 pandemic has also indicated that the age difference was significantly effective in the difference in symptom scales among patients (27). Nevertheless, further evidence exists in similar studies before the COVID-19 pandemic (42). In our study, variables such as age, type of cancer, and having or not having insurance have created significant differences in the QoL of cancer patients in Iran. Nevertheless, since the patients' QoL has deteriorated during the coronavirus crisis compared to previous studies due to adverse psychological conditions during the pandemic period, issues such as resilience, hope, optimism, dignity, self-efficacy, family support, providing conditions to reduce fear and anxiety and worry caused by infection and death, seeking and providing conditions to receive necessary routine treatments for cancer patients to prevent the deterioration of the QoL of cancer patients are more critical. (18-20, 25, 26, 43, 44).

# 5.1. Conclusions

During the COVID-19 pandemic, insomnia and fatigue, along with financial difficulties in cancer patients, have caused the worst conditions related to symptom scales, which, along with the psychological problems caused by the pandemic conditions, can significantly reduce the QoL of cancer patients. QoL of cancer patients during the COVID-19 pandemic indicated that the worst situation was in the functional scales related to the patient's emotional scales. All these cases confirm the importance of psychological and emotional support for cancer patients, especially in a pandemic. It seems the COVID-19 pandemic has generally affected the QoL of cancer patients negatively in terms of their overall health, their ability to function, and their experience of symptoms. Since only the insurance status, age, and type of cancer had an effect on the single symptom and functional scales among the examined variables, besides these factors, decision-makers and health care managers should consider other factors, such as psychological challenges related to the pandemic and control of fear, anxiety, and worry to provide services to cancer patients during the pandemic and ensure that they receive these services.

# Footnotes

Authors' Contribution: Dr. Hoseini and Mr. Veisy conducted a search on databases and found the related

articles. Dr. Amerzadeh and Ms. Riahi collected the data. Mr. Hosseinifard analyzed the data. Dr. Tahmasebi reviewed the results and wrote the main manuscript.

Conflict of Interests: There was no conflict of interest.

**Data Availability:** The dataset presented in the study is available on request from the corresponding author during submission or after publication.

**Ethical Approval:** This study has the ethics code IR.IUMS.REC.1400.1165 from the Iran University of Medical Sciences.

**Funding/Support:** This study was supported in part by grant No. 1400-3-69-22680 from the Iran University of Medical Sciences by a teaching and research scholarship from the School of Medicine.

**Informed Consent:** We explained the purpose of the study to the patients and received their consent before giving them the survey.

# References

- 1. World Health Organization. Global action plan for the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases 2013-2020. *Global status report on road safety*. 2013.
- Hannah R, Max R. Causes of Death. OurWorldInData.org. Retrieved; 2018. Available from: https://ourworldindata.org/causes-of-death.
- 3. World Health Organization. *Cancer, key facts.* 2021. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cancer.
- Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, et al. Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2021;71(3):209–49. [PubMed ID: 33538338]. https://doi.org/10.3322/ caac.21660.
- Parija SC. Nurses in a Leadership Role. Pondicherry J Nursing. 2021;14(1):1. https://doi.org/10.5005/jp-journals-10084-12176.
- Roshandel G, Ferlay J, Semnani S, Fazel A, Naeimi-Tabiei M, Ashaari M, et al. Recent cancer incidence trends and short-term predictions in Golestan, Iran 2004-2025. *Cancer Epidemiol.* 2020;**67**:101728. [PubMed ID: 32554298]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.canep.2020.101728.
- 7. Zendehdel K. Cancer statistics in I.R. Iran in 2020. *Basic Clin Cancer Res.* 2021. https://doi.org/10.18502/bccr.v12i4.7985.
- McLachlan SA, Devins GM, Goodwin PJ. Validation of the european organization for research and treatment of cancer quality of life questionnaire (QLQ-C30) as a measure of psychosocial function in breast cancer patients. *Eur J Cancer*. 1998;34(4):510-7. [PubMed ID: 9713301]. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0959-8049(97)10076-4.
- Bottomley A, Flechtner H, Efficace F, Vanvoorden V, Coens C, Therasse P, et al. Health related quality of life outcomes in cancer clinical trials. *Eur J Cancer*. 2005;41(12):1697-709. [PubMed ID: 16043345]. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.ejca.2005.05.007.
- Fixsen D, Blase K, Metz A, Van Dyke M. Implementation Science. International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences. 2015. p. 695-702. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-08-097086-8.10548-3.
- Getu MA, Wang P, Kantelhardt EJ, Seife E, Chen C, Addissie A. Translation and validation of the EORTC QLQ-BR45 among Ethiopian breast cancer patients. *Sci Rep*. 2022;**12**(1):605. [PubMed ID: 35906247].

[PubMed Central ID: PMC9338022]. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-02511-9.

