

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 (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

Patients' expectations of preventive measures of medical institutions during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in Germany in women with an increased risk for breast and ovarian cancer

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-060038
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Dec-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Schwab, Roxana; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology Droste, Annika; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics Stewen, Kathrin; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics Brenner, Walburgis; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics Schmidt, Marcus; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics Hasenburg, Annette; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics
Keywords:	COVID-19, Health & safety < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Health policy < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Breast tumours < ONCOLOGY, Gynaecological oncology < ONCOLOGY

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

3										
4 5	1	Title								
6 7	2	Patients' expectations of preventive measures of medical institutions during the SARS-CoV-								
8	3	2 pandemic in Germany in women with an increased risk for breast and ovarian cancer								
9 10	4									
11 12	5	Roxana Schwab ¹ , Annika Droste ¹ , Kathrin Stewen ¹ , Walburgis Brenner ¹ , Marcus Schmidt ¹ ,								
13	6	Annette Hasenburg ¹								
14 15	7									
16 17	8	1 University Medical Center Mainz, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics,								
18	9	Langenbeckstraße 1, D-55131 Mainz, Germany								
19 20 21	10									
22	11									
23 24	12									
25 26	13	Corresponding author:								
27 28	14	Roxana Schwab, MD								
29 30	15	University Medical Center Mainz,								
31 32	16	Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics,								
33 34	17	Langenbeckstraße 1, D-55131 Mainz, Germany								
35	18	e-mail: roxana.schwab@unimedizin-mainz.de								
36 37	19									
38 30	20									
40 41	21									
42 43	22									
44 45	23									
46	24									
47 48	25									
49 50	26									
51	27									
52 53	27									
54	28									
55 56	29									
57 58	30									
59 60	31									

1		
3	32	
4 5		
6	33	Abstract
7		
8 9 10 11	34	Objectives: To identify patient-approved contingency measures for the protection of
12 13 14	35	patients and healthcare workers from COVID-19 infection, and to use these findings to
15 16	36	improve the staffs' preparedness to cope with the course of this pandemic or similar
17 18 19	37	situations.
20 21 22 23	38	Methods (design, setting, participants, intervenations): We conducted a cross-
24 25	39	sectional web-based survey of women with an increased risk for breast or ovarian cancer,
26 27 28	40	regardless of whether they had experienced an active malignant disease during the pandemic.
29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37	41	A self-reported questionnaire, developed for this study, was used to assess expectations and
	42	opinions about preventive measures within medical institutions.
	43	Results: Sixty-four (71.9%) of the 89 potential participants responded to at least one
38 39 40	44	question regarding contingency measures within medical institutions. Approximately 37% of
41 42	45	respondents preferred having information about their facility's hygiene protocols before
43 44 45	46	appointment; 57.8% of respondents endorsed regular SARS-CoV-2 testing of patients prior to
46 47	47	medical appointments and 95.3% endorsed regular testing of HCW. Additionally, 84.4% of
48 49 50	48	respondents supported HCW's use of surgical masks and 68.8% supported HCW's use of masks
50 51 52	49	with greater protection. Notably, 75.0% of respondents advocated for the presence of a
53 54	50	significant other during medical consultations; 71.9% approved the use of telemedicine and
55 56 57	51	93.8% endorsed changes in appointment practices to enable social distancing. No significant
58 59	52	associations were found between respondents' sociodemographic, disease-specific or
60	53	pandemic-specific factors and their opinions on hygiene precautions.

Conclusions: Patients at high risk for infection or severe course of COVID-19 disease approve strict contingency measures designed to lower the transmission of COVID-19 in medical facilities. However, they also value the presence of a significant other during medical consultations and procedures. Key words: COVID-19 pandemic, contingency plans, health care facilities, patient care, BRCA 1 & 2 Word number (body text): 3261 words **Article Summary** Strengths and limitations of this study Due to the design of the study (cross-sectional web-based survey), overrepresentation of patients worrying about their health status and the underrepresentation of women without online access are two possible sources of bias. As the study was conducted during the first months of 2021, and vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 were inaccessible for a large proportion of the population at that time, we do not know whether the responses accurately depict the current state of the pandemic. Our study identified several patient-approved contingency measures for the protection of patients and healthcare workers from COVID-19 infection, which are

 essential in terms to improve the staffs' preparedness to cope with the course of this
pandemic or similar situations.

79 Introduction

By the end of 2019, the novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which causes coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19), was first reported in China before spreading rapidly to other countries by the beginning of 2020. The World Health Organization (WHO) declared the outbreak a "public health emergency of international concern" on January 30, 2020 and a pandemic on March 11, 2020 [1].

Patients with active cancers seem to have a greater risk for acquiring SARS-CoV-2 infection, and severe COVID-19, requiring admission to intensive care units and invasive ventilation. Moreover, patients with pre-existing malignant diseases have a significantly higher risk for fatal outcomes compared to people in the general population without pre-existing medical conditions [2]. In order to protect this vulnerable population from possible infection, it is crucial to implement effective contingency plans in healthcare facilities. As a pandemic is a dynamic process, measures were implemented at various time points by different countries to prevent the spread of infection among the population and to protect persons at high risk for exposure, such as HCW. In Germany, the first widespread social distancing measures were implemented by the government at the end of March 2020 [1], [3]. As a result, healthcare facilities imposed specific safety protocols, general visitation guidelines and outpatient visitation policies in accordance with national and institutional regulations. Subsequently, family members and visitors were temporarily banned from joining ambulatory and

99 hospitalized patients, with few exceptions, depending on the incidence of SARS-CoV-2100 infection.

Persons with hereditary cancers, such as women at high risk for breast and ovarian cancer, require regular medical appointments. Women with mutations in breast cancer genes 1 and 2 (BRCA 1 & 2) have a cumulative risk of up to 75% by 80 years of age for developing breast cancer and a cumulative risk of up to 44% by the age of 80 for developing ovarian cancer [4]. Even if they do not undergo active cancer treatment or follow-up care, this group of patients requires regular medical monitoring and risk-reducing surgical interventions to prevent and detect a malignant disease at early stage [5].

108 Aim of the study

We aimed to identify patient-oriented and patient-approved contingency measures for the protection of patients and HCWs to improve preparedness for future pandemics or similar situations. Therefore, we assessed the expectations and opinions of women with an increased risk for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer regarding the preventive healthcare measures of medical institutions, irrespectively whether women at risk had experienced an active malignant disease during the pandemic.

116 Materials and Methods

117 Recruitment was conducted via a direct link to the survey and an invitation to participate 118 distributed via the internet platforms of patients support groups for hereditary breast cancer 119 or ovarian cancer. All participants were aged 18 years or older. All participants gave consent 120 to participate in the study. The survey was active from 29th January to 22th February 2021.

BMJ Open

3 4	121	The data were collected anonymously, and they included participants' self-reported
5 6 7	122	sociodemographic and clinical information. The expectations and opinions of the women with
, 8 9	123	respect to the safety precautions of healthcare facilities and institutions for preventing the
10 11 12	124	spread of the virus were assessed were assessed using the following questions:
13 14 15	125	1. Would you have liked to be informed about hygiene protocols in advance of your
16 17 18	126	appointment? (Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply)
19 20	127	2. Would more information about the prevailing hygiene protocols have had a positive
21 22	128	influence on your behavior (e.g., meeting appointments)? Yes – No – I don't know/does not
23 24 25	129	apply
20 27 28	130	3. Do you think that patients should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection before an ambulatory
29 30 31	131	visit/appointment? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply
32 33	132	4. Do you think that medical personnel/physicians should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection
34 35 36	133	on a regular basis? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply
37 38 39	134	5. Do you think that appointments should be scheduled in such a way to ensure that distancing
40 41 42	135	rules can be strictly observed? <i>Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply</i>
43 44 45	136	6. Should a relative or trustworthy person be allowed to accompany patients in the healthcare
46 47	137	setting, despite the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply
48 49 50	138	7. Do you think/agree that appointments, which do not require one's physical presence (e.g.,
51 52	139	counseling appointments) should be conducted as teleconferences or video conferences
55 55 56	140	during the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply
57 58	141	8. Do you think that medical personnel should at least wear an FFP-1 mask (surgical mask)
59 60	142	during the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply

9. Do you think that medical personnel should always wear an FFP-2 mask masks during the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure patients' safety? Yes – no – I don't know/does not apply A full copy of the questions which were considered for the present evaluation can be found in the supplement file 1 (Supplement_file_1). Patient and public involvement No patient involved. Patients support groups for hereditary breast cancer or ovarian cancer supported the survey by distribution of the link via their internet platforms. Statistics For descriptive analyses, missing data consisted of participants who did not answer the survey's questions. Data were analyzed using SPSS 26.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Descriptive statistics are expressed as mean, standard deviation (SD), median, interguartile range (IQR) or proportions (%), as appropriate. We used the Mann-Whitney-U-test, the χ^2 -test and the Fisher exact test to analyze the data for differences between the responders and non-responders to the survey's questions. The Mann-Whitney-U-test, χ^2 -test or Fisher exact test were used as appropriate, to compare differences of expectations according to demographic, disease-specific and pandemic-specific variables. The p-values were calculated using a 95% confidence interval. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Because the p-values were not adjusted for multiple testing, all results should be interpreted as exploratory. **Ethics** approval This study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and adhered to the principles of best clinical practices. Prior to the data collection, all patients gave their informed consent, allowing us to collect the data and publish the results. The participants' privacy and confidentiality were guaranteed following German and European laws and regulations.

BMJ Open

2 3 4	169
4 5 6	170
7 8 9 10 11	171
13 14 15	172
16 17	173
18 19 20	174
20 21 22	175
23 24 25	176
25 26 27	177
28 29	178
30 31	179
32 33 34	180
35 36	181
37 38 39 40 41	182
42 43 44	
45 46 47	
48 49	
50 51	
52 53	
54 55	
56 57	
58 59 60	

This survey was approved by the ethical review board of the medical association of Rhineland-Palatinate (approval number 15612).

171 Results

172 Demographic characteristics of the study group

Although 89 potential participants accessed the questionnaire ("clicks"), 11% (9/89) did not 3 answer any of the questions; 80% (64/80) answered at least one question pertaining to hygiene management and expectations for preventive measures, and 20% (16/80) did not 5 answer any questions pertaining to preventive measures related to the pandemic. To 5 understand the differences between respondents and non-respondents, we analyzed the demographic, pandemic-specific and clinical characteristics of both groups (Table 1). No 3 significant differences were found between the two groups regarding demographic, 9 pandemic-specific or clinical variables, except for a higher educational level of the) respondents compared to non-respondents. L

182 **Table**

Table 1: Demographic and clinical characteristics of the total study sample

		Non-respondents	Respondents	p-value (Non- respondents group vs the Respondents group)
		Age		
	Mean (SD)	46.64 (2.210)	42,85 (1.363)	0.161 ¹
	Median (IQR)	47.50 (40.00-54.00)	43.00 (33.75-51.25)	
		(N=14)	(N=62)	
		Having a stable relation	nship	
Yes	% of N	100 (14/14)	90.6 (58/64)	0.2361
No	% of N	0 (0/14)	9.4 (6/64)	
		Living alone	·	·
Yes	% of N	100 (16/16)	90.6 (58/64)	0.340 ¹

No	% of N	0 (0/16)	9.4 (6/64)	
		Living with children <	18y	
Yes	% of n/N	25.0 (4/16)	34.4 (22/64)	0.474 ²
No	% of N	75.0 (12/16)	65.6 (42/64)	
-				
	T	Living with persons >	65у	
Yes	% of N	12.5 (2/16)	6.2 (4/64)	0.3991
No	% of N	87.5 (14/16)	93.8 (60/64)	
		Living with a partne		
Yes	% of N	62.5 (10/16)	60.9 (39/64)	0.9092
No	% of N	37.5 (6/16)	39.1 (25/64)	0.505
		37.3 (0/10)	33.1 (23/04)	
		Education		
Up to secondary	% of N	84.6 (11/13)	48.4 (31/64)	0.017 ²
level education				
Tertiary level	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	51.6 (33/64)	
education				
		Did you have COVID	-19	
Yes	% of N	0 (0/13)	4.7 (3/64)	0.429 ¹
No	% of N	100 (13/13)	95.3 (61/64)	01125
	Someone ir	n your social network h	as had COVID-19	
Yes	% of N	23.1 (3/13)	28.6 (18/63)	0.687 ²
No	% of N	76.9 (10/13)	71.4 (45/63)	
			1	
		Reduction of social net	work	
Moderate	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	15.6 (10/64)	0.983 ²
reduction				
Large reduction	% of N	84.6 (11/13)	84.4 (54/64)	
		Risk profiling for OC an	nd BC	
BRCA 1 & 2	% of N	76.9 (10/13)	70.3 (45/64)	0.895 ³
Mutations other than BRCA 1 & 2	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	14.10 (9/64)	
Positive family	% of N	7.7 (1/13)	15.6 (10/64)	
history for BC or OC				
	Having a h	istory of (in situ or inva	sive) OC and BC	
Yes	% of N	73.3 (11/15)	64.1 (41/64)	0.496 ²
No	% of N	26.7 (4/15)	35.9 (23/64)	0
	L	laving a history of invas	sive BC	
		aving a miscory of myas		

3		No	% of N	40 (6/15)	43.80 (28/64)				
4									
5			ŀ	aving a history of invas	ive OC	1			
0 7		Yes	% of N	6.7 (1/15)	1.6 (1/64)	0.260 ¹			
, 8		No	% of N	93.3 (14/15)	98.4 (63/64)	-			
9									
10	183	N = total num	ber of women who an	swered the question. $n =$	number of responder	ts to the specific			
11	184	answer. SD =	standard deviation. v =	= vears. BRCA 1 & 2 = bre	ast cancer genes 1 and	2. BC = breast			
12	185	cancer. OC = o	ovarian cancer: Values	in bold indicate statistic	al significance, as the l	evel of significance			
13	186	was set to p <	0.05 (¹ = Mann-Whitn	ev-U-test; ² = x ² -test, 2-si	ided; ³ = Fisher exact te	st, 2-sided).			
14 15		·	Υ.	, , , <u>,</u> ,		, ,			
16 17	187								
18 19	188	Opinions abo	out preventive meas	ures					
20 21	189	Approximate	ly 37.5% of the res	oondents would have	preferred to be info	rmed about their			
22 23 24	190	facility's spe	cific hygiene protoco	ols prior to their appo	intment, an equal p	roportion did not			
24 25 26	191	care to be in	formed and a slight	ly smaller proportion h	nad no opinion on th	is topic (Table 2).			
27 28	192	Only 20.3% o	of the respondents ir	ndicated that being info	ormed about hygiene	e protocols would			
29 30 31	193	have change	d their behavior, wh	nereas the majority of	respondents either h	nad no opinion or			
32 33	194	denied any p	ossible influence of	the information on the	eir behavior (Table 2)				
34 35 36	195	The majority of respondents endorsed regular testing of patients for SARS-CoV-2 prior to visits							
37 38 39	196	to healthcare facilities. However, a much larger proportion of respondents supported the							
40 41 42	197	regularly testing of HCW (Table 2).							
43 44 45	198	The proport	on of respondents	that endorsed change	s in appointment pr	actices to enable			
45 46 47	199	social distan	cing in medical instit	utions and waiting wa	rds was also quite hi	gh. Despite social			
48 49	200	distancing re	equirements for visit	ors in medical instituti	ons, the vast majorit	y of respondents			
50 51 52	201	(75.0%) supp	orted the possibility	of being accompanied	d by a significant oth	er during medical			
53 54	202	consultation	s, and 71.9% appr	oved the implement	ation of telemedic	ine while 21.9%			
55 56 57 58 59	203	disapproved	this option (Table 2)).					

4	20
5 6 7	20
7 8 9	20
10 11	20
12 13	20
14 15 16	20
17 18	21
19 20 21	21
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	

With regard to wearing protective gear, a relatively high proportion of respondents (84.4%) agreed that HCW should wear surgical masks (not cloth masks) to stop the spread of SARS-CoV-2, compared to the much smaller proportions who did not consider surgical masks to be necessary or had no opinion on the topic. Fewer respondents (66.8%) agreed that HCW wear masks with a higher level of protection (i.e., the FFP-2 mask), while more respondents disagreed and others had no opinion (Table 2).

Table 2: Participants' opinions and expectations of hygiene measures during the COVID-19 pandemic

Questions	Yes in % of respondents	No in % of respondents	l don't know/does
	(n/N)	(n/N)	not apply
			in % of
			respondents
			(n/N)
Would you have liked to be informed about	37.5%	37.5%	25.0%
hygiene protocols in advance of your	(24/64)	(24/64)	(16/64)
appointment?			
Would more information about the	20.3%	31.3%	48.4%
prevailing hygiene protocols have had a	(13/64)	(20/64)	(31/64)
positive influence on your behavior (e.g.,			
meeting appointments)?	4		
Do you think that patients should be tested	57.8%	26.6%	15.6%
for SARS-CoV-2 infection before an	(37/64)	(17/64)	(10/64)
ambulatory visit/appointment?			
Do you think that medical	95.3%	1.6%	3.1%
personnel/physicians should be tested for	(61/64)	(1/64)	(2/64)
SARS-CoV-2 infection on a regular basis?			
Do you think that appointments should be	93.8%	1.6%	4.7%
scheduled in such a way to ensure that	(60/64)	(1/64)	(3/64)
distancing rules can be strictly observed?			
Should a relative or trustworthy person be	75.0%	15.6%	9.4%
allowed to accompany patients in the	(48/64)	(10/64)	(6/64)
healthcare setting, despite the COVID-19			
pandemic?			
Do you think/agree that appointments,	71.9%	21.9%	6.3%
which do not require one's physical	(46/64)	(14/64)	(4/64)
presence (e.g., counseling appointments)			
should be conducted as teleconferences or			
video conferences during the COVID-19			
pandemic?			

2								
3		Do you think that medical personnel should	84.4%	7.8%	7.8%			
4		at least wear an FEP-1 mask (surgical mask)	(54/64)	(5/64)	(5/64)			
5		during the COVID-19 pandemic?						
7		Do you think that medical personnel should	68.8%	18.8%	12.5%			
8		always wear an FEP-2 mask masks during	(44/64)	(12/64)	(8/64)			
9		the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure patients'						
10		cafety?						
11 12	212	N = total number of women who answered the qui	estion n = numbe	r of responder	nts to the specific			
12	212	answer			to the specific			
14	215							
15	214	Factors influencing decision making related	d to hygiene pr	actices durir	ng the pandemic			
16	215	5	50 1		0			
17	213							
18 10	216	We examined group differences using the	Mann-Whitney	-U-test to id	entify subsets of			
20								
21	217	patients with similar expectations and assess differences between those who had definite						
22								
23	218	opinions of the facilities' hygiene managemen	it during the pai	ndemic and a	nswered "yes" (vs			
24 25								
25 26	219	"no") to the questions and their counterparts. Missing data included all participants who did						
27			-					
28	220	not answer the relevant question or did not	have a definite	opinion of t	he topic ("do not			
29				•				
30	221	know/does not apply").						
31								
5∠ 33								
34	222	None of the demographic, pandemic-specific of	or disease-specif	ic factors wer	e found to have a			
35								
36	223	significant influence on the respondents' op	inions with res	pect to the h	nygiene measures			
37								
38	224	implemented during the pandemic (all p-value	s > 0.05) (Table	3).				
39 40								
41								
42	225							
43					•			

Table 3: Influence of demographic, disease-specific and pandemic-specific factors on expectations regarding the prevention of SARS-CoV-2 transmission

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Age	0.441 ¹	0.373	0.316	0.100	0.102	0.487	0.263	0.729	0.821
		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Stable partnership	0.999 ³	0.508	0.645	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.368	0.999
(no vs yes)		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Living alone (yes vs	0.348 ³	0.508	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.577	0.133	0.999	0.567
no)		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Living with children	0.104 ²	0.676	0.537	0.999	0.999	0.784	0.179	0.646	1.846
(yes vs no)		3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2

							•		
Living with an elderly	0.999 ³	0.508	0.296	0.999	0.999	0.541	0.999	0.999	0.99
person (yes vs no)		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Living with a partner	0.233 ²	0.208	0.824	0.999	0.999	0.922	0.098	0.999	0.96
(yes vs no)		2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
Tertiary level	0.558 ²	0.717	0.793	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.542	0.999	0.24
education (yes vs		3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2
no)									
Having had COVID	0.999 ³	0.547	0.535	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.556	0.999	0.52
(yes vs no)		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Someone in their	0.123 ²	0.648	0.596	0.999	0.999	0.551	0.982	0.308	0.09
social network		3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
having COVID (yes									
vs no)									
Reduction of social	0.999 ³	0.360	0.512	0.999	0.999	0.800	0.442	0.577	0.62
contact (serious and		3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
very serious									
reduction vs low									
reduction)									
Risk profiling for OC	0.578 ³	0.604	0.263	0.129	0.295	0.744	0.793	0.450	0.45
and BC (-/+ family		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
history but no									
mutation vs BRCA1									
& 2 vs a mutation									
other than BRCA)					1				
Having a history of in	0.768 ²	0.930	0.836	0.999	0.999	0.163	0.179	0.999	0.18
situ or invasive BC		2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
or OC (yes vs no)									
History of invasive	0.999 ³	0.353	0.887	0.999	0.999	0.249	0.383	0.639	0.57
BC (yes vs no)		2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
History of invasive	0.999 ³	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.99
OC (ves vs no)		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Would more information about the prevailing hygiene protocols have had a positive influence on your behavior (e.g., meeting appointments)?, 3- Do you think that patients should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection before an ambulatory visit/appointment?, 4- Do you think that medical personnel/physicians should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection on a regular basis?, 5- Do you think that appointments should be scheduled in such a way to ensure that distancing rules can be strictly observed? 6- Should a relative or trustworthy person be allowed to accompany patients in the healthcare setting, despite the COVID-19 pandemic? 7- Do you think/agree that appointments, which do not require one's physical presence (e.g., counseling appointments) should be conducted as teleconferences or video conferences Page 15 of 35

1

BMJ Open

2		
3 ⊿	237	(
5	238	I
6 7	239	ä
8	240	,
9	241	,
10 11	2/12	
12	272	
13 14	2/2	
15	245	
16 17	244	
17	245	(
19		
20 21	246	1
22	240	I
23 24		
25	247	(
26		
27 28	248	i
29		
30 31	249	I
32	250	
33 34	250	
35	251	
36		
37 38	252	I
39		
40 41	253	:
42	25/	-
43 44	234	
45	255	
46		
47 48	256	
49		
50 51	257	
52		
53 54	258	
55	250	,
56	233	
57 58	260	:
59		
60	261	,

during the COVID-19 pandemic? 8- Do you think that medical personnel should at least wear an FFP-1 mask (surgical mask) during the COVID-19 pandemic? 9- Do you think that medical personnel should always wear an FFP-2 mask masks during the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure patients' safety?; vs = versus, BC = breast cancer, OC = ovarian cancer. The significance level was set at p < 0.05 (¹ = Mann-Whitney-U-test; ² = χ^2 -test, 2-sided; ³ = Fisher exact test, 2-sided).

43 Discussion

Our analysis provides a descriptive analysis of participants' expectations for preventive healthcare measures in medical institutions during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in Germany. During a pandemic, the implementation of strict contingency plans in medical institutions is vital. In the beginning of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, in January 2020, 41% of the novel infections seemed to be hospital acquired [6], fueling the spread of the virus among the wider population. Viral transmission to patients in healthcare facilities will affect the population with a higher incidence of pre-existing medical conditions, and thus, with a higher risk for a severe course of the disease [7]. Additionally, infection among HCW could lead to shortages of qualified personnel to care for the patients, bringing the healthcare system to the brink of decompensation. Thus, adequate and effective protection of both patients and HCW are of paramount importance [8].

Persons, including patients with pre-existing medical conditions might be very sensitive to the
 proper observance of contingency plans in medical institutions. This is understandable
 because the risks for severe and fatal COVID-19 is higher in the aged population and in persons
 with comorbidities [7], [9], [10]. One study found that patients with cancer were 10-fold more
 susceptible to acquiring nosocomial infections with the SARS-CoV-2 virus than were patients
 without cancer [10]. The observed 49% reduction in outpatient appointments for breast-

cancer follow-up during the pandemic [11], [12] was either a result of responses to hygiene plans or protocols within medical institutions or because of patients' worries about becoming infected with COVID-19 while visiting healthcare facilities. For reassurance, 37.5% of the participants in this study preferred to be informed of the healthcare facility's hygiene protocols in advance of medical appointments. More interestingly, over 20% of participants stated that receiving prior information about safety protocols during the COVID-19 pandemic would have strengthened their adherence to medical appointments. The dissemination of information that is valuable, transparent and proactive has been recognized previously by the WHO as an essential tool to overcome various difficulties or insecurities triggered by the pandemic [8].

The use of physical distancing to limit exposure to potentially infectious aerosols, was widely recommended [7], [8], [13]. Approximately 93.8% of participants in this study expected adherence to the recommended physical distancing rules in waiting rooms. The recommended physical distancing protocol had a decisive influence on the visiting policies of medical institutions [7]. