

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [editorial.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:editorial.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening among Rural Women in Eastern China: a Qualitative Study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-026413
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	31-Aug-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Yang, Huan; Shandong University; NHC Key Laboratory of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University) Li, Shun-Ping; Shandong University; NHC Key Laboratory of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University) Chen, Qing; Shandong University; NHC Key Laboratory of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University) Morgan, Christopher; Burnet Institute; Melbourne Univeristy
Keywords:	barriers, cervical cancer, cancer screening, China

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Peer Review Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

## Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening among Rural Women in Eastern China: a Qualitative Study

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

Huan Yang,<sup>1,2</sup> Shunping Li,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> Qing Chen,<sup>1,2</sup> Christopher Morgan<sup>3,4</sup>

- 28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
1. School of Health Care Management, Shandong University, Jinan 250012, China
  2. NHC Key Laboratory of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University),  
Jinan 250012, China
  3. Burnet Institute, Melbourne 3004, Australia
  4. Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne,  
Melbourne 3052, Australia

\* **Correspondence:** Shunping Li, School of Health Care Management, Shandong University,  
Wenhua Xi Rd 44, Jinan, Shandong Province 250012, People's Republic of China.  
E-mail: [lishunping@sdu.edu.cn](mailto:lishunping@sdu.edu.cn) Tel.: +86-131-8893-4998

**Keywords** barriers; cervical cancer; cancer screening; China

**Word count** 4084 (excluding title page, abstract, references, figures and tables)

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives** To explore barriers to cervical cancer screening among rural women in China from the perspective of women, health care providers and women's husbands to provide effective information for policy makers and planners.

**Design** A qualitative study using semi-structured in-depth interviews, focus group discussions and key informant interviews.

**Setting** This study was carried out at township level within two counties in Jining Prefecture of eastern China.

**Participants** Semi-structured in-depth interviews with 21 women eligible for screening aged between 35 and 64 years, and with five cervical cancer screening services providers. These were supplemented by two focus group discussions with nine providers of cervical cancer screening services, and four key informant interviews with husbands of women eligible for screening.

**Results** Thematic analysis generated five major themes: (1) gaps in knowledge of cervical cancer and health awareness, (2) fear of cancer and screening outcomes, (3) cultural barriers including reticence for intimate examinations, (4) influence of close contacts on screening decisions, and (5) inconvenience. These demonstrate key knowledge gaps challenging current community health education. Important service barriers, including with fear of treatment cost, and the time needed for screening were also raised.

**Conclusion** Our study details important barriers to cervical cancer screening relating to

1  
2  
3 knowledge gaps, attitudes of fear or embarrassment, and the role of contacts and service  
4  
5 models. These provide data for policy and planning to improve the screening that will  
6  
7 decrease the incidence and mortality rates of cervical cancer in China.  
8  
9

## 10 11 **Article Summary**

### 12 13 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 14  
15  
16  
17  
18 ■ The qualitative methods allowed for detailed and deep responses and triangulation  
19  
20 across providers, clients and their partners.
- 21  
22  
23  
24 ■ The findings have direct relevance to policy makers considering the development of  
25  
26 effective interventions to increase uptake rate of cervical cancer screening in China.
- 27  
28  
29  
30 ■ The study was carried out in two rural districts and results may not be generalisable to  
31  
32 all women. These findings may need to be evaluated larger or different populations.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INTRODUCTION

Cervical cancer is the second most common cancer in women worldwide.<sup>1</sup> In 2012, 528,000 new cases of cervical cancer were diagnosed and 266,000 women died of cervical cancer, and almost 9 out of every 10 of these, or 231,000 women in total, lived and died in low- or middle-income countries (LMICs).<sup>2 3</sup> In China, the estimated number of cervical cancer cases was 78,400 in 2010 and is projected to reach 93,500 in 2030.<sup>4</sup> In recent years, it is set to increase in young women.<sup>5</sup> The occurrence of cervical cancer poses a serious threat to woman's physical and mental health, and causes severe economic and social burden.<sup>6 7</sup>

Infection with the human papilloma virus (HPV) is the most significant risk factor for cervical cancer which can be transmitted during sexual intercourse.<sup>8</sup> The majority of HPV infections resolve spontaneously and do not cause symptoms or disease.<sup>1</sup> However, persistent infection with specific types of HPV (most frequently, types 16 and 18) may lead to precancerous lesions, which, if not treated, can progress to cancer 10 to 20 years later.<sup>9</sup> Cervical cancer is a preventable and treatable disease, and screening of precancerous lesions can reduce its incidence and mortality.<sup>10</sup> In many high-income countries, the incidence and mortality of cervical cancer have decreased significantly because of the efforts made to detect precancerous lesions early.<sup>11 12</sup> However, in LMICs, cervical cancer remains the most common cause of cancer-related deaths among women.<sup>13</sup>

Cervical cancer is recognized as a major public health problem in China,<sup>14</sup> both in mortality and morbidity burden, the latter causing protracted economic stress on women, heaviest in rural communities. As part of responses in 2009, a new round of deepening health

1  
2  
3 system reforms intended to integrate the breast cancer and cervical cancer screening  
4  
5 programs in rural areas into broader national public health services.<sup>15</sup> The government's  
6  
7 National Cervical Cancer Screening Program in Rural Areas (NCCSPRA) launched in 221  
8  
9 pilot counties and a total of 11.69 million rural women between 35 and 59 years of age  
10  
11 accessed this screening program between 2009 and 2011.<sup>16</sup> In one site that is the subject of  
12  
13 our study, Jining Prefecture, free breast cancer and cervical cancer screening has been  
14  
15 available to rural women over 35 years of age since 2011, with the upper age limit extended  
16  
17 from 59 to 64 years in 2014.<sup>10</sup> Despite this, uptake rate of cervical cancer screening remains  
18  
19 very low.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 In China, a number of studies have been conducted into women's knowledge and attitudes  
27  
28 toward cervical cancer screening and related factors,<sup>17-20</sup> however most data have been  
29  
30 quantitative in nature, aiming to document the magnitude of demand-side barriers to access.  
31  
32 This leaves gaps in understanding of underlying determinants of care-seeking, including the  
33  
34 reasons why women do not take up care-seeking, which require more qualitative research  
35  
36 approaches.<sup>21 22</sup> Therefore, this research aims to use qualitative inquiry to understand the  
37  
38 barriers to cervical cancer screening uptake among rural women in Jining Prefecture, and to  
39  
40 contribute new policy and practice recommendations that can help reduce cervical cancer  
41  
42 incidence.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

## 49 **METHODS**

### 50 **Study setting and design**

1  
2  
3 This study was conducted in Shandong Province, which is located in eastern China with a  
4 population of more than 100 million.<sup>23</sup> In 2016, the gross regional product of Shandong  
5 Province amounted to CNY6803 billion (US\$1024 billion), ranking it as the third largest  
6 economy within China.<sup>23</sup> Jining Prefecture, located in the southwest of Shandong Province  
7 with a population of 8.35 million and the gross regional product of CNY430 billion (US\$63  
8 billion) in 2016.<sup>24</sup>

9  
10  
11 Descriptive phenomenology is used as a qualitative approach in this study. This study was  
12 carried out at township level within two counties in Jining Prefecture of eastern China. The  
13 qualitative methods included semi-structured in-depth interviews with 21 women eligible for  
14 screening aged between 35 and 64 years, and with five cervical cancer screening services  
15 providers. These were supplemented by two focus group discussions with nine cervical  
16 cancer screening services providers, and four key informant interviews with husbands of  
17 women eligible for screening.

### 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 **Study participants and sample**

38  
39  
40 Two townships (Tangma and Xingcun) were randomly selected from within the two mainly  
41 rural areas of Sishui and Yutai Counties in Jining Prefecture. A convenience sample of 21 (10  
42 from Xingcun, 11 from Tangma) women were recruited to participate in interviews in  
43 collaboration with township community partners. The selection criteria included: women  
44 aged between 35 and 64 years, resident in the study townships, and women who had either  
45 never been screened or who had been screened once but failed to attend follow-up. Fourteen  
46 health care providers (seven from Xingcun, seven from Tangma) whose responsibilities



1  
2  
3 included cervical cancer screening service provision, were purposefully selected for  
4  
5 interviews and focus group discussions. Five providers were invited to participate in  
6  
7 semi-structured in-depth interviews and nine in focus group discussions (four in the first and  
8  
9 five in the second group). Four key informant interviews (2 from Xingcun, 2 from Tangma)  
10  
11 were conducted with screening-eligible women's husbands. The numbers of interviews and  
12  
13 focus group discussions were intended to enable a theoretical saturation of qualitative  
14  
15 themes.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## 22 **Data collection**

23  
24 All interviews and discussions were conducted over a one-week period in November 2017  
25  
26 by four researchers from Shandong University who had extensive knowledge of cervical  
27  
28 cancer, screening and HPV, and were trained in conducting qualitative research. Women  
29  
30 participants were interviewed in private rooms identified by community partners. Before  
31  
32 interviews, a short questionnaire assessed women participants' knowledge of general cancer  
33  
34 risk factors, symptoms of cancer, and screening techniques. The semi-structured in-depth  
35  
36 interviews with women included questions on sociodemographic characteristics and health  
37  
38 status, screening experience, beliefs about cervical cancer risk factors, perception of barriers  
39  
40 to screening uptake, the impact of a service providers' gender on cervical cancer screening  
41  
42 behavior, and a husband's reaction to her screening uptake and related topics. Interviews  
43  
44 lasted approximately 30 minutes.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 In-depth interviews and focus group discussions with providers were conducted close to  
53  
54 the work place and lasted approximately 30 and 45 minutes, respectively. The in-depth  
55  
56

1  
2  
3 interviews and focus group discussions guide explored providers' perception of barriers to  
4 cervical cancer screening uptake for women. Key informant interviews with  
5 screening-eligible women's husbands were conducted in their home. Interviews guide  
6 included questions on their knowledge about cervical cancer, and attitudes towards screening  
7 for cervical cancer and potential barriers to uptake.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 Verbal informed consent using a standard script was obtained from all participants prior to  
17 interviews. All interviews and focus group discussions were digitally recorded.  
18 Confidentiality was ensured through using code numbers rather than names. Researchers  
19 took care to identify and reflect on any bias relating to differential status between themselves  
20 and interviewees, aiming to minimize this effect during the interview process. Each  
21 participant was given a vacuum beverage cup to compensate for their time commitment to  
22 the study.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 **Data analysis**

36  
37 All interviews and focus group discussions were transcribed verbatim and subjected to  
38 thematic analysis. The transcripts were systematically read several times by two researchers  
39 to identify both pre-determined and emerging themes relevant to barriers to cervical cancer  
40 screening, which were then elaborated as a coding list through consensus discussion among  
41 three authors (YH, SL, QC). Codes were then used to identify themes that could be  
42 consolidated into larger categories. Investigators then discussed and agreed on a standard  
43 interpretation for each category of coded group of viewpoints. All analyses were performed  
44 in Chinese and the final results were translated into English.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Ethical approval

This study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Medical School, Shandong University (LL-201401048), and conforms to the ethics guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki.

## RESULTS

### Sociodemographic characteristics of participants

Twenty-one rural women were included in this study. The mean age of participants was 48.7  $\pm$  6.4 years, with a range from 37 to 60 years, with more than half (57.1%) aged between 46 and 55 years. Most participants (95.2%) were married and most (90.5%) had an education level of primary school or below. About half of the participants (52.4%) had previously been screened once for cervical cancer. Table 1 shows details of the characteristics of participants.

Table 1 Sociodemographic characteristics of women interviewees, n (%).

Characteristics	Sishui(n = 10)	Yutai(n =11)	Total(n = 21)
<b>Age (years)</b>			
35~45	6(60.0)	0(0.0)	6(28.6)
46~55	3(30.0)	9(81.8)	12(57.1)
56~64	1(10.0)	2(18.2)	3(14.3)
<b>Educational level</b>			
No school	3(30.0)	5(45.5)	8(38.1)
Primary school	6(60.0)	5(45.5)	11(52.4)

Middle school or above	1(10.0)	1(9.0)	2(9.5)
<b>Marital status</b>			
Married	9(90.0)	11(100.0)	20(95.2)
Divorced or widowed	1(10.0)	0(0.0)	1(4.8)
<b>Ever screened for cervical cancer</b>			
Yes	7(70.0)	4(36.4)	11(52.4)
No	3(30.0)	7(63.6)	10(47.6)

Among the 14 health care providers, the mean age was  $42.6 \pm 9.0$  years and most (64.2%) were aged between 41 and 50 years. They had an education level of junior college and above. Most providers were medical practitioners (50.0%). The mean age of four husbands who undertook key informant interviews was  $50.7 \pm 6.3$  years, and all of them were small-hold farmers.

### Key themes

Thematic analysis generated five major themes: (1) gaps in knowledge of cervical cancer and health awareness, (2) fear of cancer and screening outcomes, (3) cultural barriers, (4) influence of close contacts, and (5) inconvenience. Each of these is elaborated below, including quotations from participants with their identification number and age.

### Gaps in knowledge of cervical cancer and health awareness

Knowledge gaps and lack of access to reliable information on cervical cancer is reported as a major barrier to women's participation in cervical cancer screening. Most women indicated that they had heard about cervical cancer from their friends or television, however, almost none knew that HPV infection was the cause. Some cited inaccurate information and most

1  
2  
3 reported that their knowledge, especially about causes and symptoms, was speculative. For  
4  
5  
6 example, one reported misconception was that “cervical cancer will never happen after  
7  
8  
9 menopause”. Limited knowledge seemed linked to lack of awareness of being at any  
10  
11  
12 personal risk of cervical cancer happening. When asked why she had not participated in  
13  
14  
15 cervical cancer screening, one woman stated:

16  
17 *I think my health is in a good condition. I've never had anything serious, or any*  
18  
19 *symptoms. No symptoms, no examination. We only go to the hospital when we are*  
20  
21 *uncomfortable or feel sick.* (Woman 11, 53 years)

22  
23  
24 One of the health provider focus groups also mentioned:

25  
26  
27 *Cervix is a dumb organ. There are no symptoms nor is it typical in the early stage. It*  
28  
29 *doesn't affect their work or daily life; there is even no bleeding. No symptoms, nothing at*  
30  
31 *all. They don't think they are infected, so there is no need to go through the screening.*  
32  
33  
34 (FGD 2, provider 05, 41 years)

35  
36  
37  
38 Gaps in health knowledge specific to disease prevention, as well as limited knowledge of  
39  
40  
41 the process, cycle, purpose and importance of screening. The importance of early screening  
42  
43  
44 prior to symptoms showing, was poorly recognized. These factors were reported to limit  
45  
46  
47 women's acceptance of or commitment to screening; hindering or postponing their  
48  
49  
50 participation in cervical cancer screening.

51  
52 A woman who had been notified to attend cervical cancer screening said:

53  
54  
55 *I was told to do the screening yesterday. Well, I didn't want to. I thought I always have a*  
56  
57

1  
2  
3  
4 *good appetite and never feel uncomfortable. There's no point doing it. (Woman 04, 48*  
5  
6 *years)*

7  
8  
9 Another woman who participated in cervical cancer screening only once stated:

10  
11  
12 *I did the examination once and the doctor said I was good. So I never came back. Why*  
13  
14 *bother when I'm good? (Woman 15, 55 years)*

15  
16  
17 Health care provider viewpoints echoed this:

18  
19  
20 *These women have low health care awareness. They wouldn't go to the hospital even if*  
21  
22 *they have other common diseases. All they care about is if they could still do the*  
23  
24 *housework. They don't have much understanding of medicine, so they couldn't know the*  
25  
26 *significance of early screening if they got the disease. (FGD 1, provider 03, 52 years)*  
27  
28  
29

### 30 31 32 **Fear of cancer and screening outcomes**

33  
34  
35 The majority of women in the interviews expressed a deep fear of cancer. Some did not want  
36  
37 to know if they had cervical cancer; a common reason provided for why they were unwilling  
38  
39 to attend the screening was that they did not want to learn the results. This fear extended to  
40  
41 any form of cancer terminology. Women wanted to avoid the anxiety and distress that would  
42  
43 be associated with being told of a cancer-related lesion:  
44  
45

46  
47  
48 *It's a terrible disease. I'm afraid something bad might show. If I don't do the screening I*  
49  
50 *wouldn't know if I had it, I will at least have a good appetite. If the results were bad, I*  
51  
52 *wouldn't feel comfortable knowing that. Appetites and good sleep would be gone for sure. I*  
53  
54 *would have more years to live freely if I didn't know it. (Woman 01, 37 years)*  
55  
56

1  
2  
3  
4 *People become upset whenever they talk about cancer. In the first 2 years of the*  
5  
6 *screening campaign, we couldn't put 'cancer screening' on the banner and used 'health*  
7  
8 *examination' instead. People couldn't take it if they saw the word 'cancer'. (FGD 2,*  
9  
10  
11 *provider 01, 47 years)*

12  
13  
14 A husband also mentioned, during key informant interview:

15  
16  
17 *They were all afraid they might have it. Older women would say 'why do the screening?*  
18  
19 *I would be upset if I knew I had it'. (Husband 02, 63 years)*

20  
21  
22 Fear of a positive screening test was also related to the financial implications. Some women  
23  
24 with fewer economic resources reported avoiding screening because they were worried they  
25  
26 would not have the money for treatment if they were diagnosed with the cancer, noting that  
27  
28 would not have the money for treatment if they were diagnosed with the cancer, noting that  
29  
30 at present, while screening is free of charge, treatment is not. This suggests that family  
31  
32 finances are likely to influence their participation, with families weighing up the impact of  
33  
34 debt against that of the disease:

35  
36  
37  
38 *We wouldn't afford the treatment even if we found out we had it, so it's better we don't*  
39  
40 *do it at all. Adults need money and so do children. The money would be wasted if we went*  
41  
42 *through the treatment and not cured. No need to spend money on a disease that can't be*  
43  
44 *cured. We don't want to add burden to the family. (Woman 10, 54 years)*

45  
46  
47  
48 Two focus groups also noticed this:

49  
50  
51 *People only see nearly 100,000 yuan for the surgery and it's a very heavy burden. The*  
52  
53 *disease would drag the already poor family into debt. They can't take it. (FGD 1, provider*  
54  
55

02, 44 years)

*There are indeed financial problems, especially for rural families. They think they don't feel anything right now, if they find out they are infected after the screening they have to go through the treatment and spend money. So it's better not to do the screening at all.*

(FGD 2, provider 03, 41 years)

### **Cultural barriers**

A common report, especially among older women, was a reluctance to remove clothing or allow genital examination, especially being exposed in front of non-family members. It was mentioned by nearly all women that they felt embarrassed about this step. Informants related this to cultural norms in their rural setting, and among Chinese women more generally.