- Firkins J, Hansen L, Driessnack M, Dieckmann N. Quality of life in "chronic" cancer survivors: A meta-analysis. J Cancer Surviv. 2020;14(4):504-17. [PubMed ID: 32162194]. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11764-020-00869-9.
- Van Dipten C, Olde Hartman TC, Biermans MC, Assendelft WJ. Substitution scenario in follow-up of chronic cancer patients in primary care: Prevalence, disease duration and estimated extra consultation time. *Fam Pract.* 2016;**33**(1):4–9. [PubMed ID: 26691380]. https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmv098.
- Dehghan M, Jazinizade M, Malakoutikhah A, Madadimahani A, Iranmanesh MH, Oghabian S, et al. Stress and quality of life of patients with cancer: The mediating role of mindfulness. J Oncol. 2020;2020:3289521. [PubMed ID: 33381176]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC7748895]. https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/3289521.
- Barre PV, Padmaja G, Rana S; Tiamongla. Stress and quality of life in cancer patients: Medical and psychological intervention. *Indian J Psychol Med.* 2018;40(3):232-8. [PubMed ID: 29875530]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC5968644]. https://doi.org/10.4103/IJPSYM.IJPSYM\_512\_ 17.
- Soleimani MA, Lehto RH, Negarandeh R, Bahrami N, Nia HS. Relationships between death anxiety and quality of life in iranian patients with cancer. *Asia Pac J Oncol Nurs.* 2016;3(2):183–91. [PubMed ID: 27981157]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC5123493]. https://doi.org/10.4103/2347-5625.182935.
- Choobin MH, Mirabolfathi V, Chapman B, Moradi AR, Grunfeld EA, Derakshan N. The Impact of COVID-19 outbreak on emotional and cognitive vulnerability in iranian women with breast cancer. *Front Psychol.* 2021;12:663310. [PubMed ID: 34177718]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC8220448]. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.663310.
- Momenimovahed Z, Salehiniya H, Hadavandsiri F, Allahqoli L, Gunther V, Alkatout I. Psychological distress among cancer patients during COVID-19 pandemic in the world: A systematic review. *Front Psychol.* 2021;12:682154. [PubMed ID: 34650469]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC8506116]. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.682154.
- Falcone R, Grani G, Ramundo V, Melcarne R, Giacomelli L, Filetti S, et al. Cancer Care During COVID-19 Era: The quality of life of patients with thyroid malignancies. *Front Oncol.* 2020;**10**:1128. [PubMed ID: 32714873]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC7344223]. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2020.01128.
- Xie J, Qi W, Cao L, Tan Y, Huang J, Gu X, et al. Predictors for fear of cancer recurrence in breast cancer patients referred to radiation therapy during the COVID-19 pandemic: A multi-center cross-section survey. *Front Oncol.* 2021;11:650766. [PubMed ID: 34381703]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC8351463]. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2021.650766.
- Ciazynska M, Pabianek M, Szczepaniak K, Skibińska M, Narbutt J, Lesiak A. Predictors for fear of cancer recurrence in breast cancer patients referred to radiation therapy during the COVID-19 pandemic: A multi-center cross-section survey. *Frontiers oncol.* 2020. https://doi. org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-57046/v1.
- Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2016. CA: A Cancer J Clinicians. 2016;66(1):7-30. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21332.
- Montazeri A, Harirchi I, Vahdani M, Khaleghi F, Jarvandi S, Ebrahimi M, et al. The European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire (EORTC QLQ-C30): translation and validation study of the Iranian version. *Support Care Cancer*. 1999;7(6):400–6. [PubMed ID: 10541982]. https://doi.org/10.1007/s005200050300.
- 24. Safaee A, Dehkordi Moghimi B, Tabatabaie SHR. Reliability and validity of the QLQ-C30 questionnaire in cancer patients. *Armaghane danesh*. 2007;**12**(2):79–88.
- 25. Aliyari N. Mental health of people with cancer during Covid 19. Iran J

Cancer Care (ijca). 2021;2(1):11-7.

- 26. Karimian A, Talaei S, Abdolmaleki A, Asadi A, Akram M, Ghanimi HA. The impact of new coronavirus on cancer patients. *J Pharmaceutical Care*. 2022. https://doi.org/10.18502/jpc.v9i4.8226.
- Fard JH, Janbabaei G. Quality of life and its related factors among iranian patients with metastatic gastrointestinal tract cancer: A cross-sectional study. *Indian J Palliat Care*. 2014;20(3):215–9. [PubMed ID: 25191010]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC4154170]. https://doi.org/10.4103/0973-1075.138398.
- Mehrabi F, Hekmatpou D, Abolfathi A. The relationship between demographic characteristics and quality of life in patients with cancer. *Health Res J.* 2019;5(1):8–15. https://doi.org/10.29252/hrjbaq.5.1.
  8.
- Isfahani P, Corani Bahador R, Peirovy S, Afshari M. Quality of life among cancer patients in Iran. *Health Edu Health Promotion*. 2022;10(1):23-31.
- Alinia C, Yaghmaei S, Abdullah FZ, Ahmadi A, Samadi N, Pourteimour S, et al. Correction to: The health-related quality of life in Iranian patients with COVID-19. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2021;21(1):538. [PubMed ID: 34098900]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC8182992]. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-021-06246-w.
- Imran M, Al-Wassia R, Alkhayyat SS, Baig M, Al-Saati BA. Assessment of quality of life (QoL) in breast cancer patients by using EORTC QLQ-C30 and BR-23 questionnaires: A tertiary care center survey in the western region of Saudi Arabia. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(7). e0219093. [PubMed ID: 31291302]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC6620008]. https:// doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0219093.
- 32. Arraras Urdaniz JI, Martínez Aguillo M, Manterola Burgaleta A, Salgado Pascual E, Martínez López E, Vera García R, et al. Quality of life assessment in Spanish lung cancer patients by the EORTC questionnaires. *Oncología (Barcelona)*. 2005;**28**(4). https://doi.org/10. 4321/s0378-48352005000400002.
- Mercieca-Bebber R, Costa DS, Norman R, Janda M, Smith DP, Grimison P, et al. The EORTC Quality of Life Questionnaire for cancer patients (QLQ-C30): Australian general population reference values. *MedJ Aust.* 2019;**210**(11):499–506. [PubMed ID: 31155722]. https://doi.org/10.5694/ mja2.50207.
- Jeppesen SS, Bentsen KK, Jorgensen TL, Holm HS, Holst-Christensen L, Tarpgaard LS, et al. Quality of life in patients with cancer during the COVID-19 pandemic - a Danish cross-sectional study (COPICADS). Acta Oncol. 2021;60(1):4–12. [PubMed ID: 33031010]. https://doi.org/10.1080/ 0284186X.2020.1830169.
- Lim SL, Woo KL, Lim E, Ng F, Chan MY, Gandhi M. Impact of COVID-19 on health-related quality of life in patients with cardiovascular disease: A multi-ethnic Asian study. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2020;18(1):387. [PubMed ID: 33317547]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC7734458]. https://doi. org/10.1186/s12955-020-01640-5.
- Hosseini B, Nedjat S, Zendehdel K, Majdzadeh R, Nourmohammadi A, Montazeri A. Response shift in quality of life assessment among cancer patients: A study from Iran. *Med J Islam Repub Iran*. 2017;**31**:120. [PubMed ID: 29951421]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC6014782]. https://doi. org/10.14196/mjiri.31.120.
- Gallo O, Bruno C, Locatello LG, Martelli F, Cilona M, Orlando P, et al. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the quality of life of head and neck cancer survivors. *Support Care Cancer*. 2021;**29**(11):6297–304. [PubMed ID: 33860361]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC8049620]. https:// doi.org/10.1007/s00520-021-06198-6.
- Wondie Y, Hinz A. Quality of life among Ethiopian cancer patients. Support Care Cancer. 2020;28(11):5469-78. [PubMed ID: 32170441]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC7547027]. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-020-05398-w.
- 39. Kurzhals JK, Klee G, Busch H, Hagelstein V, Zillikens D, Terheyden

P, et al. The impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on quality of life in skin cancer patients. *PLoS One*. 2021;**16**(8). e0255501. [PubMed ID: 34407086]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC8372941]. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255501.

- Penson DF, Stoddard ML, Pasta DJ, Lubeck DP, Flanders SC, Litwin MS. The association between socioeconomic status, health insurance coverage, and quality of life in men with prostate cancer. J Clin Epidemiol. 2001;54(4):350–8. [PubMed ID: 11297885]. https://doi.org/10. 1016/s0895-4356(00)00312-7.
- 41. Jeong CW, Cowan JE, Broering JM, Ten Ham RMT, Wilson LS, Carroll PR, et al. Robust health utility assessment among long-term survivors of prostate cancer: Results from the cancer of the prostate strategic

urologic research endeavor registry. *Eur Urol*. 2019;**76**(6):743-51. [PubMed ID: 31345635]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2019.07.012.

- Akhondi-Meybodi M, Akhondi-Meybodi S, Vakili M, Javaheri Z. Quality of life in patients with colorectal cancer in Iran. *Arab J Gastroenterol.* 2016;**17**(3):127-30. [PubMed ID: 27591102]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajg. 2016.06.001.
- Abdollahzadeh F, Aghahossini SS, Rahmani A, Kermani IA. Quality of life in cancer patients and its related factors. J Caring Sci. 2012;1(2):109.
- 44. Zhao X, Tong S, Yang Y. The correlation between quality of life and positive psychological resources in cancer patients: A meta-analysis. *Front Psychol.* 2022;**13**:883157. [PubMed ID: 35783766]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC9245894]. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.883157.