

HEALTH RELATED QUALITY OF LIFE OF WOMEN WITH GYNECOLOGICAL CANCER RECEIVING CHEMOTHERAPY IN THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE HOSPITAL, IBADAN.

Omolola Lydia, ABIODUN

(email: omololatumise@gmail.com)

Department of Nursing, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

Aims: This study assessed the health related quality of life of women with gynecological cancers on chemotherapy, Identified their major concern and also assessed the relationship between quality of life with prevalent side effects as experienced by those women.

Study design: Cross sectional descriptive study on women with gynecological cancer on chemotherapy.

Place and Duration of Study: Radiation Oncology Department, University College Hospital Ibadan, between June 2018 and August 2018.

Methodology: Purposive sampling technique was used to select 117 women with gynecological cancer undergoing chemotherapy treatment at the University College Hospital, Ibadan. QoL was measured with EORTC QLQ-C30 version 3.0. The side effects were assessed by adapting Memorial Symptoms Assessment Scale. Relationships between QoL score and side effects was analyzed using Chi-square test at 5% level of significance.

Results: The mean age of participants is 48.8 years. Cervical cancer (69.2%) is the most prevalent gynecological cancer as revealed in this study. In sub-dimensions of the functional status scale the scores of cognitive and physical status were found higher while emotional and social status score were found lowest. For Global health status, majority of the respondents rated it good (82.1%). Financial difficulty ranked the highest concern (88%). There was a statistically significant association between health related quality of life and side effect of chemotherapy ($p= 0.02$). **Conclusion:** Gynecological cancer and its treatment causes a significant problem on the social, emotional and role aspect of QoL. Preventing and minimizing the effect of the symptoms of gynecologic cancer by prompt management of side effects of chemotherapy may positively impact on patient QoL.

Keywords: Health related quality of life, gynecological cancer, Chemotherapy, Side effect.

INTRODUCTION

Gynecological cancers are a frequent group of malignancies in women, accounting for approximately 18% of all female cancers worldwide [1]. Approximately 84,000 new cases are diagnosed and about 28,000 deaths occur each year from gynecologic cancer among women in the United States [2]. Prevalence of gynaecologic cancers is ranked as the fourth around the world and it is ranked as the second after breast cancer in Turkey [3]. Cervical cancer is a frequently diagnosed gynecological cancer in Africa and the leading cause of death of women in Eastern Africa, accounting for about 12% of the total new cancer cases and 10% of cancer deaths in Eastern Africa [4]. The gynaecologic cancer burden in developing countries like Nigeria is huge primarily due to the high incidence and mortality of cervical cancer [5].

The risk for the development of cancer begins to increase at 40 years of age and then increases rapidly at age 50years [6]. However, some researchers maintains that cancer does not have to be an

28 inevitable consequence of growing older and that whether the relationship between age and cancer
29 risk is due primarily to the time-dependent accumulation of genetic and epigenetic mutations or to an
30 increased susceptibility of older adults to oncogenic mutations (due to reduced immune function) is
31 not fully understood [7,8].

32
33 A recent global report by the International Agency for Research on Cancer showed that gynecological
34 cancers accounted for 25% of all new cancers diagnosed in women aged up to 65 years compared
35 with 16% in the developed world [9]. This observed trend in developing countries has been attributed
36 to several possibilities including the shift to a Western lifestyle and behaviors such as cigarette
37 smoking, low fiber/high fat diets, and less physical activity; a high prevalence of immune-suppressing
38 conditions such as malnutrition, tuberculosis, and human immunodeficiency virus; a high prevalence
39 of oncogenic infections such as hepatitis B virus, human immunodeficiency virus, hepatitis C virus,
40 human papilloma virus, and Helicobacter pylori [10].

41 Cancer itself causes comorbid symptoms and treatment strategies are also debilitating by decreasing
42 cardiorespiratory capacity, pain, fatigue and suppressing immune function, others like psychological
43 stress, anxiety, depression, fear of recurrence, sleep dysfunction and impaired Quality of Life are
44 residual symptoms during and after cancer treatment [11]. Chemotherapy can give rise to acute and
45 long term side effects which in turn can significantly compromise patient's QoL. The 5-year survival
46 rate for gynecological cancers in Africa is 30% whereas the 5-year survival rates for gynecological
47 cancers in developed countries is 74% [3]. The low 5-year survival rates in Africa are mainly
48 associated with lack of early detection programs, adequate diagnosis, and treatment facilities,
49 resulting in a high proportion of women presenting with late stage disease [12]. Although prolongation
50 of survival remains the primary goal of chemotherapy, the palliation of symptoms and preservation of
51 quality of life are also important treatment considerations [13]. In this new era of cancer management
52 more emphasis is on QoL then quantity of life and where total cure is a remote possibility so there is a
53 need of measurement of QoL which may indicate adaptation to disease and chemotherapy by the
54 patients [14]. More so, assessment of quality of life is believed to be an important element in the
55 assessment of individuals on chemotherapy because after the diagnosis of gynecologic cancer,
56 women are faced with the diagnosis itself, personal interpretation of cancer, physical effects of the
57 disease, long and short term side effects of the treatment regimes and the reaction of family and
58 friends [15,16]. Chemotherapy, unlike surgery has many adverse reactions including hair loss,
59 nausea, vomiting, fatigue and diarrhea; besides it requires extended periods of treatment and
60 repeated admissions to the hospital, which can eventually affect the QoL of patients with cancer.

61 When treatment can not result in cure, it should lead to an improvement of well-being and quality of
62 life [17]. Quality of Life for patients is defined as "extent to which one's usual or expected physical,
63 emotional and social well-being is affected by a medical condition or its treatment". While Health-
64 related quality of life (HRQOL) is a subjective health status that focuses more on the impact of a
65 perceived health state on the ability to live a fulfilling life. For patients living with cancer, all aspects of
66 life are influenced negatively [18]. Patients with cancer receiving chemotherapy face some
67 psychological problems- stress, anxiety, depression; some physiological side-effects — hair loss,
68 pain, tiredness, nausea, vomiting; some social side effects — social isolation, role and function loss;
69 and, eventually, a worsened quality of life [19]. In recent times, the goal of cancer therapy is not only
70 to cure the cancer and increase the survival, but also to minimize the symptoms, relieve suffering,
71 restore functioning, or enhance the quality of life [13]. Higher quality of life leads patients to complete
72 therapy with the lowest harm, control experienced symptoms and overcome these symptoms.

73 Most of the gynecologic cancer patients presented with advanced cancer and generalized metastases
74 to various organ systems; as a result, most women had several symptoms and had been sick for
75 about 2 years before diagnosis, due to poor access to specialized health care, thus affecting their
76 quality of life [20].

77 Also, the problem of finances as the cost of chemotherapy is usually unaffordable, and this is a major
78 obstacle for many patients to continue with the treatment [21]. Knowledge about QoL issues is crucial
79 to constitute follow-up care programs adjusted to the survivors' needs and provide appropriate
80 education in prevention and early detection of survivors' needs and ultimately improve their QoL [22].
81 Currently, there is paucity of such studies assessing HRQoL of women with gynecological cancer on
82 chemotherapy in Nigeria. This has prompted this study, which assessed the Health Related Quality of
83 life in women with gynecologic cancers receiving chemotherapy at the University College Hospital
84 Ibadan, Oyo State Nigeria.

85 **MATERIALS AND METHODS / METHODOLOGY**

86 The descriptive cross-sectional research design was used to elicit information from women with
87 gynecological cancers on chemotherapy at the University College Hospital (UCH), Ibadan. UCH is
88 located on Queen Elizabeth road in Ibadan North Local Government Area of Ibadan. It was
89 established in 1958 as one of the foremost tertiary hospital to perform the tripartite function of training,
90 research and service to the people of Nigeria in particular and Africa as a whole. It has 45 specialty
91 departments including Radiation Oncology department. The Radiation Oncology department
92 comprises of radiation oncology clinic and radiation oncology ward: the clinic opens Monday to Friday
93 and provide care for patients on an outpatient basis whereas, the ward is a 16 bedded ward for both
94 male and female patients that require inpatient care. The department renders both radiotherapy and
95 chemotherapy treatment for all forms of cancers.
96 117 women with gynecological cancer and on chemotherapy were purposively selected for this study.
97 The number of women was determined using the formula for calculating single proportion [23], where:

$$n = \frac{z^2 pq}{d^2}$$

98 and z was set at 1.96 (95% confidence interval). The data were collected between 1st of
99 June, 2018 and 30th of August, 2018. Due to the small number of the study population, all patients
100 who were living with gynaecological cancers and on chemotherapy, above the age of 18 and agreed
101 to participate in this study were included in this study while women who were newly diagnosed with
102 gynecological cancer, yet to commence chemotherapy, below the age of 18 years, too ill or living with
103 dementia were excluded from this study.

104 For each woman recruited, explanations were made about the study focusing on the study objectives,
105 problem statement and methods with emphasis on their right to confidentiality, right to refuse to
106 participate, beneficence and non-maleficence before consent were obtained.

107 The instrument for the study consisted of both self-structured items and validated instruments. Section
108 A assessed information on socio demographic characteristics of the participants e.g age, sex, type of
109 cancer, educational level etc, this constitutes questions 1 - 10. Section B Second part included
110 European Organization for Research and treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire EORTC
111 QLQ-C 30 version 3.0 questionnaire which is an integrated system for assessing the health related
112 QoL of cancer patients. The core questionnaire, the QLQ-C30, is the product of collaborative
113 research. It was first released in 1993 and has been used in a wide range of cancer clinical trials, by a
114 large number of research groups [24]. Section C assessed the side effects of chemotherapy adapting
115 Memorial Symptoms Assessment Scale (MSAS).

116 The QLQ-C30 version 3.0 incorporates five functional scales (physical, role, cognitive, emotional, and
117 social), a global health status/ QoL scale and symptom scales which include a number of single items
118 assessing additional symptoms commonly reported by cancer patients. This questionnaire includes a
119 total of 30 items and is composed of scales that evaluate physical (5 items), emotional (4 items), role
120 (2 items), cognitive (2 items) and social (2 items) functioning as well as global health status (2 items).
121 Higher mean scores on these scales represent better functioning. The questionnaire also comprises 3
122 symptom scales measuring nausea and vomiting (2 items), fatigue (3 items) and pain (2 items), and 6
123 single items assessing financial impact and various physical symptoms such as dyspnea, insomnia,
124 appetite loss, constipation and diarrhea. All of the scales and single-item measures range in score
125 from 0 to 100. A high scale score represents a higher response level. Thus a high score for a
126 functional scale represents a high/ healthy level of functioning; a high score for the global health
127 status/ QoL represents a high QoL; but a high score for a symptom scale/ item represents a high level
128 of symptomatology [24]. Two research assistants were recruited and together with the researcher,
129 obtained the data for this study.

130 The data collected was analyzed using IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version
131 22). To determine the quality of life levels, descriptive statistics were used (mean, standard deviations
132 and frequencies). Prevalent side-effects were then identified as those with higher frequencies. The
133 side effects were also categorized as 'mild' and 'severe' using the mean (33.65 ± 7.40). Association
134 between Side effects of chemotherapy and health related quality of life of women with gynecologic
135 cancers on chemotherapy was analyzed using Chi-square test at 5% level of significance.

136 Results

137 The mean age was 48.8 years (±10years). 74.4% were Christians while 25.6% of the respondents
138 were Muslims. 65.8% were of Yoruba tribe, 27.4% of Igbo tribe while 6.8% were of Hausa tribe. 53%
139 of the respondents were married, 22.2% were divorced and 6.8% were single. Cervical cancer was
140 the most prevalent 69.2% respondents followed by ovarian cancer in 17.1% respondents, endometrial
141 cancer in 6.8% respondents while vaginal and vulva cancers occurred equally among 6.8%
142 respondents. The mean course of chemotherapy was 3times (±1.5times), mean number of children
143 was 4 children (±2children). 62.4% were traders, 20.5% were housewives, and 13.7% were civil

144 servants while 3.4% were students. About 41.0% had a tertiary education, 39.3% had only secondary
 145 school education, 16.2% had only primary school education while only 3.4% of respondents had no
 146 formal education.

147 **Table 1: Respondent's demographic characteristics**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Age			48.79	10.04	28	68
28-34	16	13.7				
35-41	5	4.3				
42-48	39	33.3				
48.8-54	20	17.1				
55-61	20	17.1				
62-68	17	14.5				
Religion						
Islam	30	25.6				
Christianity	87	74.4				
Others	0	0.0				
Tribe						
Hausa	8	6.8				
Igbo	32	27.4				
Yoruba	77	65.8				
Others						
Occupation						
Civil servant	16	13.7				
Trader	73	62.4				
Student	4	3.4				
Housewife	24	20.5				
Level of education						
Primary	19	16.2				
Secondary	46	39.3				
Tertiary	48	41.0				
No formal education	4	3.4				
Other treatment received						
Surgery	16	13.7				
Radiotherapy	71	60.7				
None	30	25.6				

148

149 **Table 2: Respondent's demographic characteristics**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Cancer type						
Ovarian	20	17.1				
Cervical	81	69.2				
Vaginal	4	3.4				
Vulva	4	3.4				
Endometrial	8	6.8				
Course of chemotherapy			3.03	1.50	1	6
1	14	12.0				
2	37	31.6				
3	33	28.2				
4	9	7.7				
5	12	10.3				
6	12	10.3				

150

151 The women's mean EORTC QLQ-30 scores were given in Table 3. When the patients' QoL scores
 152 were evaluated, the mean of global health QoL score was determined as (63.03 ±18.09). When the
 153 sub-dimensions of the functional status scale were evaluated, the mean of cognitive score
 154 (61.6±33.56) was found higher than other dimensions. However, Social score (36.75±33.59) was the
 155 lowest score in women with gynecologic cancer. Fatigue score (56.4±28.0) was found higher than all
 156 other symptoms. The major concern as seen from the single items scale is financial difficulties
 157 (88.3±25.26).

158 **Table 3: Health related quality of life of respondents**

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Functional scale				
Physical functioning	60.40	36.79	0.00	100.00
Role functioning	53.70	34.82	0.00	100.00
Emotional functioning	49.43	32.29	0.00	100.00
Cognitive functioning	61.60	33.56	0.00	100.00
Social functioning	36.75	33.59	0.00	100.00
Symptom scale				
Fatigue	56.41	28.01	16.67	100.00
Nausea and vomiting	51.19	31.90	0.00	100.00
Pain	50.85	29.18	16.67	100.00
Quality of life scale /global health status	63.03	18.09	33.33	83.33
Single items				
Dyspnea	25.64	34.57	0.00	100.00
Insomnia	50.14	33.80	0.00	100.00
Appetite loss	54.13	32.37	0.00	100.00
Constipation	41.60	31.84	0.00	100.00
Diarrhea	15.95	27.54	0.00	100.00
Financial difficulties	88.31	25.26	0.00	100.00

159 Table 4 shows that 82.1% of the respondents have a better health related quality of life while 17.9%
 160 has a worse health related quality of life.

161 **Table 4: Categories of respondents' health related quality of life**

Health related quality of life	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Better	96	82.1
Worse	21	17.9

163 From table 5 below, it could be deduced that the prevalent side effects of chemotherapy among
 164 respondents (in order of occurrence) are problem with sexual activities (69.2%), worrying (50.4%),
 165 pain (49.6%), dizziness (46.2%), itching (39.3%), nausea (38.5%), fatigue and nervousness (36.8%),
 166 problem with urination (35.1%), lack of appetite (28.2%), vomiting (27.3%), difficulty in sleeping and
 167 feeling of sadness (24.0%), shortness of breath (20.6%) with the least being constipation with 18.8%.

168 **Table 5: Side effects of chemotherapy**

Variable	Not at all F(%)	Slightly F(%)	Severe F(%)
Problem with sexual activities	24(20.5)	12(10.3)	81(69.2)
Worrying	24(20.5)	34(29.1)	59(50.4)
Pain	33 (28.2)	26(22.2)	58(49.6)
Dizziness	24(20.5)	39(33.3)	54(46.2)
Itching	29(24.8)	42(35.9)	46(39.3)
Nausea	13(11.1)	59(50.4)	45(38.5)
Lack of energy/fatigue	41(35.0)	33(28.2)	43(36.8)
Feeling nervous	41(35.0)	33(28.2)	43(36.8)
Problem with urination	37(31.6)	39(33.3)	41(35.1)
Lack of appetite	29(24.8)	55(47.0)	33(28.2)
Vomiting	23(19.7)	62(53.0)	32(27.3)
Difficulty in sleeping	41(35.0)	48(41.0)	28(24.0)
Feeling sad	36(30.8)	53(45.3)	28(24.0)
Shortness of breath	52(44.4)	41(35.0)	24(20.6)
Constipated	42(35.9)	53(45.3)	22(18.8)

170 **Table 5: Categories of side effects of chemotherapy experienced by respondents**
 171 Table 5: above shows that the mean score for side effects of chemotherapy (33.65 ± 7.40) with the
 172 minimum and maximum scores being 21 and 45 respectively. The categories of side effect
 173 experienced by women on chemotherapy were also presented. It could therefore be deduced that
 174 75.2% of women suffered severe side effects whereas only 24.8% suffered mild side effects of
 175 chemotherapy.

Side effects of chemotherapy		Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Mild 29(24.8%)	Severe 88(75.2%)	33.65	7.40	21	45

176 **Association between the side effects of chemotherapy and health related quality of life of**
 177 **women with gynecological cancers on chemotherapy.**
 178

179 Table 6, the P=Value 0.02 is less than 0.05 and it can therefore be concluded that there is significant
 180 association between health related quality of life and prevalent side effects experienced by women on
 181 chemotherapy. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

182 **Association between the side effects of chemotherapy and health related quality of life of**
 183 **women with gynecologic cancers on chemotherapy.**
 184

184 **Table 6**

Variable	Prevalent side effects		X ²	P-value
	Mild	Severe		
Quality of life			8.434	0.015
Better	29(24.8%)	67(57.3%)		
Worse	0(0.0%)	21(17.9%)		

185
 186 **DISCUSSION**

187 **The ages of respondents ranges between 28 and 68years, with mean age of 48.8 years (± 10 years)**
 188 **this is in agreement with findings from a similar study [25] with a mean age of 48.4 (± 12.0) years.** Age
 189 has been reported to be a single predictor of cancer development. Risk for the development of cancer
 190 begins to increase at 40 years of age and then increase rapidly at age 50years [6].

191 In this study, gynaecologic cancer includes cervical cancer, ovarian cancer, endometrial cancer, vulva
 192 and vagina cancer. Cervical cancer was the most prevalent (69.2%) respondents followed by ovarian
 193 cancer in (17.1%) respondents, endometrial cancer in (6.8%) respondents while vaginal and vulva
 194 cancers occurred equally among (3.4%) respondents, this report is in agreement with a large review
 195 carried out in Lagos and Ibadan (South West Nigeria) in 2011 showed that cervical cancer was
 196 second only to breast cancer as the commonest cancer in the region [26]. The pattern from Aminu
 197 Kano Teaching hospital in the largest metropolis in the north west of the country equally shows that
 198 cervical cancer is the commonest Gynaecologic malignancy in women. Cervical cancer is the 4th
 199 commonest cancer in women and the 7th overall worldwide [27]. Its highest incidence occurs in less
 200 developed areas of the world where 85% of the cases now occur [2].

201 In this study, the sub-dimensions of the functional status scale were evaluated, the mean of cognitive
 202 and physical score was found higher while emotional and social functional sub dimensions score were
 203 found lowest in women with gynecological cancer on chemotherapy. Similarly, a study in Turkey,
 204 which evaluated QoL of women using EORTC QLQ-C30 scale, stated that emotional (49.55 ± 32.42)
 205 aspects of QoL were mostly affected among the functional parameters and cognitive function
 206 (66.33 ± 27.45) was found higher [15]. The report is also in line with a result from a similar study by [1]
 207 the mean of cognitive score was found higher than other dimensions and emotional score was the
 208 lowest score in women with gynecologic cancer. It was stated in their study that the low social
 209 functioning score, and especially emotional functions have been observed to decrease significantly in
 210 the women with gynecological cancer and the findings indicates the impaired QoL in cancer patients
 211 [1]. In Nigeria, families, parental, and friends support is at quite a low level, some see cancerous
 212 disease as a hopeless case thereby abandoning their relations with such disease at such a critical
 213 state thus making an immense contribution to the impaired social and emotional well-being. Also,
 214 cancer requires a long treatment process and obscurity keep the patients away from social life and
 215 lead to disturbances in interpersonal relationships resulting into low social functioning [1].

216 Regarding self-rated health, most of the respondents (63.03 ± 18.09) rated it as very good or good and
 217 considered that they are satisfied with it. A similarly high score for global health was reported in a
 218 study on Quality of Life of Women with Gynecologic Cancer in Turkey [sueli and livia, 2001 28] where
 219 it was stated that high score of global health result indicates that, in view of the prospect of progress
 220 of a chronic disease, they are satisfied with the moment they are experiencing. Although, the QoL as

221 seen in this study is higher than that reported and may be attributed to racial difference. In another
222 study on the Quality of Life in Cancer Patients undergoing Chemotherapy, findings show that the
223 Quality of life (QoL) was fairly favorable in majority (66%) of the patients [29].
224 In relation to the symptom scale out of the 96 respondents with a better quality of life, 33 has mild
225 symptom with good functioning while 63 has severe symptoms with poor functioning. All the 21
226 respondents with worse quality of life have severe symptom and poor functioning. Despite the severe
227 symptoms experienced with poor functioning by majority, they still claimed to have good quality of life
228 this could be related to the fact that Nigerians are very strong and still claim to be fine in the face of
229 hardship.

230 On the single scale, financial difficulty ranked the highest followed by fatigue, pains, loss of appetite,
231 nausea and vomiting (88%,56%,54%,51% and 50%) respectively. It was also observed that financial
232 difficulties ranked highest in a study carried out at the university college hospital on health related
233 quality of life in women with breast cancer [30]. The problem of finances is a major cause of health
234 deterioration as the cost of chemotherapy is usually unaffordable, and this is a major obstacle for
235 many patients to continue with the treatment [30]. Fatigue is the most significant problem affecting the
236 daily activities and life of cancer patients. In this present study, fatigue score was found second
237 highest for women with gynecological cancer on chemotherapy. Pain and fatigue were the most
238 troublesome symptoms reported in a similar study also carried out in Ibadan [30]. There was a
239 statistically significant association between the prevalent side effects and health related quality of life
240 of women with gynecological cancer on chemotherapy ($P = .02$). This study revealed that larger
241 number of the respondents had good health related quality of life but majority experiences severe side
242 effects of chemotherapy.

243 **CONSENT**

244 Informed consent form was obtained from all respondents before administering the questionnaires.

245 **ETHICAL ASPECTS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

246 Ethical approval sought and obtained from the joint University of Ibadan/University College Hospital
247 (UI/UCH) ethical review board. **IRB Research approval number: UI/EC/18/0157.**

248 There is no conflict of interest.

249 **Limitation:** The study was limited by insufficient literature on HRQOL in Nigeria, thus creating a
250 dearth of local literature in this area of study and inadequate fund which did not enable the researcher
251 to consider a larger sample population.

252 **Conclusion**

253 This study revealed that larger number of the respondents had good health related quality of life but
254 majority experiences severe side effects. Minimizing the side effect of chemotherapy may positively
255 impact on patient's health related quality of life, and there is need for regular assessment of health
256 related quality of life of women with gynecological cancer because measuring the impact of cancer
257 and its treatment on patients' quality of life is being recognized as an important outcome measure.

258

259 **References**

- 260 1. Goker T, Guvenal E, Yanikkerem A, Turhan F.M, Koyuncu. Quality of Life in Women with
261 Gynecologic Cancer in Turkey. Asian Pacific J. Cancer Prev. 2011; 12, 3121-3128.
- 262 2. US Cancer Statistics Working Group, United States cancer statistics: Incidence and mortality web-
263 based report. 2013.
- 264 3.Güngör, Oskay , Dişsiz M, Şenyürek N, İnce G, Kocaoğlu İ, and Duyar B.2017. Factors Affecting
265 Quality of Life and Fatigue in Gynaecologic Cancer Patients. International Journal of Medical
266 Research & Health Sciences. 6(6): 109-117
- 267 4. World Health Organization (WHO) 2016. CancerGeneva: World Health Organization; Available
268 from: <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs297/en/index.html>. [Last accessed on 2016 Oct
269 12].
- 270 5. Agboeze J, Ezenonu P.O, Onoh R.C, Nwali M.I, Agwu M.R, Egbuji C.C. Frequency and Pattern of
271 Gynecological Cancers in Federal Teaching Hospital, Abakaliki, Nigeria. Journal of basic & Clinical
272 reproductive Sciences. 2015; 4(2).
- 273 6. American Cancer Society Facts & Figures. 2013. Atlanta: US Department of Health and
274 Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and National Cancer Institute
- 275 7. Niccoli T, Partridge L. Ageing as a risk factor for disease. CurrBiol.2012; 22(17):R741-
276 R752[PubMed][Google Scholar]
- 277 8. Finkel T, Serrano M, Blasco M.A. The common biology of cancer and ageing
278 nature.2007;448(7155): 767-74[PubMed][Google Scholar]
- 279 9. Ferlay J, Shin H.R, Bray F, Forman D, Mathers C, Parkin D.M. Estimates of worldwide burden of
280 cancer in 2008: GLOBOCAN 2008. Int. J. Cancer. 2010; 127: 2893-917.

- 281 10.
- 282 11. Lerman, R., Jarski, R., Rea, H., Gellish, R. and Vicini, F. 2011. Improving symptoms and quality
283 of life female cancer survivors: a randomized controlled study. *Ann. Surg. Oncol.* :10.1-2.
- 284 12. Kruk ME, Nigenda G, Knaul FM., 2015. Redesigning primary care to tackle the global epidemic of
285 non-communicable disease. *Am J Public Health*;105:431-7.
- 286 13. Muliira R.S, Salas A.S, O'Brien B. Quality of life among female cancer survivors in Africa: An
287 integrative literature review. *Asia Pac Journal Oncol. Nurs.* 2017; 4: 6-17.
- 288 14. Petrosyan F, Daw H, Haddad A, Spiro T. Targeted therapy for lung cancer. *Anti-cancer drugs.*
289 2012; 23(10):1016-21.
- 290 15. Pınar G, Algier L, Çolak M, Ayhan, A. Quality of life in patients with gynecologic cancer. *Int. J.*
291 *Hematol Oncol.* 2008; 3: 141-9.
- 292 16. Özaras G, Özyurda F. Quality of life and influencing factors in patients with gynecologic cancer
293 diagnosis at Gazi University, Turkey. *Asian Pac J. Cancer Prev.* 2010; 11: 1403-8.
- 294 17. Weaver K.E, Forsythe L.P, Reeve B.B, Alfano C.M, Rodriguez J.L, Sabatino S.A, et al. Mental and
295 physical health-related quality of life among US cancer survivors: population estimates from the 2010
296 National Health Interview Survey. *Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers & Prevention.* 2012; 21(11):
297 2108-17.
- 298 18. Farrell C, Brearley S.G, Pilling M, Molassiotis A. The impact of chemotherapy related nausea on
299 patients' nutritional status, psychological distress and quality of life. *Support Care Cancer.* 2013; 21:
300 59-66.
- 301 19. Ferlay J, Steliarova-Foucher E, Lortet-Tieulent J, Rosso S, Coebergh J.W, Comber H. *et al.*
302 Cancer incidence and mortality patterns in Europe: Estimates for 40 countries in Europe. *Int. J.*
303 *Cancer.* 2013; 49: 1374-403.
- 304 20. Khalil J, Bellefqih S, Sahli N, Afif M, Elkacemi H, Elmajjaoui S, *et al.* Impact of cervical cancer on
305 quality of life: Beyond the short term (results from a single institution): Quality of life in long-term
306 cervical cancer survivors: Results from a single institution. *Gynecol. Oncol. Res. Pract.* 2015.
- 307 21. Akinyemiju TF. Socio-economic and health access determinants of breast and cervical cancer
308 screening in low-income countries: Analysis of the World Health Survey. 2012
- 309 22. Gonçalves, V. 2010. Long-term quality of life in gynecological cancer survivors. *Curr. Opin.*
310 *Obstet. Gynecol.* 22, 30-5.
- 311 23. Onoja, M. A. 2012. Quantitative research/study design.ppt presentation at the Department of
312 epidemiology and medical statistics, Faculty of public Health, College of Medicine. Ibadan.
- 313 24. Aaronson N.K, Ahmedzai S, Bergman B, Bullinger M, Cull A, Duez N.J, et al. The European
314 Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer QLQ-C30: A quality-of-life instrument for use in
315 international clinical trials in oncology. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute.* 1993; 85: 365-376.
- 316 25. Livia L. R. J, Sueli R. Evaluation of the Quality of Life of Gynecological Cancer Patients.
317 Submitted to Antineoplastic Chemotherapy. 2010; 18 (5): 849-55.
- 318 26. Durowade K.A, Osagbemi G.K, Salaudeen A.G, Musa O.I, Akande T.M, Babatunde O.A. et al.
319 Prevalence and risk factors of cervical cancer among women in an urban community of Kwara State,
320 north central Nigeria. *J. Prev. Med. Hyg.* 2012; 53(4): 213-9.
- 321 27. GBD. Mortality and Causes of Death Collaborators. Global, regional, and national age-sex specific
322 all-cause and cause-specific mortality for 240 causes of death, 1990-2013: a systematic analysis for
323 the Global Burden of Disease Study. *Lancet.* 2015; 385 (9963): 117-171.
- 324 28.
- 325 29. Dehkordi A, Heydarnejad M.S, Fatehi D. Quality of life in cancer patients undergoing
326 chemotherapy. *Oman Medical Journal.* 2009; 24: 204-207.
- 327 30. Jaiyesimi A.O, Sofela E.A, Rufai A.A. Health related quality of life and its determinants in Nigerian
328 breast cancer patients. *Afr. J. Med. Sci.* 2007; 36: 259-65.
- 329 **Out**
- 330 Sanni O, Ocheke A, Oyeboode T, Jonah M, Nyango D, Silas O, Sagay S. of gynecological
331 malignancies in Jos. *Tropic j. Obstetgynecol.* 2013; 30 (1).
- 332 Skeel R.T, Khleif S.N. *Handbook of cancer chemotherapy: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.* 2011.
- 333