*Felt like a very private part and I don't want other people to see it. That's the thought. Yes it's embarrassing. I'm too old. Don't want to be a joke. So ashamed.* (Woman 09, 55 years)

*When I went to the gynecology for the screening, I went inside and the doctor told me to take off my pants, and I suddenly didn't want to do the screening.* (Woman 02, 48 years)

Participants were specifically asked about willingness to accept screening by male doctors. For some participants, the gender of the service provider seemed a barrier; nearly half indicated that they would not undertake screening if performed by a male doctor.

*I wouldn't go if a man was doing the examination. It's less acceptable than a woman. It's so private and men are so improper for that.* (Woman 14, 41 years)



1  
2  
3 A female service provider mentioned:  
4  
5

6 *They are very conservative. Some women with vaginitis go to the clinic. We tell them to*  
7 *take off the pants and they are embarrassed. Some even put up with the disease until they*  
8 *can't. So they would be more uncomfortable if male doctors are here. (Provider 01, 63*  
9 *years)*  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

### 16 **Influence of close contacts**

17

18 It was found that close contacts (such as mothers, sisters or neighbors) were an important  
19 factor influencing women's participation in cervical cancer screening. Knowing other people  
20 who had been screened or who had been diagnosed with cervical cancer and undertaken  
21 treatment was reported to increase participation in screening. The converse was also true,  
22 with reports that if close contacts were not willing to participate, this reduced affected  
23 women's acceptance of screening. This was also reported to generate clusters of women who  
24 would refuse screening.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 *I wouldn't know it if they (the neighbors) asked me to come along. If the others (the*  
39 *neighbors) don't come, I wouldn't either. It's good to have someone with you. I wouldn't*  
40 *come by myself. (Woman 05, 55 years)*  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 *I would for sure not come by myself. (Woman 06, 48 years)*  
47  
48

49 A service provider mentioned a similar situation during the screening campaign:  
50  
51

52 *We met this situation once when we were doing the screening in a town. Several women*  
53 *came together and they learned they need to take off the pants. One said 'This is what it is.*  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 *Forget it. Let's go'. And all of them felt reluctant and left together. It's a group mentality.*

4  
5  
6 (Provider 03, 43 years)

### 7 8 9 **Inconvenience**

10  
11  
12 Difficulty in scheduling, or otherwise allocating time for screening was considered to be a  
13  
14 significant barrier to women's participation. Many women eligible for screening work in  
15  
16 disparate locations throughout the year and may and only return home at the time of Spring  
17  
18 Festival. Such holidays are busy with limited time available for activities such as routine  
19  
20 health checks. One working woman stated that leave is only feasible for actual illness.  
21  
22

23  
24  
25  
26 *I work elsewhere and only ask for leave when they have an emergency or special*  
27  
28 *occasions at home. It's hard to ask for leave and I lose some salary for that. Usually I*  
29  
30 *come home once a year for only 5 or 6 days. It's not enough.* (Woman 21, 40 years)

31  
32  
33  
34 *Many rural people go to other places to work and don't come home often. We call them*  
35  
36 *to come back but they can't. They don't get paid if they ask for leave and it's too expensive*  
37  
38 *on the road. So they don't want to come back.* (Provider 02, 44 years)

39  
40  
41  
42 Women who do not travel for work also report many demands on their time including  
43  
44 family business, child-care, housework and farming duties that are often seasonal. Lack of  
45  
46 time for routine health care is reported as a barrier to cervical cancer screening either. When  
47  
48 asked why not attend the screening, a woman who had never gone through the examination  
49  
50 said:  
51  
52

53  
54  
55 *I'm always busy with the kids going to school every day and housework never seems to*  
56  
57

1  
2  
3  
4 *end. Family and housework are the most important for me. So I somehow forget about it*  
5  
6 *(the screening). (Woman 08, 46 years)*  
7

8  
9 *I tell you we farmers are pretty busy. When we are not, we want to do some small*  
10  
11 *business to make money. So no time for examinations. (Woman 19, 56 years)*  
12  
13

## 14 15 16 **DISCUSSION**

17  
18  
19 This study used standard qualitative tools to explore the barriers to attending cervical cancer  
20 screening among rural women in Jining Prefecture of Shandong province in eastern China.  
21  
22 Such in-depth assessments have rarely been reported in Chinese literature. Our study  
23  
24 identified gaps in knowledge of cervical cancer and health awareness, fear of cancer and  
25  
26 screening outcomes, cultural barriers, the influence of close contacts, and inconvenience as  
27  
28 frequently cited barriers.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 Our findings on gaps in knowledge or awareness are echoed in studies from other  
36  
37 resource-constrained settings, with specific misconceptions and poor awareness of the  
38  
39 benefits of routine health checks reported from diverse settings including Burkina Faso,  
40  
41 <sup>25</sup>Iran,<sup>26</sup> Malawi,<sup>27 28</sup> Nigeria<sup>29</sup> and elsewhere. Reluctance to seek care in the absence of  
42  
43 symptoms is a common theme, seen also in high-income settings such as Norway,<sup>30</sup> and this  
44  
45 was one of the most important constraints identified in our study. Our finding that there is  
46  
47 very low awareness of the risks posed by cervical cancer is seen elsewhere in China.<sup>31 32</sup>  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 Fear poses a significant psychological barrier to care-seeking for cervical cancer screening.  
54  
55 This includes the general fear of “cancer” as a vicious and intractable class of disease,<sup>33</sup> and  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 the fear that it would not be possible to emotionally cope with a diagnosis, seen in relation to  
4  
5 cervical cancer in our findings and in other high- middle- and low-income settings.<sup>34 35 36</sup> A  
6  
7 study among Mexican women shows that women reported not attending cervical cancer  
8  
9 screening because of fear of ‘knowing,’ that is, prefer to live with hopeful doubts instead of  
10  
11 facing the possibility of an unfavorable result.<sup>37</sup> This poses a key knowledge challenge to  
12  
13 community health education efforts; they must find ways to not only build knowledge of the  
14  
15 risks of an asymptomatic disease, but also address the misconceptions and emotions aroused  
16  
17 by cancer more generally, in order to build trust that timely screening can render cervical  
18  
19 cancer treatable.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 The influence of women’s close contacts risks generating clusters of mutually-reinforcing  
27  
28 resistance to screening,<sup>38</sup> with partners playing a key role.<sup>39 40</sup> This suggests some education  
29  
30 initiatives will need to address whole communities and possibly include peer-education  
31  
32 approaches that encourage positive health discussions among friends.  
33  
34  
35

36 In our study, like other resource-constrained settings<sup>28</sup> fears of financial catastrophe  
37  
38 generated by high treatment costs also posed a barrier to screening. In our context this  
39  
40 emphasizes the need for health planners to understand the pragmatic choices families make  
41  
42 when health care costs are seen as unaffordable. Making treatment financially accessible, for  
43  
44 cervical cancer and many other protracted diseases, is a key challenge facing China’s public  
45  
46 health system reformers.  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 We found culturally based embarrassment to be a key barrier. Such associations with  
52  
53 concepts of conservatism and modesty obstruct access to reproductive health in general and  
54  
55  
56

1  
2  
3 cervical cancer screening in particular in our and many other settings,<sup>31 41-43</sup> especially when  
4  
5 providers are male,<sup>44 45</sup> or women are older.<sup>46</sup> For such communities in China and Asian  
6  
7 populations elsewhere,<sup>47</sup> this requires providers of screening to have high levels of cultural  
8  
9 competence, and planners to ensure sufficient numbers of female providers.  
10  
11  
12

13  
14 Inconvenient screening services, in terms of timing and location also posed a major barrier  
15  
16 for the rural women in our study. This applies to those who must relocate for paid work and  
17  
18 those whose family care duties leave little time for health screening, and findings were seen  
19  
20 in a wide range of settings.<sup>34 48 49</sup> Delivering services at times, even holiday times, and in  
21  
22 places where women already congregate, perhaps through mobile services, may help  
23  
24 overcome this barrier in China, and elsewhere.<sup>47</sup>  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 These findings have several implications for practice, as noted above in relation to each  
30  
31 key theme. In addition, new methods for screening<sup>50</sup> using automated nucleic acid  
32  
33 amplification tests may help overcome timing and location constraints by allowing more  
34  
35 rapid screening, and may help overcome cultural constraints by allowing women to  
36  
37 self-collect vaginal swab samples.  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 Our study acknowledges the usual limitations of qualitative research, with our findings  
43  
44 immediately generalizable only to our sample of women from rural area of Jining were  
45  
46 characterized by low educational levels. However, this is, unusually for China, an in-depth  
47  
48 assessment of women, providers and husbands, which we believe will be useful across a  
49  
50 wide range of settings where uptake is poor, and provide a basis for future research.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

## CONCLUSION

In summary, our study details important barriers to cervical cancer screening in terms of gaps in knowledge, fear of cancer and screening outcomes, cultural embarrassment, the influence of close contacts, and inconvenience. We hope policy makers and planners can make use of these findings to improve education and service delivery for screening that will decrease the incidence and mortality rates of cervical cancer in China.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the study participants for their time and contribution to this study. This work was supported by China Medical Board Open Competition Grant [Grant number CMB14-195]. Responsibility for any remaining errors lies solely with the authors.

## Author Contributions

Huan Yang completed the data collection and analyses, and wrote the manuscript. Shunping Li designed the study, collected the data, and edited the manuscript. Qing Chen designed the study and collected the data. Chris Morgan helped design the study, supported interpretation of findings, and edited the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

## Competing Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## Funding

1  
2  
3 This work was supported by China Medical Board Open Competition Grant [Grant number  
4  
5  
6 CMB14-195]. Responsibility for any remaining errors lies solely with the authors.  
7

### 8 9 **Ethics approval**

10  
11  
12 The study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Medical School, Shandong  
13  
14 University (LL-201401048).  
15

### 16 17 **Data sharing**

18  
19  
20 No additional data are available.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

1. WHO. Comprehensive cervical cancer prevention and control: a healthier future for girls and women. Geneva: *World Health Organization*, 2013.
2. WHO. Comprehensive Cervical Cancer Control: A guide to essential practice. 2 ed. Geneva: *World Health Organization*, 2014.
3. Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Dikshit R, et al. Cancer incidence and mortality worldwide: Sources, methods and major patterns in GLOBOCAN 2012. *International Journal of Cancer* 2015;136(5):E359-E86. doi: doi:10.1002/ijc.29210
4. Ferlay J, Shin HR, Bray F, et al. Estimates of worldwide burden of cancer in 2008: GLOBOCAN 2008. *International Journal of Cancer* 2010;127(12):2893-917. doi: doi:10.1002/ijc.25516
5. Kim K, Zang R, Choi S-C, et al. Current status of gynecological cancer in China. *J Gynecol Oncol* 2009;20(2):72-76.
6. Sun X, Liu R, Li F. Disease burden of malignant neoplasm among residents of Yancheng city, 2009. *Chinese Journal of Public Health* 2011(03):371-73.
7. Guo X, Sun J, Ma J, et al. Economic burden of malignant neoplasm in Shandong Province. *Chinese Journal of Public Health* 2010(07):813-16.
8. Acharya Pandey R, Karmacharya E. Cervical cancer screening behavior and associated factors among women of Ugrachandi Nala, Kavre, Nepal. *European Journal of Medical Research* 2017;22(1):32. doi: 10.1186/s40001-017-0274-9
9. de Sanjose S, Quint WGV, Alemany L, et al. Human papillomavirus genotype attribution in invasive cervical cancer: a retrospective cross-sectional worldwide study. *The Lancet Oncology* 2010;11(11):1048-56. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045\(10\)70230-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(10)70230-8)
10. Liu T, Li S, Ratcliffe J, et al. Assessing Knowledge and Attitudes towards Cervical Cancer Screening among Rural Women in Eastern China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2017;14(9):967.
11. Haesebaert J, Lutringer-Magnin D, Kalecinski J, et al. French women's knowledge of and attitudes towards cervical cancer prevention and the acceptability of HPV vaccination among those with 14 – 18 year old daughters: a quantitative-qualitative study. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12(1):1034. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-12-1034
12. GILES M, GARLAND S. A study of women's knowledge regarding human papillomavirus infection, cervical cancer and human papillomavirus vaccines. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol* 2006;46(4):311-15. doi: doi:10.1111/j.1479-828X.2006.00598.x



13. Louie KS, Sanjose SD, Mayaud P. Epidemiology and prevention of human papillomavirus and cervical cancer in sub-Saharan Africa: a comprehensive review. *Trop Med Int Health* 2009;14(10):1287-302. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3156.2009.02372.x
14. Gu C, Chan CWH, Twinn S. How Sexual History and Knowledge of Cervical Cancer and Screening Influence Chinese Women's Screening Behavior in Mainland China. *Cancer Nurs* 2010;33(6):445-53. doi: 10.1097/NCC.0b013e3181e456dc
15. Chen W, Zhang S, Zeng H, et al. Report of Cancer Incidence and Mortality in China, 2010. *China Cancer* 2014(01):1-10.
16. Di J, Rutherford S, Wu J, et al. Knowledge of Cervical Cancer Screening among Women across Different Socio-Economic Regions of China. *PLoS One* 2015;10(12):e0144819. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0144819
17. Jia Y, Li S, Yang R, et al. Knowledge about Cervical Cancer and Barriers of Screening Program among Women in Wufeng County, a High-Incidence Region of Cervical Cancer in China. *PLoS ONE* 2013;8(7):e67005. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0067005
18. Tang T. Investigation on status quo of cognitive, attitude and behavior of women toward cervical cancer screening and analysis of its related factors. *Chinese And Foreign Medical Research* 2016(03):68-69.
19. Liu L, Xu J, Yang C, et al. Investigation on status quo of cognitive of 1208 outpatients toward cervical cancer screening and analysis of its related factors. *Practical Clinical Journal of Integrated Traditional Chinese and Western Medicine* 2016(08):51-52+65.
20. Zhou W, Shan H, Qi J, et al. Investigation on status quo of cognitive of 1200 women of childbearing age toward cervical cancer and analysis of its related factors. *Maternal and Child Health Care of China* 2017(18):4510-12.
21. Li SP, Zheng ZY, Meng QY, et al. Barriers to tuberculosis care for drug users in two provinces of China: a qualitative study. *The International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease* 2013;17(10):1358-63. doi: 10.5588/ijtld.12.0784
22. Pope C, Mays N. Qualitative Research: Reaching the parts other methods cannot reach: an introduction to qualitative methods in health and health services research. *BMJ* 1995;311(6996):42-45. doi: 10.1136/bmj.311.6996.42
23. China Statistical Yearbook 2017 [Available from: <http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/2017/indexch.htm>. accessed March 9 2018.

- 1  
2  
3 24. Shandong Statistical Yearbook 2017 [Available from:  
4 <http://www.stats-sd.gov.cn/tjnj/nj2017/indexch.htm> accessed March 9 2018.  
5  
6  
7 25. Compaore S, Ouedraogo CMR, Koanda S, et al. Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening in Burkina  
8 Faso: Needs for Patient and Professional Education. *J Cancer Educ* 2016;31(4):760-66. doi:  
9 10.1007/s13187-015-0898-9  
10  
11 26. Bayrami R, Taghipour A, Fau - Ebrahimipour H, Ebrahimipour H. Personal and socio-cultural  
12 barriers to cervical cancer screening in Iran, patient and provider perceptions: a qualitative study.  
13 *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2015;16(9):3729-34.  
14  
15 27. Fort VK, Makin MS, Siegler AJ, et al. Barriers to cervical cancer screening in Mulanje, Malawi: a  
16 qualitative study. *Patient preference and adherence* 2011;5:125-31. doi: 10.2147/ppa.s17317  
17  
18 28. Ndejjo R, Mukama T, Kiguli J, et al. Knowledge, facilitators and barriers to cervical cancer  
19 screening among women in Uganda: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open* 2017;7(6) doi:  
20 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016282  
21  
22 29. Isa Modibbo F, Dareng E, Bamisaye P, et al. Qualitative study of barriers to cervical cancer  
23 screening among Nigerian women. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(1) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008533  
24  
25 30. Gele AA, Qureshi SA, Kour P, et al. Barriers and facilitators to cervical cancer screening among  
26 Pakistani and Somali immigrant women in Oslo: a qualitative study. *International Journal of*  
27 *Women's Health* 2017;9:487-96. doi: 10.2147/ijwh.s139160  
28  
29 31. Gu C, Chan CWH, Twinn S, et al. The influence of knowledge and perception of the risk of  
30 cervical cancer on screening behavior in mainland Chinese women. *Psycho-Oncology*  
31 2012;21(12):1299-308. doi: doi:10.1002/pon.2037  
32  
33 32. Twinn S, Shiu ATY, Holroyd E. Women's Knowledge About Cervical Cancer and Cervical Screening  
34 Practice: A Pilot Study of Hong Kong Chinese Women. *Cancer Nurs* 2002;25(5):377-84.  
35  
36 33. Charlotte V, M. ML, Małgorzata H, et al. What do people fear about cancer? A systematic review  
37 and meta-synthesis of cancer fears in the general population. *Psycho-Oncology*  
38 2017;26(8):1070-79. doi: doi:10.1002/pon.4287  
39  
40 34. Nolan J, Renderos TB, Hynson J, et al. Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening and Follow - up Care  
41 among Black Women in Massachusetts. *J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs* 2014;43(5):580-88. doi:  
42 doi:10.1111/1552-6909.12488  
43  
44 35. Mupepi SC, Sampelle CM, Johnson TRB. Knowledge, Attitudes, and Demographic Factors  
45 Influencing Cervical Cancer Screening Behavior of Zimbabwean Women. *Journal of Women's*  
46 *Health* 2011;20(6):943-52. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2010.2062  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 36. Agurto I, Bishop A, Sánchez G, et al. Perceived barriers and benefits to cervical cancer screening  
4 in Latin America. *Preventive Medicine* 2004;39(1):91-98. doi:  
5 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2004.03.040>  
6  
7  
8 37. Marván ML, Ehrenzweig Y, Catillo-López RL. Knowledge about cervical cancer prevention and  
9 psychosocial barriers to screening among Mexican women. *J Psychosom Obstet Gynaecol*  
10 2013;34(4):163-69. doi: 10.3109/0167482x.2013.846904  
11  
12  
13 38. Cunningham MS, Skrastins E, Fitzpatrick R, et al. Cervical cancer screening and HPV vaccine  
14 acceptability among rural and urban women in Kilimanjaro Region, Tanzania. *BMJ Open* 2015;5(3)  
15 doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005828  
16  
17  
18 39. Winkler J, Bingham A, Coffey P, et al. Women's participation in a cervical cancer screening  
19 program in northern Peru. *Health Educ Res* 2008;23(1):10-24. doi: 10.1093/her/cyl156  
20  
21  
22 40. Akinyemiju TF. Socio-Economic and Health Access Determinants of Breast and Cervical Cancer  
23 Screening in Low-Income Countries: Analysis of the World Health Survey. *PLoS One*  
24 2012;7(11):e48834. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0048834  
25  
26  
27 41. Daley E, Alio A, Anstey EH, et al. Examining Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening and Treatment  
28 in Florida through a Socio-Ecological Lens. *Journal of Community Health* 2011;36(1):121-31. doi:  
29 10.1007/s10900-010-9289-7  
30  
31  
32 42. Ghebre RG, Sewali B, Osman S, et al. Cervical Cancer: Barriers to Screening in the Somali  
33 Community in Minnesota. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health* 2015;17(3):722-28. doi:  
34 10.1007/s10903-014-0080-1  
35  
36  
37 43. Kwok C, White K, Roydhouse JK. Chinese-Australian Women's Knowledge, Facilitators and  
38 Barriers Related to Cervical Cancer Screening: A Qualitative Study. *J Immigr Minor Health*  
39 2011;13(6):1076. doi: 10.1007/s10903-011-9491-4  
40  
41  
42 44. Maar M, Burchell A, Little J, et al. A Qualitative Study of Provider Perspectives of Structural  
43 Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening Among First Nations Women. *Women's Health*  
44 *Issues*;23(5):e319-e25. doi: 10.1016/j.whi.2013.06.005  
45  
46  
47 45. Williams MS, Amoateng P. Knowledge and Beliefs about Cervical Cancer Screening Among Men  
48 in Kumasi, Ghana. *Ghana Medical Journal* 2012;46(3):147-51.  
49  
50  
51 46. Byrd TL, Chavez R, Wilson KM. Barriers and facilitators of cervical cancer screening among  
52 Hispanic women. *Ethn Dis* 2007;17(1):129-34.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 47. Lu M, Moritz S, Lorenzetti D, et al. A systematic review of interventions to increase breast and  
4 cervical cancer screening uptake among Asian women. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12(1):413. doi:  
5 10.1186/1471-2458-12-413  
6  
7  
8 48. Markovic M, Kesic V, Topic L, et al. Barriers to cervical cancer screening: A qualitative study with  
9 women in Serbia. *Social Science & Medicine* 2005;61(12):2528-35. doi:  
10 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.05.001  
11  
12  
13 49. Foliaki S, Matheson A. Barriers to Cervical Screening among Pacific Women in a New Zealand  
14 Urban Population 2015.  
15  
16 50. Toliman P, Badman SG, Gabuzzi J, et al. Field evaluation of the Xpert® HPV Point of Care Test for  
17 the detection of human papillomavirus infection using self-collected vaginal and  
18 clinician-collected cervical specimens. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 2016 doi:  
19 10.1128/jcm.00529-16  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Reporting checklist for qualitative study.

Based on the SRQR guidelines.

	Reporting Item	Page Number
	#1 Concise description of the nature and topic of the study identifying the study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g. ethnography, grounded theory) or data collection methods (e.g. interview, focus group) is recommended	2
	#2 Summary of the key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results and conclusions	2
Problem formulation	#3 Description and significance of the problem / phenomenon studied: review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement	4-5
Purpose or research question	#4 Purpose of the study and specific objectives or questions	5
Qualitative approach and research paradigm	#5 Qualitative approach (e.g. ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research) and guiding theory if appropriate; identifying the research paradigm (e.g. postpositivist, constructivist / interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale. The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method or technique rather than other options available; the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate the rationale for several items might be discussed together.	6
Researcher characteristics and reflexivity	#6 Researchers' characteristics that may influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications / experience, relationship with participants, assumptions and / or	7-8

1			presuppositions; potential or actual interaction between	
2			researchers' characteristics and the research questions,	
3			approach, methods, results and / or transferability	
4				
5				
6	Context	#7	Setting / site and salient contextual factors; rationale	5-6
7				
8				
9	Sampling strategy	#8	How and why research participants, documents, or events	6-7
10			were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling	
11			was necessary (e.g. sampling saturation); rationale	
12				
13				
14				
15	Ethical issues	#9	Documentation of approval by an appropriate ethics review	8-9
16	pertaining to human		board and participant consent, or explanation for lack thereof;	
17	subjects		other confidentiality and data security issues	
18				
19				
20				
21	Data collection	#10	Types of data collected; details of data collection procedures	7-8
22	methods		including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data	
23			collection and analysis, iterative process, triangulation of	
24			sources / methods, and modification of procedures in	
25			response to evolving study findings; rationale	
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31	Data collection	#11	Description of instruments (e.g. interview guides,	7-8
32	instruments and		questionnaires) and devices (e.g. audio recorders) used for	
33	technologies		data collection; if / how the instruments(s) changed over the	
34			course of the study	
35				
36				
37				
38	Units of study	#12	Number and relevant characteristics of participants,	9-10
39			documents, or events included in the study; level of	
40			participation (could be reported in results)	
41				
42				
43				
44				
45	Data processing	#13	Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis,	8
46			including transcription, data entry, data management and	
47			security, verification of data integrity, data coding, and	
48			anonymisation / deidentification of excerpts	
49				
50				
51				
52	Data analysis	#14	Process by which inferences, themes, etc. were identified and	8
53			developed, including the researchers involved in data	
54			analysis; usually references a specific paradigm or approach;	
55			rationale	
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

1	Techniques to	#15	Techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data	8
2	enhance		analysis (e.g. member checking, audit trail, triangulation);	
3	trustworthiness		rationale	
4				
5				
6				
7	Syntheses and	#16	Main findings (e.g. interpretations, inferences, and themes);	10
8	interpretation		might include development of a theory or model, or integration	
9			with prior research or theory	
10				
11				
12				
13	Links to empirical	#17	Evidence (e.g. quotes, field notes, text excerpts, photographs)	10-16
14	data		to substantiate analytic findings	
15				
16				
17				
18	Intergration with	#18	Short summary of main findings; explanation of how findings	16-18
19	prior work,		and conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or	
20	implications,		challenge conclusions of earlier scholarship; discussion of	
21	transferability and		scope of application / generalizability; identification of unique	
22	contribution(s) to the		contributions(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field	
23	field			
24				
25				
26				
27				
28	Limitations	#19	Trustworthiness and limitations of findings	18-19
29				
30				
31				
32	Conflicts of interest	#20	Potential sources of influence of perceived influence on study	19
33			conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	
34				
35				
36	Funding	#21	Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data	19-20
37			collection, interpretation and reporting	
38				
39				
40				

41 The SRQR checklist is distributed with permission of Wolters Kluwer © 2014 by the Association of  
 42 American Medical Colleges. This checklist was completed on 29. August 2018 using  
 43 <http://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with [Penelope.ai](#)  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60

# BMJ Open

## Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening among Rural Women in Eastern China: a Qualitative Study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-026413.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Dec-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Yang, Huan; Shandong University; NHC Key Laboratory of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University) Li, Shun-Ping; Shandong University; NHC Key Laboratory of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University) Chen, Qing; Shandong University; NHC Key Laboratory of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University) Morgan, Christopher; Burnet Institute; Melbourne Univeristy
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Qualitative research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health, Health policy, Health services research
Keywords:	barriers, cervical cancer, cancer screening, China

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



1  
2  
3  
4 **Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening among Rural Women in Eastern**  
5  
6 **China: a Qualitative Study**  
7  
8  
9

10 *Huan Yang,<sup>1,2</sup> Shunping Li,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> Qing Chen,<sup>1,2</sup> Christopher Morgan<sup>3,4</sup>*

- 11  
12  
13 1. *School of Health Care Management, Shandong University, Jinan 250012, China*  
14  
15  
16 2. *NHC Key Laboratory of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University),*  
17  
18 *Jinan 250012, China*  
19  
20  
21 3. *Burnet Institute, Melbourne 3004, Australia*  
22  
23  
24 4. *Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne,*  
25  
26 *Melbourne 3052, Australia*  
27  
28

29  
30 \* **Correspondence** *Shunping Li, School of Health Care Management, Shandong University,*  
31  
32 *Wenhua Xi Rd 44, Jinan, Shandong Province 250012, People's Republic of China.*

33  
34 *E-mail: [lishunping@sdu.edu.cn](mailto:lishunping@sdu.edu.cn) Tel.: +86-131-8893-4998*  
35  
36

37  
38  
39 **Keywords** *barriers; cervical cancer; cancer screening; China*  
40  
41

42 **Word count** 4363  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives** To explore barriers to free cervical cancer screening among rural women in China from the perspective of women, healthcare providers and women's husbands to inform intervention planning.

**Design** A qualitative study framed around potential policy and practice options, drawing on the concepts of descriptive phenomenology and implementation research.

**Setting** This study was carried out at township level within two counties in Jining Prefecture of eastern China.

**Participants and data collection** Semi-structured in-depth interviews with 21 women and five healthcare providers, focus group discussions with nine healthcare providers, and key informant interviews with 4 husbands of women eligible for screening.

**Results** Thematic analysis generated five major themes: (1) gaps in knowledge of cervical cancer and health awareness, (2) fear of cancer and screening outcomes, (3) cultural barriers including reticence for intimate examinations, (4) influence of close contacts on screening decisions, and (5) inconvenience. These demonstrate key knowledge gaps challenging current community health education. Important service barriers, including with fear of treatment cost, and the time needed for screening were also raised.

**Conclusion** Our study details important barriers to cervical cancer screening relating to knowledge gaps, attitudes of fear or embarrassment, and the role of contacts and service models. These provide data for policy and planning to improve the screening that will

1  
2  
3  
4 decrease the incidence and mortality rates of cervical cancer in China.  
5  
6

## 7 **Article Summary**

8  
9

### 10 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

11  
12  
13

- 14 ■ The qualitative methods allowed for detailed and deep responses and triangulation  
15 across providers, clients and their partners.  
16  
17
- 18 ■ The findings have direct relevance to policy makers considering the development of  
19 interventions to increase uptake rate of cervical cancer screening in our setting.  
20  
21
- 22 ■ Our purposive sampling may bias our findings to those representative of women with  
23 lower educational levels and low uptake of services.  
24  
25
- 26 ■ Some social acceptability bias may have influenced focus group discussion findings,  
27 which we attempted to counter-balance with individual interview data.  
28  
29
- 30 ■ As a qualitative study, there are limits to generalizability beyond our setting.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INTRODUCTION

Infection with the human papilloma virus (HPV) is the most significant risk factor for cervical cancer which can be transmitted during sexual intercourse.<sup>1</sup> The majority of HPV infections resolve spontaneously and do not cause symptoms or disease.<sup>2</sup> However, persistent infection with specific types of HPV (most frequently, types 16 and 18) may lead to precancerous lesions, which, if not treated, can progress to cancer 10 to 20 years later.<sup>3</sup> Cervical cancer is a preventable and treatable disease, and screening of precancerous lesions can reduce its incidence and mortality.<sup>4</sup> In many high-income countries, the incidence and mortality of cervical cancer have decreased significantly because of the efforts made to detect precancerous lesions early.<sup>5 6</sup> However, in low- or middle-income countries, cervical cancer remains the most common cause of cancer-related deaths among women.<sup>7</sup>

Cervical cancer is recognized as a major public health problem in China,<sup>8</sup> both in mortality and morbidity burden, the latter causing protracted economic stress on women, heaviest in rural communities. As part of responses in 2009, a new round of deepening health system reforms intended to integrate the breast cancer and cervical cancer screening programs in rural areas into broader national public health services.<sup>9</sup> The government's National Cervical Cancer Screening Program in Rural Areas (NCCSPRA) launched in 221 pilot counties and a total of 11.69 million rural women between 35 and 59 years of age accessed this screening program between 2009 and 2011.<sup>10</sup> In one site that is the subject of our study, Jining Prefecture, free breast cancer and cervical cancer screening has been available to rural women over 35 years of age since 2011, with the upper age limit extended

1  
2  
3  
4 from 59 to 64 years in 2014, with three free screens available to women up until November  
5  
6 2017.<sup>4</sup> However uptake rate of the free service remains very low.<sup>4</sup>  
7  
8  
9

10 In China, a number of studies have been conducted into women's knowledge and attitudes  
11  
12 toward cervical cancer screening and related factors,<sup>11-14</sup> however most data have been  
13  
14 quantitative in nature.<sup>12-14</sup> This leaves gaps in understanding of underlying determinants of  
15  
16 care-seeking, including the reasons why women do not take up free care-seeking, which  
17  
18 require more qualitative research approaches.<sup>15 16</sup> Therefore, this research aimed to gain a  
19  
20 deeper understanding of the nature of barriers to uptake of free cervical cancer screening by  
21  
22 rural women in Jining Prefecture, using a design that can suggest new policy and practice  
23  
24 approaches that may be able to increase future uptake and reduce the burden of cervical  
25  
26 cancer.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

## 34 **METHODS**

### 35 **Study setting and design**

36  
37  
38 This study was conducted in Shandong Province, which is located in eastern China with a  
39  
40 population of more than 100 million.<sup>17</sup> In 2016, the gross regional product of Shandong  
41  
42 Province amounted to CNY6803 billion (US\$1024 billion), ranking it as the third largest  
43  
44 economy within China.<sup>17</sup> Jining Prefecture, located in the southwest of Shandong Province  
45  
46 with a population of 8.35 million and the gross regional product of CNY430 billion (US\$63  
47  
48 billion) in 2016.<sup>18</sup>  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 Our study design drew on descriptive phenomenology,<sup>19</sup> concepts of acceptability and  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 appropriateness in health implementation research,<sup>20</sup> and was framed by options for change  
5  
6 in policy or practice, as identified by local health managers and experts. These helped  
7  
8 identify qualitative tools, and categories of inquiry, deemed useful to understand knowledge  
9  
10 and attitudes affecting women's and family's decision-making in relation to screening. The  
11  
12 qualitative data collection methods included semi-structured in-depth interviews with 21  
13  
14 women eligible for free screening aged between 35 and 64 years, and with five healthcare  
15  
16 providers. These were supplemented by focus group discussions with healthcare providers of  
17  
18 varying disciplines (described below) aiming to use discussion to elicit contrasting  
19  
20 disciplinary perspectives. To gain a partner perspective, key informant interviews were  
21  
22 conducted with husbands of women eligible for screening.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **Study participants and sample**

32  
33  
34 Two townships (Tangma and Xingcun) were randomly selected from within the mainly rural  
35  
36 areas of Sishui and Yutai Counties in Jining Prefecture in eastern China. Purposive sampling  
37  
38 was used to focus research on those were representative of women as less likely to take up  
39  
40 screening, identified by local health managers. The selection criteria included: women aged  
41  
42 between 35 and 64 years (those eligible for free screening and at higher risk), resident in the  
43  
44 study townships, not in formal employment, and those who had either never been screened  
45  
46 or who had failed to attend a second or third follow-up screening. Twenty-one women (10  
47  
48 from Xingcun, 11 from Tangma) were recruited in collaboration with township community  
49  
50 partners. One third had never been screened, one third screened once, and one third screened  
51  
52 twice. Fourteen health care providers (7 from Xingcun, 7 from Tangma) including hospital  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 managers, public health directors and medical practitioners whose responsibilities included  
5  
6 contact, recording and managing data for screening and screening service provision, were  
7  
8 purposefully selected by discipline mix. Five providers took part in semi-structured in-depth  
9  
10 interviews and nine in two focus group discussions (four in the first and five in the second  
11  
12 group). Four key informant interviews (2 from Xingcun, 2 from Tangma) were conducted  
13  
14 with screening-eligible women's husbands who were purposefully selected and weren't  
15  
16 related to the women participants. The numbers of interviews and focus group discussions  
17  
18 were designed to enable a theoretical saturation of qualitative themes, and data collection  
19  
20 ceased when no new information was being obtained.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **Data collection**

29  
30  
31 All interviews and discussions were conducted over a one-week period in November 2017  
32  
33 by four researchers from Shandong University who had extensive knowledge of cervical  
34  
35 cancer, and were trained in conducting qualitative research and interviews on sensitive  
36  
37 topics. Women participants were interviewed in healthcare institutions identified by  
38  
39 community partners. Individual interviews in private rooms gave participants the opportunity  
40  
41 to speak freely and comfortably. Before interviews, a short questionnaire<sup>4</sup> including 17 items  
42  
43 was used to assess knowledge on cervical cancer, risk factors, symptoms, and the objectives  
44  
45 and processes of cervical cancer screening. Consistent with earlier studies, responses were  
46  
47 scored as correct (one point), incorrect or "do not know" (zero points), with numbers of  
48  
49 correct scores used to categorize respondents into 2 groups: "high level of knowledge"  
50  
51 (score 9 to 17) or "low level of knowledge" (score 0-8).<sup>21 22</sup> The semi-structured in-depth  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

interviews with women used open questions in categories informed by our design, with detailed probes to deepen responses (Table 1). Topics covered included sociodemographic characteristics, screening experience, purpose of cervical cancer screening, perception of barriers to screening uptake and suggestions for overcoming barriers.

Table 1 Overview of question categories in semi-structured in-depth interviews

<b>Knowledge of cervical cancer screening</b>
Have you heard about cervical cancer screening?
What do you understand cervical cancer screening?
Why cervical cancer screening is done?
<b>Barriers to cervical cancer screening</b>
Why don't you take free cervical cancer screening?
Why do you think other women don't take free cervical cancer screening?
<b>Suggestions for overcoming barriers</b>
How do you think these barriers could be overcome?

In-depth interviews and focus group discussions with providers were conducted close to the work place and lasted approximately 30 and 45 minutes, respectively. The in-depth interviews and focus group discussions guide (Table 2) explored providers' experiences in providing screening services, perception of barriers to cervical cancer screening uptake for women, and suggestions for overcoming barriers. Key informant interviews with husbands were conducted in their home. Interviews guide included questions on their knowledge about cervical cancer, and attitudes towards screening for cervical cancer and potential barriers to uptake for women.



Table 2 Overview of discussion/question categories for focus groups and provider interviews

<b>Experience in providing screening services</b>
How long have you provided screening services?
What are your responsibilities for screening services?
<b>Barriers to cervical cancer screening</b>
Why do you think women don't take free cervical cancer screening?
<b>Suggestions for overcoming barriers</b>
How do you think these barriers could be overcome?

Verbal informed consent using a standard script was obtained from all participants prior to interviews. All interviews and focus group discussions were digitally recorded. Confidentiality was ensured through using code numbers rather than names. Researchers took care to identify and reflect on any bias relating to differential status between themselves and interviewees, using introductory explanations on themselves their neutrality and the study purpose, ensuring simple comprehensible language, and maintaining careful non-judgmental listening, in order to minimize bias during the interview process. Each participant was given a vacuum beverage cup to compensate for their time commitment to the study.

### **Data analysis**

All interviews and focus group discussions were transcribed verbatim and subjected to thematic analysis.<sup>23</sup> We analyzed the data across all stakeholder groups collectively. HY collated interview and questionnaire data across all sites, ensuring consistency supervised by

1  
2  
3  
4 SL for data integrity. HY and SL jointly read all transcripts and developed themes (both  
5  
6 pre-determined by our design and emerging), a topic index and code structure. HY, SL and  
7  
8 QC undertook coding and thematic consolidation, with any differences discussed and  
9  
10 resolved through consensus. These analyses were performed in Chinese and then translated  
11  
12 into English by HY for further review by SL, QC and CM. Care was taken to ensure data  
13  
14 validity in the translation of dialect and colloquialisms.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 21 **Ethical approval**

22  
23  
24 This study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Medical School, Shandong  
25  
26 University (LL-201401048), and conforms to the ethics guidelines of the Declaration of  
27  
28 Helsinki.  
29  
30  
31

### 32 33 **Patient and public involvement**

34  
35  
36 Participants were not involved in the study design and conduct, but their experiences and  
37  
38 preferences will inform the development of the research questions to generate major themes  
39  
40 for analysis. Public involvement including community partners were involved in the  
41  
42 recruitment process. A policy brief containing findings and implications will be provided to  
43  
44 local policy makers and managers, and to community leaders for dissemination to study  
45  
46 participants.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

## 52 53 **RESULTS**

### 54 55 **Sociodemographic characteristics of participants** 56 57 58 59 60

There were no refusals of consent or drop-outs during participation, with a total of twenty-one rural women participating. The mean age of participants was  $48.7 \pm 6.4$  years, with a range from 37 to 60 years, with more than half (57.1%) aged between 46 and 55 years. Most participants (95.2%) were married and most (90.5%) had an education level of primary school or below. About half of the participants (52.4%) had previously been screened once for cervical cancer. Table 3 shows details of the characteristics of participants. The mean knowledge scores were  $4.4 \pm 2.3$  (range from 0 to 10).

Table 3 Sociodemographic characteristics of women interviewees, n (%).

Characteristics	Sishui(n = 10)	Yutai(n =11)	Total(n = 21)
<b>Age (years)</b>			
35~45	6(60.0)	0(0.0)	6(28.6)
46~55	3(30.0)	9(81.8)	12(57.1)
56~64	1(10.0)	2(18.2)	3(14.3)
<b>Educational level</b>			
No school	3(30.0)	5(45.5)	8(38.1)
Primary school	6(60.0)	5(45.5)	11(52.4)
Middle school or above	1(10.0)	1(9.0)	2(9.5)
<b>Marital status</b>			
Married	9(90.0)	11(100.0)	20(95.2)
Divorced or widowed	1(10.0)	0(0.0)	1(4.8)
<b>Ever screened for cervical cancer</b>			
Yes	7(70.0)	4(36.4)	11(52.4)
No	3(30.0)	7(63.6)	10(47.6)

1  
2  
3  
4 Among the 14 health care providers, the mean age was  $42.6 \pm 9.0$  years and most (64.2%)  
5  
6 were aged between 41 and 50 years. They had an education level of junior college and  
7  
8 above. Most providers were medical practitioners (50.0%). The mean age of four husbands  
9  
10 who undertook key informant interviews was  $50.7 \pm 6.3$  years, and all of them were  
11  
12 small-hold farmers.  
13  
14  
15

### 16 17 18 **Key themes**

19  
20  
21 Thematic analysis generated five major themes: (1) gaps in knowledge of cervical cancer  
22  
23 and health awareness, (2) fear of cancer and screening outcomes, (3) cultural barriers, (4)  
24  
25 influence of close contacts, and (5) inconvenience. Each of these is elaborated below,  
26  
27 including quotations from participants with their identification number and age.  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 33 **Gaps in knowledge of cervical cancer and health awareness**

34  
35  
36 Knowledge gaps and lack of access to reliable information on cervical cancer is reported as a  
37  
38 major barrier to women's participation in cervical cancer screening. The results of this  
39  
40 questionnaires showed that the majority of women participants had a low level of cervical  
41  
42 cancer knowledge. Most women indicated that they had heard about cervical cancer from  
43  
44 their friends or television, however, almost none knew that HPV infection was the cause.  
45  
46 Some cited inaccurate information and most reported that their knowledge, especially about  
47  
48 causes and symptoms, was speculative. For example, one reported misconception was that  
49  
50 "cervical cancer will never happen after menopause". Limited knowledge seemed linked to  
51  
52 lack of awareness of being at any personal risk of cervical cancer happening. When asked  
53  
54 why she had not participated in cervical cancer screening, one woman stated:  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *I think my health is in a good condition. I've never had anything serious, or any*  
5  
6 *symptoms. No symptoms, no examination. We only go to the hospital when we are*  
7  
8 *uncomfortable or feel sick. (Woman 11, 53 years)*  
9

10  
11  
12 One of the health provider focus groups also mentioned:  
13

14  
15  
16 *Cervix is a dumb organ. There are no symptoms nor is it typical in the early stage. It*  
17  
18 *doesn't affect their work or daily life; there is even no bleeding. No symptoms, nothing at*  
19  
20 *all. They don't think they are infected, so there is no need to go through the screening.*  
21  
22  
23 (FGD 2, provider 05, 41 years)  
24

25  
26  
27 Gaps in health knowledge specific to disease prevention, as well as limited knowledge of  
28  
29 the process, cycle, purpose and importance of screening. The importance of early screening  
30  
31 prior to symptoms showing, was poorly recognized. These factors were reported to limit  
32  
33 women's acceptance of or commitment to screening, hindering or postponing their  
34  
35 participation in cervical cancer screening.  
36  
37  
38

39  
40  
41 A woman who had been notified to attend cervical cancer screening said:  
42

43  
44 *I was told to do the screening yesterday. Well, I didn't want to. I thought I always have*  
45  
46 *a good appetite and never feel uncomfortable. There's no point doing it. (Woman 04, 48*  
47  
48 *years)*  
49

50  
51  
52 Another woman who participated in cervical cancer screening only once stated:  
53

54  
55  
56 *I did the examination once and the doctor said I was good. So I never came back. Why*  
57  
58 *bother when I'm good? (Woman 15, 55 years)*  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Health care provider viewpoints echoed this:  
5  
6

7 *These women have low health care awareness. They wouldn't go to the hospital even if*  
8 *they have other common diseases. All they care about is if they could still do the*  
9 *housework. They don't have much understanding of medicine, so they couldn't know the*  
10 *significance of early screening if they got the disease. (FGD 1, provider 03, 52 years)*  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

### 18 **Fear of cancer and screening outcomes**

19  
20 The majority of women in the interviews expressed a deep fear of cancer. Some did not want  
21  
22 to know if they had cervical cancer, a common reason provided for why they were unwilling  
23  
24 to attend the screening was that they did not want to learn the results. This fear extended to  
25  
26 any form of cancer terminology. Women wanted to avoid the anxiety and distress that would  
27  
28 be associated with being told of a cancer-related lesion:  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 *It's a terrible disease. I'm afraid something bad might show. If I don't do the screening*  
37 *I wouldn't know if I had it, I will at least have a good appetite. If the results were bad, I*  
38 *wouldn't feel comfortable knowing that. Appetites and good sleep would be gone for sure.*  
39 *I would have more years to live freely if I didn't know it. (Woman 01, 37 years)*  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 *People become upset whenever they talk about cancer. In the first 2 years of the*  
48 *screening campaign, we couldn't put 'cancer screening' on the banner and used 'health*  
49 *examination' instead. People couldn't take it if they saw the word 'cancer'. (FGD 2,*  
50 *provider 01, 47 years)*  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57  
58 A husband also mentioned, during key informant interview:  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *They were all afraid they might have it. Older women would say 'why do the screening?*

5  
6  
7 *I would be upset if I knew I had it' .(Husband 02, 63 years)*

8  
9  
10 Fear of a positive screening test was also related to the financial implications. Some women  
11  
12 with fewer economic resources reported avoiding screening because they were worried they  
13  
14 would not have the money for treatment if they were diagnosed with the cancer, noting that  
15  
16 at present, while screening is free of charge, treatment is not. This suggests that family  
17  
18 finances are likely to influence their participation, with families weighing up the impact of  
19  
20 debt against that of the disease:  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 *We wouldn't afford the treatment even if we found out we had it, so it's better we don't*  
27  
28 *do it at all. Adults need money and so do children. The money would be wasted if we went*  
29  
30 *through the treatment and not cured. No need to spend money on a disease that can't be*  
31  
32 *cured. We don't want to add burden to the family. (Woman 10, 54 years)*  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 Two focus groups also noticed this:

38  
39  
40 *People only see nearly 100,000 yuan for the surgery and it's a very heavy burden. The*  
41  
42 *disease would drag the already poor family into debt. They can't take it. (FGD 1, provider*  
43  
44 *02, 44 years)*  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 *There are indeed financial problems, especially for rural families. They think they don't*  
50  
51 *feel anything right now, if they find out they are infected after the screening they have to*  
52  
53 *go through the treatment and spend money. So it's better not to do the screening at all.*  
54  
55  
56  
57 (FGD 2, provider 03, 41 years)  
58  
59  
60

## Cultural barriers

A common report, especially among older women, was a reluctance to remove clothing or allow genital examination, especially being exposed in front of non-family members. It was mentioned by nearly all women that they felt embarrassed about this step. Informants related this to cultural norms in their rural setting, and among Chinese women more generally.

*Felt like a very private part and I don't want other people to see it. That's the thought. Yes it's embarrassing. I'm too old. Don't want to be a joke. So ashamed. (Woman 09, 55 years)*

*When I went to the gynecology for the screening, I went inside and the doctor told me to take off my pants, and I suddenly didn't want to do the screening. (Woman 02, 48 years)*

Participants were specifically asked about willingness to accept screening by male doctors. For some participants, the gender of the service provider seemed a barrier; nearly half indicated that they would not undertake screening if performed by a male doctor.

*I wouldn't go if a man was doing the examination. It's less acceptable than a woman. It's so private and men are so improper for that. (Woman 14, 41 years)*

A female service provider mentioned:

*They are very conservative. Some women with vaginitis go to the clinic. We tell them to take off the pants and they are embarrassed. Some even put up with the disease until they can't. So they would be more uncomfortable if male doctors are here. (Provider 01, 63 years)*



### **Influence of close contacts**

It was found that close contacts (such as mothers, sisters or neighbors) were an important factor influencing women's participation in cervical cancer screening. Knowing other people who had been screened or who had been diagnosed with cervical cancer and undertaken treatment was reported to increase participation in screening. The converse was also true, with reports that if close contacts were not willing to participate, this reduced affected women's acceptance of screening. This was also reported to generate clusters of women who would refuse screening.

*I wouldn't know it if they (the neighbors) asked me to come along. If the others (the neighbors) don't come, I wouldn't either. It's good to have someone with you. I wouldn't come by myself.* (Woman 05, 55 years)

*I would for sure not come by myself.* (Woman 06, 48 years)

A service provider mentioned a similar situation during the screening campaign:

*We met this situation once when we were doing the screening in a town. Several women came together and they learned they need to take off the pants. One said 'This is what it is. Forget it. Let's go'. And all of them felt reluctant and left together. It's a group mentality.*  
(Provider 03, 43 years)

### **Inconvenience**

Difficulty in scheduling, or otherwise allocating time for screening was considered to be a significant barrier to women's participation. Many women eligible for screening work in

1  
2  
3  
4 disparate locations throughout the year and may and only return home at the time of Spring  
5  
6 Festival. Such holidays are busy with limited time available for activities such as routine  
7  
8 health checks. One working woman stated that leave is only feasible for actual illness.  
9  
10

11  
12 *I work elsewhere and only ask for leave when they have an emergency or special*  
13  
14 *occasions at home. It's hard to ask for leave and I lose some salary for that. Usually I*  
15  
16 *come home once a year for only 5 or 6 days. It's not enough. (Woman 21, 40 years)*  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 *Many rural people go to other places to work and don't come home often. We call them*  
22  
23 *to come back but they can't. They don't get paid if they ask for leave and it's too expensive*  
24  
25 *on the road. So they don't want to come back. (Provider 02, 44 years)*  
26  
27

28  
29 Women who do not travel for work also report many demands on their time including  
30  
31 family business, child-care, housework and farming duties that are often seasonal. Lack of  
32  
33 time for routine health care is reported as a barrier to cervical cancer screening either. When  
34  
35 asked why not attend the screening, a woman who had never gone through the examination  
36  
37 said:  
38  
39  
40

41  
42  
43 *I'm always busy with the kids going to school every day and housework never seems to*  
44  
45 *end. Family and housework are the most important for me. So I somehow forget about it*  
46  
47 *(the screening). (Woman 08, 46 years)*  
48  
49

50  
51  
52 *I tell you we farmers are pretty busy. When we are not, we want to do some small*  
53  
54 *business to make money. So no time for examinations. (Woman 19, 56 years)*  
55  
56  
57  
58

## 59 **DISCUSSION**

60

1  
2  
3  
4 This study used standard qualitative tools to explore the barriers to attending cervical cancer  
5  
6 screening among rural women in Jining Prefecture of Shandong province in eastern China.  
7  
8 Such in-depth assessments have rarely been reported in Chinese literature. Our study  
9  
10 identified gaps in knowledge of cervical cancer and health awareness, fear of cancer and  
11  
12 screening outcomes, cultural barriers, the influence of close contacts, and inconvenience as  
13  
14 frequently cited barriers.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Our findings on gaps in knowledge or awareness are echoed in studies from other  
22  
23 resource-constrained settings, with specific misconceptions and poor awareness of the  
24  
25 benefits of routine health checks reported from diverse settings including Burkina Faso,  
26  
27 <sup>24</sup>Iran,<sup>25</sup> Malawi,<sup>26 27</sup> Nigeria<sup>28</sup> and elsewhere. Reluctance to seek care in the absence of  
28  
29 symptoms is a common theme, seen also in high-income settings such as Norway,<sup>29</sup> and this  
30  
31 was one of the most important constraints identified in our study. Our finding that there is  
32  
33 very low awareness of the risks posed by cervical cancer is seen elsewhere in China.<sup>30 31</sup>  
34  
35 Accessible and attractive educational products tailored to rural women are urgently needed  
36  
37 to communicate accurate information about cervical cancer, those at risk, screening methods,  
38  
39 treatments available, and the need for regular checks.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 Fear poses a significant psychological barrier to care-seeking for cervical cancer  
49  
50 screening. This includes the general fear of “cancer” as a vicious and intractable class of  
51  
52 disease,<sup>32</sup> and the fear that it would not be possible to emotionally cope with a diagnosis,  
53  
54 seen in relation to cervical cancer in our findings and in other high- middle- and low-income  
55  
56 settings.<sup>33 34 35</sup> A study among Mexican women shows that women reported not attending  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 cervical cancer screening because of fear of ‘knowing,’ that is, prefer to live with hopeful  
5  
6 doubts instead of facing the possibility of an unfavorable result.<sup>36</sup> This poses a key  
7  
8 knowledge challenge to community health education efforts. They must find ways to not  
9  
10 only build knowledge of the risks of an asymptomatic disease, but also address the  
11  
12 misconceptions and emotions aroused by cancer more generally, in order to build trust that  
13  
14 timely screening can render cervical cancer treatable.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 The influence of women’s close contacts risks generating clusters of mutually-reinforcing  
22  
23 resistance to screening,<sup>37</sup> with partners playing a key role.<sup>38 39</sup> This suggests some education  
24  
25 initiatives will need to address whole communities and possibly include peer-education  
26  
27 approaches that encourage positive health discussions among friends.  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 In our study, like other resource-constrained settings<sup>27</sup> fears of financial catastrophe  
33  
34 generated by high treatment costs also posed a barrier to screening. In our context this  
35  
36 emphasizes the need for health planners to understand the pragmatic choices families make  
37  
38 when health care costs are seen as unaffordable. Making treatment financially accessible, for  
39  
40 cervical cancer and many other protracted diseases, is a key challenge facing China’s public  
41  
42 health system reformers.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 We found culturally based embarrassment to be a key barrier. Such associations with  
50  
51 concepts of conservatism and modesty obstruct access to reproductive health in general and  
52  
53 cervical cancer screening in particular in our and many other settings,<sup>30 40-42</sup> especially when  
54  
55 providers are male,<sup>43 44</sup> or women are older.<sup>45</sup> For such communities in China and Asian  
56  
57 populations elsewhere,<sup>46</sup> this requires providers of screening to have high levels of cultural  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 competence, and planners to ensure sufficient numbers of female providers. On the other  
5  
6 hand, inconvenient screening services, in terms of timing and location also posed a major  
7  
8 barrier for the rural women in our study. This applies to those who must relocate for paid  
9  
10 work and those whose family care duties leave little time for health screening, and findings  
11  
12 were seen in a wide range of settings.<sup>33 47 48</sup> Delivering services at times, even holiday times,  
13  
14 and in places where women already congregate, perhaps through mobile services, may help  
15  
16 overcome this barrier in China, and elsewhere.<sup>46</sup>  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 These findings have several implications for practice, as noted above in relation to each  
24  
25 key theme. In addition, new methods for screening<sup>49</sup> using automated nucleic acid  
26  
27 amplification tests may help overcome timing and location constraints by allowing more  
28  
29 rapid screening, and may help overcome cultural constraints by allowing women to  
30  
31 self-collect vaginal swab samples.  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 The mix of data sources across women, their husbands, and healthcare providers enabled  
37  
38 triangulation of themes and identification of varying viewpoints. The qualitative methods  
39  
40 with data saturation provided detailed and rich responses on barriers to cervical cancer  
41  
42 screening for this group of rural women, available to inform providers and other researchers.  
43  
44 In addition, a policy brief containing findings and implications will be provided to local  
45  
46 policy makers and managers, and to community leaders, to inform future planning. Our  
47  
48 study acknowledges the usual limitations of qualitative research, our purposeful sample may  
49  
50 under-represent some women, and the peer effect in the focus group discussions may have  
51  
52 influenced providers to give answers that they perceive to be more socially acceptable. As a  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 qualitative study, our findings relate primarily to our study setting, and our recommendations  
5  
6 should be tested with larger studies.  
7  
8  
9

## 10 11 **CONCLUSION**

12  
13  
14  
15 In summary, our study details important barriers to cervical cancer screening in terms of  
16  
17 gaps in knowledge, fear of cancer and screening outcomes, cultural embarrassment, the  
18  
19 influence of close contacts, and inconvenience. We hope policy makers and planners can  
20  
21 make use of these findings to improve education and service delivery for screening that will  
22  
23 decrease the incidence and mortality rates of cervical cancer in China.  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 29 **Acknowledgments**

30  
31  
32 We would like to acknowledge and thank all community partners who assisted with data  
33  
34 collection and recruitment of participants and the study participants for their time and  
35  
36 contribution to this study. This work was supported by China Medical Board Open  
37  
38 Competition Grant [Grant number CMB14-195]. Responsibility for any remaining errors lies  
39  
40 solely with the authors.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

## 46 47 **Author Contributions**

48  
49 Huan Yang designed the study, completed the data collection and analyses, and wrote the  
50  
51 manuscript. Shunping Li designed the study, collected and analyzed the data, and edited the  
52  
53 manuscript. Qing Chen designed the study, collected and analyzed the data. Christopher  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Morgan helped design the study, supported interpretation of findings, and edited the  
5  
6 manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.  
7  
8

### 9 **Competing Interests**

10  
11  
12  
13 The authors declare no conflict of interest.  
14  
15

### 16 **Funding**

17  
18  
19 This work was supported by China Medical Board Open Competition Grant [Grant number  
20  
21 CMB14-195]. Responsibility for any remaining errors lies solely with the authors.  
22  
23  
24

### 25 **Ethics approval**

26  
27  
28 The study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Medical School, Shandong  
29  
30 University (LL-201401048).  
31  
32  
33

### 34 **Data sharing**

35  
36  
37 No additional data are available.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

1. Acharya Pandey R, Karmacharya E. Cervical cancer screening behavior and associated factors among women of Ugrachandi Nala, Kavre, Nepal. *European Journal of Medical Research* 2017;22(1):32. doi: 10.1186/s40001-017-0274-9
2. WHO. Comprehensive cervical cancer prevention and control: a healthier future for girls and women. Geneva: *World Health Organization*, 2013.
3. de Sanjose S, Quint WGV, Alemany L, et al. Human papillomavirus genotype attribution in invasive cervical cancer: a retrospective cross-sectional worldwide study. *The Lancet Oncology* 2010;11(11):1048-56. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045\(10\)70230-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(10)70230-8)
4. Liu T, Li S, Ratcliffe J, et al. Assessing Knowledge and Attitudes towards Cervical Cancer Screening among Rural Women in Eastern China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2017;14(9):967.
5. Haesebaert J, Lutringer-Magnin D, Kalecinski J, et al. French women's knowledge of and attitudes towards cervical cancer prevention and the acceptability of HPV vaccination among those with 14 – 18 year old daughters: a quantitative-qualitative study. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12(1):1034. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-12-1034
6. GILES M, GARLAND S. A study of women's knowledge regarding human papillomavirus infection, cervical cancer and human papillomavirus vaccines. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol* 2006;46(4):311-15. doi: doi:10.1111/j.1479-828X.2006.00598.x
7. Louie KS, Sanjose SD, Mayaud P. Epidemiology and prevention of human papillomavirus and cervical cancer in sub - Saharan Africa: a comprehensive review. *Trop Med Int Health* 2009;14(10):1287-302. doi: doi:10.1111/j.1365-3156.2009.02372.x
8. Gu C, Chan CWH, Twinn S. How Sexual History and Knowledge of Cervical Cancer and Screening Influence Chinese Women's Screening Behavior in Mainland China. *Cancer Nurs* 2010;33(6):445-53. doi: 10.1097/NCC.0b013e3181e456dc
9. Chen W, Zhang S, Zeng H, et al. Report of Cancer Incidence and Mortality in China, 2010. *China Cancer* 2014(01):1-10.
10. Di J, Rutherford S, Wu J, et al. Knowledge of Cervical Cancer Screening among Women across Different Socio-Economic Regions of China. *PLoS One* 2015;10(12):e0144819. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0144819



11. Jia Y, Li S, Yang R, et al. Knowledge about Cervical Cancer and Barriers of Screening Program among Women in Wufeng County, a High-Incidence Region of Cervical Cancer in China. *PLoS ONE* 2013;8(7):e67005. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0067005
12. Tang T. Investigation on status quo of cognitive, attitude and behavior of women toward cervical cancer screening and analysis of its related factors. *Chinese And Foreign Medical Research* 2016(03):68-69.
13. Liu L, Xu J, Yang C, et al. Investigation on status quo of cognitive of 1208 outpatients toward cervical cancer screening and analysis of its related factors. *Practical Clinical Journal of Integrated Traditional Chinese and Western Medicine* 2016(08):51-52+65.
14. Zhou W, Shan H, Qi J, et al. Investigation on status quo of cognitive of 1200 women of childbearing age toward cervical cancer and analysis of its related factors. *Maternal and Child Health Care of China* 2017(18):4510-12.
15. Li SP, Zheng ZY, Meng QY, et al. Barriers to tuberculosis care for drug users in two provinces of China: a qualitative study. *The International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease* 2013;17(10):1358-63. doi: 10.5588/ijtld.12.0784
16. Pope C, Mays N. Qualitative Research: Reaching the parts other methods cannot reach: an introduction to qualitative methods in health and health services research. *BMJ* 1995;311(6996):42-45. doi: 10.1136/bmj.311.6996.42
17. China Statistical Yearbook 2017 [Available from: <http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/2017/indexch.htm>. accessed March 9 2018.
18. Shandong Statistical Yearbook 2017 [Available from: <http://www.stats-sd.gov.cn/tjnj/nj2017/indexch.htm> accessed March 9 2018.
19. Denzin NK, Lincoln YS. Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc 1994.
20. Peters DH, Tran NT, Adam T. Implementation research in health: a practical guide. Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research. World Health Organization 2013.
21. Bansal AB, Pakhare AP, Kapoor N, et al. Knowledge, attitude, and practices related to cervical cancer among adult women: A hospital-based cross-sectional study. *Journal of natural science, biology, and medicine* 2015;6(2):324-28. doi: 10.4103/0976-9668.159993
22. Ahmed SA, Sabitu K, Idris SH, et al. Knowledge, attitude and practice of cervical cancer screening among market women in Zaria, Nigeria. *Nigerian Medical Journal* 2013;54(5):316-19. doi: 10.4103/0300-1652.122337

- 1  
2  
3  
4 23. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*  
5 2006;3(2):77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa  
6  
7  
8 24. Compaore S, Ouedraogo CMR, Koanda S, et al. Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening in Burkina  
9 Faso: Needs for Patient and Professional Education. *J Cancer Educ* 2016;31(4):760-66. doi:  
10 10.1007/s13187-015-0898-9  
11  
12 25. Bayrami R, Taghipour A, Fau - Ebrahimipour H, Ebrahimipour H. Personal and socio-cultural  
13 barriers to cervical cancer screening in Iran, patient and provider perceptions: a qualitative  
14 study. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2015;16(9):3729-34.  
15  
16  
17 26. Fort VK, Makin MS, Siegler AJ, et al. Barriers to cervical cancer screening in Mulanje, Malawi: a  
18 qualitative study. *Patient preference and adherence* 2011;5:125-31. doi: 10.2147/ppa.s17317  
19  
20  
21 27. Ndejjo R, Mukama T, Kiguli J, et al. Knowledge, facilitators and barriers to cervical cancer  
22 screening among women in Uganda: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open* 2017;7(6) doi:  
23 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016282  
24  
25  
26 28. Isa Modibbo F, Dareng E, Bamisaye P, et al. Qualitative study of barriers to cervical cancer  
27 screening among Nigerian women. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(1) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008533  
28  
29  
30 29. Gele AA, Qureshi SA, Kour P, et al. Barriers and facilitators to cervical cancer screening among  
31 Pakistani and Somali immigrant women in Oslo: a qualitative study. *International Journal of*  
32 *Women's Health* 2017;9:487-96. doi: 10.2147/ijwh.s139160  
33  
34  
35 30. Gu C, Chan CWH, Twinn S, et al. The influence of knowledge and perception of the risk of  
36 cervical cancer on screening behavior in mainland Chinese women. *Psycho-Oncology*  
37 2012;21(12):1299-308. doi: doi:10.1002/pon.2037  
38  
39  
40 31. Twinn S, Shiu ATY, Holroyd E. Women's Knowledge About Cervical Cancer and Cervical Screening  
41 Practice: A Pilot Study of Hong Kong Chinese Women. *Cancer Nurs* 2002;25(5):377-84.  
42  
43  
44 32. Charlotte V, M. ML, Małgorzata H, et al. What do people fear about cancer? A systematic review  
45 and meta-synthesis of cancer fears in the general population. *Psycho-Oncology*  
46 2017;26(8):1070-79. doi: doi:10.1002/pon.4287  
47  
48  
49 33. Nolan J, Renderos TB, Hynson J, et al. Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening and Follow - up Care  
50 among Black Women in Massachusetts. *J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs* 2014;43(5):580-88. doi:  
51 doi:10.1111/1552-6909.12488  
52  
53  
54 34. Mupepi SC, Sampelle CM, Johnson TRB. Knowledge, Attitudes, and Demographic Factors  
55 Influencing Cervical Cancer Screening Behavior of Zimbabwean Women. *Journal of Women's*  
56 *Health* 2011;20(6):943-52. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2010.2062  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 35. Agurto I, Bishop A, Sánchez G, et al. Perceived barriers and benefits to cervical cancer screening  
5 in Latin America. *Preventive Medicine* 2004;39(1):91-98. doi:  
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2004.03.040>  
7  
8  
9 36. Marván ML, Ehrenzweig Y, Catillo-López RL. Knowledge about cervical cancer prevention and  
10 psychosocial barriers to screening among Mexican women. *J Psychosom Obstet Gynaecol*  
11 2013;34(4):163-69. doi: 10.3109/0167482x.2013.846904  
12  
13  
14 37. Cunningham MS, Skrastins E, Fitzpatrick R, et al. Cervical cancer screening and HPV vaccine  
15 acceptability among rural and urban women in Kilimanjaro Region, Tanzania. *BMJ Open*  
16 2015;5(3) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005828  
17  
18  
19 38. Winkler J, Bingham A, Coffey P, et al. Women's participation in a cervical cancer screening  
20 program in northern Peru. *Health Educ Res* 2008;23(1):10-24. doi: 10.1093/her/cyl156  
21  
22  
23 39. Akinyemiju TF. Socio-Economic and Health Access Determinants of Breast and Cervical Cancer  
24 Screening in Low-Income Countries: Analysis of the World Health Survey. *PLoS One*  
25 2012;7(11):e48834. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0048834  
26  
27  
28 40. Daley E, Alio A, Anstey EH, et al. Examining Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening and Treatment  
29 in Florida through a Socio-Ecological Lens. *Journal of Community Health* 2011;36(1):121-31. doi:  
30 10.1007/s10900-010-9289-7  
31  
32  
33 41. Ghebre RG, Sewali B, Osman S, et al. Cervical Cancer: Barriers to Screening in the Somali  
34 Community in Minnesota. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health* 2015;17(3):722-28. doi:  
35 10.1007/s10903-014-0080-1  
36  
37  
38 42. Kwok C, White K, Roydhouse JK. Chinese-Australian Women's Knowledge, Facilitators and  
39 Barriers Related to Cervical Cancer Screening: A Qualitative Study. *J Immigr Minor Health*  
40 2011;13(6):1076. doi: 10.1007/s10903-011-9491-4  
41  
42  
43 43. Maar M, Burchell A, Little J, et al. A Qualitative Study of Provider Perspectives of Structural  
44 Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening Among First Nations Women. *Women's Health*  
45 *Issues*;23(5):e319-e25. doi: 10.1016/j.whi.2013.06.005  
46  
47  
48 44. Williams MS, Amoateng P. Knowledge and Beliefs about Cervical Cancer Screening Among Men  
49 in Kumasi, Ghana. *Ghana Medical Journal* 2012;46(3):147-51.  
50  
51  
52 45. Byrd TL, Chavez R, Wilson KM. Barriers and facilitators of cervical cancer screening among  
53 Hispanic women. *Ethn Dis* 2007;17(1):129-34.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 46. Lu M, Moritz S, Lorenzetti D, et al. A systematic review of interventions to increase breast and  
5 cervical cancer screening uptake among Asian women. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12(1):413. doi:  
6 10.1186/1471-2458-12-413  
7  
8  
9 47. Markovic M, Kesic V, Topic L, et al. Barriers to cervical cancer screening: A qualitative study with  
10 women in Serbia. *Social Science & Medicine* 2005;61(12):2528-35. doi:  
11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.05.001>  
12  
13  
14 48. Foliaki S, Matheson A. Barriers to Cervical Screening among Pacific Women in a New Zealand  
15 Urban Population 2015.  
16  
17  
18 49. Toliman P, Badman SG, Gabuzzi J, et al. Field evaluation of the Xpert® HPV Point of Care Test for  
19 the detection of human papillomavirus infection using self-collected vaginal and  
20 clinician-collected cervical specimens. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 2016 doi:  
21 10.1128/jcm.00529-16  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Reporting checklist for qualitative study.

Based on the SRQR guidelines.

	Reporting Item	Page Number
	#1 Concise description of the nature and topic of the study identifying the study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g. ethnography, grounded theory) or data collection methods (e.g. interview, focus group) is recommended	2
	#2 Summary of the key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results and conclusions	2
Problem formulation	#3 Description and significance of the problem / phenomenon studied: review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement	4-5
Purpose or research question	#4 Purpose of the study and specific objectives or questions	5
Qualitative approach and research paradigm	#5 Qualitative approach (e.g. ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research) and guiding theory if appropriate; identifying the research paradigm (e.g. postpositivist, constructivist / interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale. The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method or technique rather than other options available; the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate the rationale for several items might be discussed together.	5-6
Researcher characteristics and reflexivity	#6 Researchers' characteristics that may influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications / experience, relationship with participants, assumptions and / or	7,9

		presuppositions; potential or actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research questions, approach, methods, results and / or transferability	
Context	#7	Setting / site and salient contextual factors; rationale	5-6
Sampling strategy	#8	How and why research participants, documents, or events were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g. sampling saturation); rationale	6-7
Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects	#9	Documentation of approval by an appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues	9-10
Data collection methods	#10	Types of data collected; details of data collection procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources / methods, and modification of procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale	7-9
Data collection instruments and technologies	#11	Description of instruments (e.g. interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g. audio recorders) used for data collection; if / how the instruments(s) changed over the course of the study	7-9
Units of study	#12	Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents, or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results)	11
Data processing	#13	Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis, including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of data integrity, data coding, and anonymisation / deidentification of excerpts	9
Data analysis	#14	Process by which inferences, themes, etc. were identified and developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a specific paradigm or approach; rationale	9

1	Techniques to	#15	Techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data	9
2	enhance		analysis (e.g. member checking, audit trail, triangulation);	
3	trustworthiness		rationale	
4				
5				
6				
7	Syntheses and	#16	Main findings (e.g. interpretations, inferences, and themes);	11
8	interpretation		might include development of a theory or model, or integration	
9			with prior research or theory	
10				
11				
12				
13	Links to empirical	#17	Evidence (e.g. quotes, field notes, text excerpts, photographs)	11-17
14	data		to substantiate analytic findings	
15				
16				
17				
18	Intergration with	#18	Short summary of main findings; explanation of how findings	18-21
19	prior work,		and conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or	
20	implications,		challenge conclusions of earlier scholarship; discussion of	
21	transferability and		scope of application / generalizability; identification of unique	
22	contribution(s) to the		contributions(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field	
23	field			
24				
25				
26				
27				
28	Limitations	#19	Trustworthiness and limitations of findings	20-21
29				
30				
31				
32	Conflicts of interest	#20	Potential sources of influence of perceived influence on study	22
33			conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	
34				
35				
36	Funding	#21	Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data	22
37			collection, interpretation and reporting	
38				
39				
40				

41 The SRQR checklist is distributed with permission of Wolters Kluwer © 2014 by the Association of  
 42 American Medical Colleges. This checklist was completed on 29. August 2018 using  
 43 <http://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with [Penelope.ai](#)  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60

# BMJ Open

## Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening among Rural Women in Eastern China: a Qualitative Study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-026413.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Feb-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Yang, Huan; Shandong University; NHC Key Laboratory of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University) Li, Shun-Ping; Shandong University; NHC Key Laboratory of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University) Chen, Qing; Shandong University; NHC Key Laboratory of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University) Morgan, Christopher; Burnet Institute; Melbourne Univeristy
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Qualitative research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health, Health policy, Health services research
Keywords:	barriers, cervical cancer, cancer screening, China

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



1  
2  
3  
4 **Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening among Rural Women in Eastern**  
5  
6 **China: a Qualitative Study**  
7  
8  
9

10 *Huan Yang,<sup>1,2</sup> Shunping Li,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> Qing Chen,<sup>1,2</sup> Christopher Morgan<sup>3,4</sup>*

- 11  
12  
13 1. *School of Health Care Management, Shandong University, Jinan 250012, China*  
14  
15  
16 2. *NHC Key Laboratory of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University),*  
17  
18 *Jinan 250012, China*  
19  
20  
21 3. *Burnet Institute, Melbourne 3004, Australia*  
22  
23  
24 4. *Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne,*  
25  
26 *Melbourne 3052, Australia*  
27  
28

29  
30  
31 \* **Correspondence** *Shunping Li, School of Health Care Management, Shandong University,*  
32 *Wenhua Xi Rd 44, Jinan, Shandong Province 250012, People's Republic of China.*

33  
34 *E-mail: [lishunping@sdu.edu.cn](mailto:lishunping@sdu.edu.cn) Tel.: +86-131-8893-4998*  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 **Keywords** *barriers; cervical cancer; cancer screening; China*  
40  
41

42 **Word count** 4388  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives** To explore barriers to free cervical cancer screening among rural women in China from the perspective of women, healthcare providers and women's husbands to inform intervention planning.

**Design** A qualitative study framed around potential policy and practice options, drawing on the concepts of descriptive phenomenology and implementation research.

**Setting** This study was carried out at township level within two counties in Jining Prefecture of eastern China.

**Participants and data collection** Semi-structured in-depth interviews with 21 women and five healthcare providers, focus group discussions with nine healthcare providers, and key informant interviews with 4 husbands of women eligible for screening.

**Results** Thematic analysis generated five major themes: (1) gaps in knowledge of cervical cancer and health awareness, (2) fear of cancer and screening outcomes, (3) cultural barriers including reticence for intimate examinations, (4) influence of close contacts on screening decisions, and (5) inconvenience. These demonstrate key knowledge gaps challenging current community health education. Important barriers, including fear of treatment cost and the time needed for screening, were also raised.

**Conclusion** Our study details important barriers to cervical cancer screening relating to knowledge gaps, attitudes of fear or embarrassment, and the role of contacts and service models. These provide data for policy and planning to improve the screening that will

1  
2  
3  
4 decrease the incidence and mortality rates of cervical cancer in China.  
5  
6

## 7 **Article Summary**

8  
9

### 10 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

11  
12  
13

14 The qualitative methods allowed for detailed and deep responses and triangulation across  
15 providers, clients and their partners.  
16  
17

18 The findings have direct relevance to policy makers considering the development of  
19 interventions to increase uptake rate of cervical cancer screening in our setting.  
20  
21  
22

23 Our purposive sampling may bias our findings to those representative of women with lower  
24 educational levels and low uptake of services.  
25  
26  
27

28 Some social acceptability bias may have influenced focus group discussion findings, which  
29 we attempted to counter-balance with individual interview data.  
30  
31  
32

33 As a qualitative study, there are limits to generalizability beyond our setting.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INTRODUCTION

Infection with the human papilloma virus (HPV), which can be transmitted during sexual intercourse, is the most significant risk factor for cervical cancer.<sup>1</sup> The majority of HPV infections resolve spontaneously and do not cause symptoms or disease.<sup>2</sup> However, persistent infection with specific types of HPV (most frequently, types 16 and 18) may lead to precancerous lesions, which, if not treated, can progress to cancer 10 to 20 years later.<sup>3</sup> Cervical cancer is a preventable and treatable disease, and screening of precancerous lesions can reduce its incidence and mortality.<sup>4</sup> In many high-income countries, the incidence and mortality of cervical cancer have decreased significantly because of the efforts made to detect precancerous lesions early.<sup>5 6</sup> However, in low- or middle-income countries, cervical cancer remains the most common cause of cancer-related deaths among women.<sup>7</sup>

Cervical cancer is recognized as a major public health problem in China,<sup>8</sup> both in mortality and morbidity burden, the latter causing protracted economic stress on women, heaviest in rural communities. As part of responses in 2009, a new round of deepening health system reforms intended to integrate the breast cancer and cervical cancer screening programs in rural areas into broader national public health services.<sup>9</sup> The government's National Cervical Cancer Screening Program in Rural Areas (NCCSPRA) launched in 221 pilot counties and a total of 11.69 million rural women between 35 and 59 years of age accessed this screening program between 2009 and 2011.<sup>10</sup> In one site that is the subject of our study, Jining Prefecture, free breast cancer and cervical cancer screening has been available to rural women over 35 years of age since 2011, with the upper age limit extended

1  
2  
3  
4 from 59 to 64 years in 2014, with three free screens available to women up until November  
5  
6 2017.<sup>4</sup> However uptake rate of the free service remains very low.<sup>4</sup>  
7  
8  
9

10 In China, a number of studies have been conducted into women's knowledge and attitudes  
11  
12 toward cervical cancer screening and related factors,<sup>11-14</sup> however most data have been  
13  
14 quantitative in nature.<sup>12-14</sup> This leaves local gaps in understanding of underlying  
15  
16 determinants of care-seeking, including the reasons why women do not take up free care,  
17  
18 which require more qualitative research approaches.<sup>15 16</sup> This research aimed to gain a deeper  
19  
20 understanding of the barriers to uptake of free cervical cancer screening by rural women in  
21  
22 Jining Prefecture, using a design that can suggest new policy and practice approaches that  
23  
24 may be able to increase future uptake and reduce the burden of cervical cancer.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

## 33 **METHODS**

### 34 35 36 **Study setting and design** 37 38 39

40 This study was conducted in Shandong Province, which is located in eastern China with a  
41  
42 population of more than 100 million.<sup>17</sup> In 2016, the gross regional product of Shandong  
43  
44 Province amounted to CNY6803 billion (US\$1024 billion), ranking it as the third largest  
45  
46 economy within China.<sup>17</sup> Jining Prefecture, located in the southwest of Shandong Province  
47  
48 with a population of 8.35 million and the gross regional product of CNY430 billion (US\$63  
49  
50 billion) in 2016.<sup>18</sup>  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Our study design drew on descriptive phenomenology,<sup>19</sup> concepts of acceptability and  
57  
58 appropriateness in health implementation research,<sup>20</sup> and was framed by options for change  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 in policy or practice, as identified by local health managers and experts. These helped  
5  
6 identify qualitative tools, and categories of inquiry, deemed useful to understand knowledge  
7  
8 and attitudes affecting women's and family's decision-making in relation to screening. The  
9  
10 qualitative data collection methods included semi-structured in-depth interviews with 21  
11  
12 women eligible for free screening aged between 35 and 64 years, and with five healthcare  
13  
14 providers. These were supplemented by focus group discussions with healthcare providers of  
15  
16 varying disciplines (described below) aiming to use discussion to elicit contrasting  
17  
18 disciplinary perspectives. To gain a partner perspective, key informant interviews were  
19  
20 conducted with husbands of women eligible for screening.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 **Study participants and sample**

30  
31  
32 Two townships (Tangma and Xingcun) were randomly selected from within the mainly rural  
33  
34 areas of Sishui and Yutai Counties in Jining Prefecture in eastern China. Purposive sampling  
35  
36 was used to focus research on those were representative of women as less likely to take up  
37  
38 screening, identified by local health managers. The selection criteria included: women aged  
39  
40 between 35 and 64 years (those eligible for free screening and at higher risk), resident in the  
41  
42 study townships, not in formal employment, and those who had either never been screened  
43  
44 or who had failed to attend a second or third follow-up screening. Twenty-one women (10  
45  
46 from Xingcun, 11 from Tangma) were recruited in collaboration with township community  
47  
48 partners. Fourteen health care providers (7 from Xingcun, 7 from Tangma) including  
49  
50 hospital managers, public health directors and medical practitioners whose responsibilities  
51  
52 included contact, recording and managing data for screening and screening service  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 provision, were purposefully selected by discipline mix. Five providers took part in  
5  
6 semi-structured in-depth interviews and nine in two focus group discussions (four in the first  
7  
8 and five in the second group). Four key informant interviews (2 from Xingcun, 2 from  
9  
10 Tangma) were conducted with screening-eligible women's husbands who were purposefully  
11  
12 selected and were not related to the women participants. The numbers of interviews and  
13  
14 focus group discussions were designed to enable a theoretical saturation of qualitative  
15  
16 themes, and data collection ceased at a point when no new information was being obtained  
17  
18 (as assessed by rapid review during field operations).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 **Data collection**

27  
28  
29 All interviews and discussions were conducted over a one-week period in November 2017  
30  
31 by four researchers from Shandong University who had extensive knowledge of cervical  
32  
33 cancer, and were trained in conducting qualitative research and interviews on sensitive  
34  
35 topics. Women participants were interviewed in healthcare institutions identified by  
36  
37 community partners. Individual interviews in private rooms gave participants the opportunity  
38  
39 to speak freely and comfortably. Before interviews, a short questionnaire<sup>4</sup> including 17 items  
40  
41 was used to assess knowledge on cervical cancer, risk factors, symptoms, and the objectives  
42  
43 and processes of cervical cancer screening. Consistent with earlier studies, responses were  
44  
45 scored as correct (one point), incorrect or "do not know" (zero points), with numbers of  
46  
47 correct scores used to categorize respondents into 2 groups: "high level of knowledge"  
48  
49 (score 9 to 17) or "low level of knowledge" (score 0-8).<sup>21 22</sup> The semi-structured in-depth  
50  
51 interviews with women used open questions in categories informed by our design, with  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

detailed probes to deepen responses (Table 1). Topics covered included sociodemographic characteristics, screening experience, purpose of cervical cancer screening, perception of barriers to screening uptake and suggestions for overcoming barriers.

Table 1 Overview of question categories in semi-structured in-depth interviews

<b>Knowledge of cervical cancer screening</b>
Have you heard about cervical cancer screening?
What do you understand cervical cancer screening?
Why cervical cancer screening is done?
<b>Barriers to cervical cancer screening</b>
Why don't you take free cervical cancer screening?
Why do you think other women don't take free cervical cancer screening?
<b>Suggestions for overcoming barriers</b>
How do you think these barriers could be overcome?

In-depth interviews and focus group discussions with providers were conducted close to the work place and lasted approximately 30 and 45 minutes, respectively. The in-depth interviews and focus group discussions guide (Table 2) explored providers' experiences in providing screening services, perception of barriers to cervical cancer screening uptake for women, and suggestions for overcoming barriers. Key informant interviews with husbands were conducted in their home. Interview guides included questions on their knowledge about cervical cancer, and attitudes towards screening for cervical cancer and potential barriers to uptake for women.

Table 2 Overview of discussion/question categories for focus groups and provider interviews



### Experience in providing screening services

How long have you provided screening services?

What are your responsibilities for screening services?

### Barriers to cervical cancer screening

Why do you think women don't take free cervical cancer screening?

### Suggestions for overcoming barriers

How do you think these barriers could be overcome?

Verbal informed consent using a standard script was obtained from all participants prior to interviews. All interviews and focus group discussions were digitally recorded. Confidentiality was ensured through using code numbers rather than names. Researchers took care to identify and reflect on any bias relating to differential status between themselves and interviewees, using introductory explanations on themselves their neutrality and the study purpose, ensuring simple comprehensible language, and maintaining careful non-judgmental listening, in order to minimize bias during the interview process. Each participant was given a vacuum beverage cup to compensate for their time commitment to the study.

### Data analysis

All interviews and focus group discussions were transcribed verbatim and subjected to thematic analysis.<sup>23</sup> We analyzed the data across all stakeholder groups collectively. HY collated interview and questionnaire data across all sites, ensuring consistency supervised by SL for data integrity. HY and SL jointly read all transcripts and developed themes (both pre-determined by our design and emerging), a topic index and code structure. HY, SL and

1  
2  
3  
4 QC undertook coding and thematic consolidation, with any differences discussed and  
5  
6 resolved through consensus. These analyses were performed in Chinese and then translated  
7  
8 into English by HY for further review by SL, QC and CM. Care was taken to ensure data  
9  
10 validity in the translation of dialect and colloquialisms.  
11  
12  
13  
14

### 15 **Ethical approval**

16  
17  
18 This study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Medical School, Shandong  
19  
20 University (LL-201401048), and conforms to the ethics guidelines of the Declaration of  
21  
22 Helsinki.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **Patient and public involvement**

29  
30  
31 Participants were not involved in the study design and conduct, but their experiences and  
32  
33 preferences will inform the development of the research questions to generate major themes  
34  
35 for analysis. Public involvement including community partners was involved in the  
36  
37 recruitment process. A policy brief containing findings and implications will be provided to  
38  
39 local policy makers and managers, and to community leaders for dissemination to study  
40  
41 participants.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

## 49 **RESULTS**

### 50 **Sociodemographic characteristics of participants**

51  
52  
53 There were no refusals of consent or drop-outs during participation, with a total of  
54  
55 twenty-one rural women participating. The mean age of participants was  $48.7 \pm 6.4$  years,  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

with a range from 37 to 60 years, and with more than half (57.1%) aged between 46 and 55 years. Most participants (95.2%) were married and most (90.5%) had an education level of primary school or below. About half of the participants (52.4%) had previously been screened once for cervical cancer. Table 3 shows details of the characteristics of participants. The mean knowledge scores were  $4.4 \pm 2.3$  (range from 0 to 10).

Table 3 Sociodemographic characteristics of women interviewees, n (%).

Characteristics	Sishui(n = 10)	Yutai(n =11)	Total(n = 21)
<b>Age (years)</b>			
35~45	6(60.0)	0(0.0)	6(28.6)
46~55	3(30.0)	9(81.8)	12(57.1)
56~64	1(10.0)	2(18.2)	3(14.3)
<b>Educational level</b>			
No school	3(30.0)	5(45.5)	8(38.1)
Primary school	6(60.0)	5(45.5)	11(52.4)
Middle school or above	1(10.0)	1(9.0)	2(9.5)
<b>Marital status</b>			
Married	9(90.0)	11(100.0)	20(95.2)
Divorced or widowed	1(10.0)	0(0.0)	1(4.8)
<b>Ever screened for cervical cancer</b>			
Yes	7(70.0)	4(36.4)	11(52.4)
No	3(30.0)	7(63.6)	10(47.6)

Among the 14 health care providers, the mean age was  $42.6 \pm 9.0$  years and most (64.2%) were aged between 41 and 50 years. They had an education level of junior college and

1  
2  
3  
4 above. Most providers were medical practitioners (50.0%). The mean age of four husbands  
5  
6 who undertook key informant interviews was  $50.7 \pm 6.3$  years, and all of them were  
7  
8 small-hold farmers.  
9

### 10 11 12 13 **Key themes**

14  
15  
16 Thematic analysis generated five major themes: (1) gaps in knowledge of cervical cancer  
17  
18 and health awareness, (2) fear of cancer and screening outcomes, (3) cultural barriers, (4)  
19  
20 influence of close contacts, and (5) inconvenience. Each of these is elaborated below,  
21  
22 including quotations from participants with their identification number and age.  
23  
24  
25

### 26 27 28 **Gaps in knowledge of cervical cancer and health awareness**

29  
30  
31 Knowledge gaps and lack of access to reliable information on cervical cancer is reported as a  
32  
33 major barrier to women's participation in cervical cancer screening. Findings from these  
34  
35 interviews showed that the majority of women participants had a low level of cervical cancer  
36  
37 knowledge. Most women indicated that they had heard about cervical cancer from their  
38  
39 friends or television, however, almost none knew that HPV infection was the cause. Some  
40  
41 cited inaccurate information and most reported that their knowledge, especially about causes  
42  
43 and symptoms, was speculative. For example, one reported misconception was that "cervical  
44  
45 cancer will never happen after menopause". Limited knowledge seemed linked to lack of  
46  
47 awareness of being at any personal risk of cervical cancer happening. When asked why she  
48  
49 had not participated in cervical cancer screening, one woman stated:  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 *I think my health is in a good condition. I've never had anything serious, or any*  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *symptoms. No symptoms, no examination. We only go to the hospital when we are*  
5  
6 *uncomfortable or feel sick. (Woman 11, 53 years)*  
7  
8

9  
10 One of the health provider focus groups also mentioned:

11  
12  
13 *Cervix is a dumb organ. There are no symptoms nor is it typical in the early stage. It*  
14  
15 *doesn't affect their work or daily life; there is even no bleeding. No symptoms, nothing at*  
16  
17 *all. They don't think they are infected, so there is no need to go through the screening.*  
18  
19  
20  
21 (FGD 2, provider 05, 41 years)  
22  
23

24  
25 There were gaps in disease prevention understanding, as well as limited knowledge of the  
26  
27 process, cycle, purpose and importance of screening. The importance of early screening prior  
28  
29 to symptoms was poorly recognized. These factors were reported to limit women's  
30  
31 acceptance of or commitment to screening, hindering or postponing their participation in  
32  
33 cervical cancer screening.  
34  
35

36  
37  
38 A woman who had been notified to attend cervical cancer screening said:

39  
40  
41 *I was told to do the screening yesterday. Well, I didn't want to. I thought I always have*  
42  
43 *a good appetite and never feel uncomfortable. There's no point doing it. (Woman 04, 48*  
44  
45 *years)*  
46  
47

48  
49  
50 Another woman who participated only once in cervical cancer screening stated:

51  
52  
53 *I did the examination once and the doctor said I was good. So I never came back. Why*  
54  
55 *bother when I'm good? (Woman 15, 55 years)*  
56  
57

58  
59 Health care provider viewpoints echoed this:  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *These women have low health care awareness. They wouldn't go to the hospital even if*  
5  
6 *they have other common diseases. All they care about is if they could still do the*  
7  
8 *housework. They don't have much understanding of medicine, so they couldn't know the*  
9  
10 *significance of early screening if they got the disease. (FGD 1, provider 03, 52 years)*  
11  
12  
13  
14

### 15 **Fear of cancer and screening outcomes**

16  
17  
18  
19 The majority of women in the interviews expressed a deep fear of cancer. Some did not want  
20  
21 to know if they had cervical cancer; a common reason offered for why they were unwilling  
22  
23 to attend the screening was that they did not want to learn the results. This fear extended to  
24  
25 any form of cancer terminology. Women wanted to avoid the anxiety and distress that would  
26  
27 be associated with being told of a cancer-related lesion:  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 *It's a terrible disease. I'm afraid something bad might show. If I don't do the screening*  
34  
35 *I wouldn't know if I had it, I will at least have a good appetite. If the results were bad, I*  
36  
37 *wouldn't feel comfortable knowing that. Appetites and good sleep would be gone for sure.*  
38  
39 *I would have more years to live freely if I didn't know it. (Woman 01, 37 years)*  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 *People become upset whenever they talk about cancer. In the first 2 years of the*  
45  
46 *screening campaign, we couldn't put 'cancer screening' on the banner and used 'health*  
47  
48 *examination' instead. People couldn't take it if they saw the word 'cancer'. (FGD 2,*  
49  
50 *provider 01, 47 years)*  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 A husband also mentioned, during key informant interview:  
56  
57

58 *They were all afraid they might have it. Older women would say 'why do the screening?*  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *I would be upset if I knew I had it'. (Husband 02, 63 years)*  
5  
6

7 Fear of a positive screening test was also related to the financial implications. Some women  
8  
9 with fewer economic resources reported avoiding screening because they were worried they  
10 would not have the money for treatment if they were diagnosed with the cancer, noting that  
11  
12 at present, while screening is free of charge, treatment is not. This suggests that family  
13  
14 finances are likely to influence their participation, with families weighing up the impact of  
15  
16 debt against that of the disease:  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 *We wouldn't afford the treatment even if we found out we had it, so it's better we don't*  
24 *do it at all. Adults need money and so do children. The money would be wasted if we went*  
25 *through the treatment and not cured. No need to spend money on a disease that can't be*  
26 *cured. We don't want to add burden to the family. (Woman 10, 54 years)*  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Two focus groups also noticed this:  
35  
36

37 *People only see nearly 100,000 yuan for the surgery and it's a very heavy burden. The*  
38 *disease would drag the already poor family into debt. They can't take it. (FGD 1, provider*  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

59 *There are indeed financial problems, especially for rural families. They think they don't*  
60 *feel anything right now, if they find out they are infected after the screening they have to*  
*go through the treatment and spend money. So it's better not to do the screening at all.*  
(FGD 2, provider 03, 41 years)

## **Cultural barriers**

1  
2  
3  
4 A common report, especially among older women, was a reluctance to remove clothing or  
5  
6 allow genital examination, especially being exposed in front of non-family members. It was  
7  
8 mentioned by nearly all women that they felt embarrassed about this step. Informants related  
9  
10 this to cultural norms in their rural setting, and among Chinese women more generally.  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 *Felt like a very private part and I don't want other people to see it. That's the thought.*

16  
17  
18 *Yes it's embarrassing. I'm too old. Don't want to be a joke. So ashamed.* (Woman 09, 55  
19  
20 years)  
21  
22

23  
24 *When I went to the gynecology for the screening, I went inside and the doctor told me to*  
25  
26 *take off my pants, and I suddenly didn't want to do the screening.* (Woman 02, 48 years)  
27  
28

29  
30 Participants were specifically asked about willingness to accept screening by male doctors.  
31  
32 For some participants, the gender of the service provider seemed a barrier; nearly half  
33  
34 indicated that they would not undertake screening if performed by a male doctor.  
35  
36

37  
38 *I wouldn't go if a man was doing the examination. It's less acceptable than a woman.*  
39  
40 *It's so private and men are so improper for that.* (Woman 14, 41 years)  
41  
42

43  
44 A female service provider mentioned:  
45  
46

47  
48 *They are very conservative. Some women with vaginitis go to the clinic. We tell them to*  
49  
50 *take off the pants and they are embarrassed. Some even put up with the disease until they*  
51  
52 *can't. So they would be more uncomfortable if male doctors are here.* (Provider 01, 63  
53  
54 years)  
55  
56  
57

### 58 **Influence of close contacts**

59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 It was found that close contacts (such as mothers, sisters or neighbors) were an important  
5  
6 factor influencing women's participation in cervical cancer screening. Knowing other people  
7  
8 who had been screened or who had been diagnosed with cervical cancer and undertaken  
9  
10 treatment was reported to increase participation in screening. The converse was also true,  
11  
12 with reports that if close contacts were not willing to participate, this reduced women's  
13  
14 acceptance of screening. This was also reported to generate clusters of women who would  
15  
16 refuse screening.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 *I wouldn't know it if they (the neighbors) asked me to come along. If the others (the*  
24  
25 *neighbors) don't come, I wouldn't either. It's good to have someone with you. I wouldn't*  
26  
27 *come by myself.* (Woman 05, 55 years)  
28  
29  
30

31 *I would for sure not come by myself.* (Woman 06, 48 years)  
32  
33

34 A service provider mentioned a similar situation during the screening campaign:  
35  
36

37  
38 *We met this situation once when we were doing the screening in a town. Several women*  
39  
40 *came together and they learned they need to take off the pants. One said 'This is what it is.*  
41  
42 *Forget it. Let's go'. And all of them felt reluctant and left together. It's a group mentality.*  
43  
44  
45 (Provider 03, 43 years)  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 **Inconvenience**

51  
52

53 Difficulty in scheduling, or otherwise allocating time for screening was considered to be a  
54  
55 significant barrier to women's participation. Many women eligible for screening work in  
56  
57 disparate locations throughout the year may only return home at the time of Spring Festival.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Such holidays are busy with limited time available for activities such as routine health  
5  
6 checks. One working woman stated that leave is only feasible for actual illness.  
7  
8

9  
10 *I work elsewhere and only ask for leave when they have an emergency or special*  
11  
12 *occasions at home. It's hard to ask for leave and I lose some salary for that. Usually I*  
13  
14 *come home once a year for only 5 or 6 days. It's not enough. (Woman 21, 40 years)*  
15  
16

17  
18 *Many rural people go to other places to work and don't come home often. We call them*  
19  
20 *to come back but they can't. They don't get paid if they ask for leave and it's too expensive*  
21  
22 *on the road. So they don't want to come back. (Provider 02, 44 years)*  
23  
24

25  
26  
27 Women who do not travel for work also report many demands on their time including  
28  
29 family business, child-care, housework and farming duties that are often seasonal. Lack of  
30  
31 time for routine health care is reported as a barrier to cervical cancer screening either. When  
32  
33 asked why not attend the screening, a woman who had never gone through the examination  
34  
35 said:  
36  
37

38  
39  
40 *I'm always busy with the kids going to school every day and housework never seems to*  
41  
42 *end. Family and housework are the most important for me. So I somehow forget about it*  
43  
44 *(the screening). (Woman 08, 46 years)*  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 *I tell you we farmers are pretty busy. When we are not, we want to do some small*  
50  
51 *business to make money. So no time for examinations. (Woman 19, 56 years)*  
52  
53  
54

## 55 56 **DISCUSSION**

57  
58  
59 This study used qualitative tools to explore the barriers to attending cervical cancer  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 screening among rural women in Jining Prefecture of Shandong province in eastern China.  
5  
6 Such in-depth assessments have rarely been reported in Chinese literature. Our study  
7  
8 identified gaps in knowledge of cervical cancer and health awareness, fear of cancer and  
9  
10 screening outcomes, cultural barriers, the influence of close contacts, and inconvenience as  
11  
12 frequently cited barriers.  
13  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 Our findings on gaps in knowledge or awareness are echoed in studies from other  
19  
20 resource-constrained settings, with specific misconceptions and poor awareness of the  
21  
22 benefits of routine health checks reported from diverse settings including Burkina Faso,  
23  
24 <sup>24</sup>Iran,<sup>25</sup> Malawi,<sup>26 27</sup> Nigeria<sup>28</sup> and elsewhere. Reluctance to seek care in the absence of  
25  
26 symptoms is a common theme, seen also in high-income settings such as Norway,<sup>29</sup> and this  
27  
28 was one of the most important constraints identified in our study. Our finding that there is  
29  
30 very low awareness of the risks posed by cervical cancer is seen elsewhere in China.<sup>30 31</sup>  
31  
32  
33 Accessible and attractive educational products tailored to rural women are urgently needed  
34  
35 to communicate accurate information about cervical cancer, those at risk, screening methods,  
36  
37 treatments available, and the need for regular checks.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 Fear poses a significant psychological barrier to care-seeking for cervical cancer  
46  
47 screening. This includes the general fear of “cancer” as a vicious and intractable class of  
48  
49 disease,<sup>32</sup> and the fear that it would not be possible to emotionally cope with a diagnosis,  
50  
51 seen in relation to cervical cancer in our findings and in other high- middle- and low-income  
52  
53 settings.<sup>33-35</sup> A study among Mexican women shows that women reported not attending  
54  
55 cervical cancer screening because of fear of ‘knowing,’ that is, they prefer to live in hopeful  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 uncertainty rather than facing the possibility of an unfavorable result.<sup>36</sup> This poses a key  
5  
6 communication challenge to community health education efforts. They must find ways to not  
7  
8 only build knowledge of the risks of an asymptomatic disease, but also address the  
9  
10 misconceptions and emotions aroused by cancer more generally, in order to build trust that  
11  
12 timely screening can render cervical cancer treatable.  
13  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 The influence of women's close contacts risks generating clusters of mutually-reinforcing  
19  
20 resistance to screening,<sup>37</sup> with partners playing a key role.<sup>38 39</sup> This suggests some education  
21  
22 initiatives will need to address whole communities and possibly include peer-education  
23  
24 approaches that encourage positive health discussions among friends.  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 In our study, as in other resource-constrained settings,<sup>27</sup> fears of financial catastrophe  
30  
31 generated by high treatment costs also posed a barrier to screening. In our context this  
32  
33 emphasizes the need for health planners to understand the pragmatic choices families make  
34  
35 when health care costs are seen as unaffordable. Making treatment financially accessible, for  
36  
37 cervical cancer and many other protracted diseases, is a key challenge facing China's public  
38  
39 health system reformers.  
40  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 We found culturally based embarrassment to be a key barrier. Such associations with  
46  
47 concepts of conservatism and modesty obstruct access to reproductive health in general and  
48  
49 cervical cancer screening in particular in our and many other settings,<sup>30 40-42</sup> especially when  
50  
51 providers are male,<sup>43 44</sup> or women are older.<sup>45</sup> For such communities in China and Asian  
52  
53 populations elsewhere,<sup>46</sup> this requires providers of screening to have high levels of cultural  
54  
55 competence, and planners to ensure sufficient numbers of female providers. Lastly,  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 inconvenient screening services, in terms of timing and location also posed a major barrier  
5  
6 for the rural women in our study. This applies to those who must relocate for paid work and  
7  
8 those whose family care duties leave little time for health screening; findings also seen in a  
9  
10 wide range of other settings.<sup>33 47 48</sup> Delivering services at times, even holiday times, and in  
11  
12 places where women already congregate, perhaps through mobile services, may help  
13  
14 overcome this barrier in China, and elsewhere.<sup>46</sup>  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 These findings have several implications for practice, as noted above in relation to each  
22  
23 key theme. In addition, new methods for screening<sup>49</sup> using automated nucleic acid  
24  
25 amplification tests may help overcome timing and location constraints by allowing more  
26  
27 rapid screening, and may help overcome cultural distaste for vaginal examinations by  
28  
29 allowing women to self-collect vaginal swab samples.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 Our mix of data sources across women, their husbands, and healthcare providers enabled  
36  
37 triangulation of themes and identification of varying viewpoints. The qualitative methods  
38  
39 with data saturation provided detailed and rich responses on barriers to cervical cancer  
40  
41 screening for this group of rural women, available to inform providers and other researchers.  
42  
43 In addition, a policy brief containing findings and implications will be provided to local  
44  
45 policy makers and managers, and to community leaders, to inform future planning. Our  
46  
47 study acknowledges the usual limitations of qualitative research, our purposeful sample may  
48  
49 over-represent women with lower educational levels and low uptake of services, and the peer  
50  
51 effect in focus group discussions may have influenced providers to give answers that they  
52  
53 perceive to be more socially acceptable. As a qualitative study, our findings relate primarily  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 to our study setting, and our recommendations should be tested with larger studies.  
5  
6  
7

## 8 **CONCLUSION**

9

10  
11 In summary, our study details important barriers to cervical cancer screening in terms of  
12 gaps in knowledge, fear of cancer and screening outcomes, cultural embarrassment, the  
13 influence of close contacts, and inconvenience. We hope policy makers and planners can  
14 make use of these findings to improve education and service delivery for screening that will  
15 decrease the incidence and mortality rates of cervical cancer in China.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 **Acknowledgments**

27

28  
29 We would like to acknowledge and thank all community partners who assisted with data  
30 collection and recruitment of participants and the study participants for their time and  
31 contribution to this study. This work was supported by China Medical Board Open  
32 Competition Grant [Grant number CMB14-195]. Responsibility for any remaining errors lies  
33 solely with the authors.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

## 43 **Author Contributions**

44

45  
46 Huan Yang designed the study, completed the data collection and analyses, and wrote the  
47 manuscript. Shunping Li designed the study, collected and analyzed the data, and edited the  
48 manuscript. Qing Chen designed the study, collected and analyzed the data. Christopher  
49 Morgan helped design the study, supported interpretation of findings, and edited the  
50 manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### **Competing Interests**

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

### **Funding**

This work was supported by China Medical Board Open Competition Grant [Grant number CMB14-195]. Responsibility for any remaining errors lies solely with the authors.

### **Ethics approval**

The study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Medical School, Shandong University (LL-201401048).

### **Data sharing**

No additional data are available.

## REFERENCES

1. Acharya Pandey R, Karmacharya E. Cervical cancer screening behavior and associated factors among women of Ugrachandi Nala, Kavre, Nepal. *European Journal of Medical Research* 2017;22(1):32. doi: 10.1186/s40001-017-0274-9
2. WHO. Comprehensive cervical cancer prevention and control: a healthier future for girls and women. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2013.
3. de Sanjose S, Quint WGV, Alemany L, et al. Human papillomavirus genotype attribution in invasive cervical cancer: a retrospective cross-sectional worldwide study. *The Lancet Oncology* 2010;11(11):1048-56. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045\(10\)70230-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(10)70230-8)
4. Liu T, Li S, Ratcliffe J, et al. Assessing Knowledge and Attitudes towards Cervical Cancer Screening among Rural Women in Eastern China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2017;14(9):967.
5. Haesebaert J, Lutringer-Magnin D, Kalecinski J, et al. French women's knowledge of and attitudes towards cervical cancer prevention and the acceptability of HPV vaccination among those with 14 – 18 year old daughters: a quantitative-qualitative study. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12(1):1034. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-12-1034
6. GILES M, GARLAND S. A study of women's knowledge regarding human papillomavirus infection, cervical cancer and human papillomavirus vaccines. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol* 2006;46(4):311-15. doi: doi:10.1111/j.1479-828X.2006.00598.x
7. Louie KS, Sanjose SD, Mayaud P. Epidemiology and prevention of human papillomavirus and cervical cancer in sub-Saharan Africa: a comprehensive review. *Trop Med Int Health* 2009;14(10):1287-302. doi: doi:10.1111/j.1365-3156.2009.02372.x
8. Gu C, Chan CWH, Twinn S. How Sexual History and Knowledge of Cervical Cancer and Screening Influence Chinese Women's Screening Behavior in Mainland China. *Cancer Nurs* 2010;33(6):445-53. doi: 10.1097/NCC.0b013e3181e456dc
9. Chen W, Zhang S, Zeng H, et al. Report of Cancer Incidence and Mortality in China, 2010. *China Cancer* 2014(01):1-10.
10. Di J, Rutherford S, Wu J, et al. Knowledge of Cervical Cancer Screening among Women across Different Socio-Economic Regions of China. *PLoS One* 2015;10(12):e0144819. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0144819
11. Jia Y, Li S, Yang R, et al. Knowledge about Cervical Cancer and Barriers of Screening Program among Women in Wufeng County, a High-Incidence Region of Cervical Cancer in China. *PLoS*



- 1  
2  
3 ONE 2013;8(7):e67005. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0067005  
4  
5  
6 12. Tang T. Investigation on status quo of cognitive, attitude and behavior of women toward  
7 cervical cancer screening and analysis of its related factors. Chinese And Foreign Medical  
8 Research 2016(03):68-69.  
9  
10  
11 13. Liu L, Xu J, Yang C, et al. Investigation on status quo of cognitive of 1208 outpatients toward  
12 cervical cancer screening and analysis of its related factors. Practical Clinical Journal of  
13 Integrated Traditional Chinese and Western Medicine 2016(08):51-52+65.  
14  
15  
16 14. Zhou W, Shan H, Qi J, et al. Investigation on status quo of cognitive of 1200 women of  
17 childbearing age toward cervical cancer and analysis of its related factors. Maternal and Child  
18 Health Care of China 2017(18):4510-12.  
19  
20  
21 15. Li SP, Zheng ZY, Meng QY, et al. Barriers to tuberculosis care for drug users in two provinces of  
22 China: a qualitative study. The International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease  
23 2013;17(10):1358-63. doi: 10.5588/ijtld.12.0784  
24  
25  
26  
27 16. Pope C, Mays N. Qualitative Research: Reaching the parts other methods cannot reach: an  
28 introduction to qualitative methods in health and health services research. BMJ  
29 1995;311(6996):42-45. doi: 10.1136/bmj.311.6996.42  
30  
31  
32 17. China Statistical Yearbook 2017 [Available from:  
33 <http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/2017/indexch.htm>. accessed March 9 2018.  
34  
35  
36 18. Shandong Statistical Yearbook 2017 [Available from:  
37 <http://www.stats-sd.gov.cn/tjnj/nj2017/indexch.htm> accessed March 9 2018.  
38  
39  
40 19. Denzin NK, Lincoln YS. Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage  
41 Publications, Inc 1994.  
42  
43  
44 20. Peters DH, Tran NT, Adam T. Implementation research in health: a practical guide. Alliance for  
45 Health Policy and Systems Research. World Health Organization 2013.  
46  
47  
48 21. Bansal AB, Pakhare AP, Kapoor N, et al. Knowledge, attitude, and practices related to cervical  
49 cancer among adult women: A hospital-based cross-sectional study. Journal of natural science,  
50 biology, and medicine 2015;6(2):324-28. doi: 10.4103/0976-9668.159993  
51  
52  
53 22. Ahmed SA, Sabitu K, Idris SH, et al. Knowledge, attitude and practice of cervical cancer screening  
54 among market women in Zaria, Nigeria. Nigerian Medical Journal 2013;54(5):316-19. doi:  
55 10.4103/0300-1652.122337  
56  
57  
58 23. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology  
59 2006;3(2):77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 24. Compaore S, Ouedraogo CMR, Koanda S, et al. Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening in Burkina  
5 Faso: Needs for Patient and Professional Education. *J Cancer Educ* 2016;31(4):760-66. doi:  
6 10.1007/s13187-015-0898-9  
7
- 8  
9 25. Bayrami R, Taghipour A Fau - Ebrahimipour H, Ebrahimipour H. Personal and socio-cultural  
10 barriers to cervical cancer screening in Iran, patient and provider perceptions: a qualitative  
11 study. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2015;16(9):3729-34.  
12
- 13  
14 26. Fort VK, Makin MS, Siegler AJ, et al. Barriers to cervical cancer screening in Mulanje, Malawi: a  
15 qualitative study. *Patient preference and adherence* 2011;5:125-31. doi: 10.2147/ppa.s17317  
16
- 17  
18 27. Ndejjo R, Mukama T, Kiguli J, et al. Knowledge, facilitators and barriers to cervical cancer  
19 screening among women in Uganda: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open* 2017;7(6) doi:  
20 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016282  
21
- 22  
23 28. Isa Modibbo F, Dareng E, Bamisaye P, et al. Qualitative study of barriers to cervical cancer  
24 screening among Nigerian women. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(1) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008533  
25
- 26  
27 29. Gele AA, Qureshi SA, Kour P, et al. Barriers and facilitators to cervical cancer screening among  
28 Pakistani and Somali immigrant women in Oslo: a qualitative study. *International Journal of*  
29 *Women's Health* 2017;9:487-96. doi: 10.2147/ijwh.s139160  
30
- 31  
32 30. Gu C, Chan CWH, Twinn S, et al. The influence of knowledge and perception of the risk of  
33 cervical cancer on screening behavior in mainland Chinese women. *Psycho-Oncology*  
34 2012;21(12):1299-308. doi: doi:10.1002/pon.2037  
35
- 36  
37 31. Twinn S, Shiu ATY, Holroyd E. Women's Knowledge About Cervical Cancer and Cervical Screening  
38 Practice: A Pilot Study of Hong Kong Chinese Women. *Cancer Nurs* 2002;25(5):377-84.  
39
- 40  
41 32. Charlotte V, M. ML, Małgorzata H, et al. What do people fear about cancer? A systematic review  
42 and meta-synthesis of cancer fears in the general population. *Psycho-Oncology*  
43 2017;26(8):1070-79. doi: doi:10.1002/pon.4287  
44
- 45  
46 33. Nolan J, Renderos TB, Hynson J, et al. Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening and Follow-up Care  
47 among Black Women in Massachusetts. *J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs* 2014;43(5):580-88. doi:  
48 doi:10.1111/1552-6909.12488  
49
- 50  
51 34. Mupepi SC, Sampelle CM, Johnson TRB. Knowledge, Attitudes, and Demographic Factors  
52 Influencing Cervical Cancer Screening Behavior of Zimbabwean Women. *Journal of Women's*  
53 *Health* 2011;20(6):943-52. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2010.2062  
54
- 55  
56 35. Agurto I, Bishop A, Sánchez G, et al. Perceived barriers and benefits to cervical cancer screening  
57 in Latin America. *Preventive Medicine* 2004;39(1):91-98. doi:  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygmed.2004.03.040>  
4

- 5  
6 36. Marván ML, Ehrenzweig Y, Catillo-López RL. Knowledge about cervical cancer prevention and  
7 psychosocial barriers to screening among Mexican women. *J Psychosom Obstet Gynaecol*  
8 2013;34(4):163-69. doi: 10.3109/0167482x.2013.846904  
9
- 10  
11 37. Cunningham MS, Skrastins E, Fitzpatrick R, et al. Cervical cancer screening and HPV vaccine  
12 acceptability among rural and urban women in Kilimanjaro Region, Tanzania. *BMJ Open*  
13 2015;5(3) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005828  
14
- 15  
16 38. Winkler J, Bingham A, Coffey P, et al. Women's participation in a cervical cancer screening  
17 program in northern Peru. *Health Educ Res* 2008;23(1):10-24. doi: 10.1093/her/cyl156  
18
- 19  
20 39. Akinyemiju TF. Socio-Economic and Health Access Determinants of Breast and Cervical Cancer  
21 Screening in Low-Income Countries: Analysis of the World Health Survey. *PLoS One*  
22 2012;7(11):e48834. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0048834  
23
- 24  
25 40. Daley E, Alio A, Anstey EH, et al. Examining Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening and Treatment  
26 in Florida through a Socio-Ecological Lens. *Journal of Community Health* 2011;36(1):121-31. doi:  
27 10.1007/s10900-010-9289-7  
28
- 29  
30 41. Ghebre RG, Sewali B, Osman S, et al. Cervical Cancer: Barriers to Screening in the Somali  
31 Community in Minnesota. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health* 2015;17(3):722-28. doi:  
32 10.1007/s10903-014-0080-1  
33
- 34  
35 42. Kwok C, White K, Roydhouse JK. Chinese-Australian Women's Knowledge, Facilitators and  
36 Barriers Related to Cervical Cancer Screening: A Qualitative Study. *J Immigr Minor Health*  
37 2011;13(6):1076. doi: 10.1007/s10903-011-9491-4  
38
- 39  
40 43. Maar M, Burchell A, Little J, et al. A Qualitative Study of Provider Perspectives of Structural  
41 Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening Among First Nations Women. *Women's Health*  
42 *Issues*;23(5):e319-e25. doi: 10.1016/j.whi.2013.06.005  
43
- 44  
45 44. Williams MS, Amoateng P. Knowledge and Beliefs about Cervical Cancer Screening Among Men  
46 in Kumasi, Ghana. *Ghana Medical Journal* 2012;46(3):147-51.  
47
- 48  
49 45. Byrd TL, Chavez R, Wilson KM. Barriers and facilitators of cervical cancer screening among  
50 Hispanic women. *Ethn Dis* 2007;17(1):129-34.  
51
- 52  
53 46. Lu M, Moritz S, Lorenzetti D, et al. A systematic review of interventions to increase breast and  
54 cervical cancer screening uptake among Asian women. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12(1):413. doi:  
55 10.1186/1471-2458-12-413  
56
- 57  
58 47. Markovic M, Kesic V, Topic L, et al. Barriers to cervical cancer screening: A qualitative study with  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 women in Serbia. Social Science & Medicine 2005;61(12):2528-35. doi:  
4 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.05.001  
5  
6

7 48. Foliaki S, Matheson A. Barriers to Cervical Screening among Pacific Women in a New Zealand  
8 Urban Population 2015.  
9

10  
11 49. Toliman P, Badman SG, Gabuzzi J, et al. Field evaluation of the Xpert® HPV Point of Care Test for  
12 the detection of human papillomavirus infection using self-collected vaginal and  
13 clinician-collected cervical specimens. Journal of Clinical Microbiology 2016 doi:  
14 10.1128/jcm.00529-16  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

# Reporting checklist for qualitative study.

Based on the SRQR guidelines.

	Reporting Item	Page Number
	#1 Concise description of the nature and topic of the study identifying the study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g. ethnography, grounded theory) or data collection methods (e.g. interview, focus group) is recommended	2
	#2 Summary of the key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results and conclusions	2
Problem formulation	#3 Description and significance of the problem / phenomenon studied: review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement	4-5
Purpose or research question	#4 Purpose of the study and specific objectives or questions	5
Qualitative approach and research paradigm	#5 Qualitative approach (e.g. ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research) and guiding theory if appropriate; identifying the research paradigm (e.g. postpositivist, constructivist / interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale. The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method or technique rather than other options available; the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate the rationale for several items might be discussed together.	5-6
Researcher characteristics and reflexivity	#6 Researchers' characteristics that may influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications / experience, relationship with participants, assumptions and / or	7,9

		presuppositions; potential or actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research questions, approach, methods, results and / or transferability	
Context	#7	Setting / site and salient contextual factors; rationale	5-6
Sampling strategy	#8	How and why research participants, documents, or events were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g. sampling saturation); rationale	6-7
Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects	#9	Documentation of approval by an appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues	9-10
Data collection methods	#10	Types of data collected; details of data collection procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources / methods, and modification of procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale	7-9
Data collection instruments and technologies	#11	Description of instruments (e.g. interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g. audio recorders) used for data collection; if / how the instruments(s) changed over the course of the study	7-9
Units of study	#12	Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents, or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results)	11
Data processing	#13	Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis, including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of data integrity, data coding, and anonymisation / deidentification of excerpts	9
Data analysis	#14	Process by which inferences, themes, etc. were identified and developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a specific paradigm or approach; rationale	9

1	Techniques to	#15	Techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data	9
2	enhance		analysis (e.g. member checking, audit trail, triangulation);	
3	trustworthiness		rationale	
4				
5				
6				
7	Syntheses and	#16	Main findings (e.g. interpretations, inferences, and themes);	11
8	interpretation		might include development of a theory or model, or integration	
9			with prior research or theory	
10				
11				
12				
13	Links to empirical	#17	Evidence (e.g. quotes, field notes, text excerpts, photographs)	11-17
14	data		to substantiate analytic findings	
15				
16				
17				
18	Intergration with	#18	Short summary of main findings; explanation of how findings	18-21
19	prior work,		and conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or	
20	implications,		challenge conclusions of earlier scholarship; discussion of	
21	transferability and		scope of application / generalizability; identification of unique	
22	contribution(s) to the		contributions(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field	
23	field			
24				
25				
26				
27				
28	Limitations	#19	Trustworthiness and limitations of findings	20-21
29				
30				
31				
32	Conflicts of interest	#20	Potential sources of influence of perceived influence on study	22
33			conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	
34				
35				
36	Funding	#21	Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data	22
37			collection, interpretation and reporting	
38				
39				
40				

41 The SRQR checklist is distributed with permission of Wolters Kluwer © 2014 by the Association of  
 42 American Medical Colleges. This checklist was completed on 29. August 2018 using  
 43 <http://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with [Penelope.ai](#)  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60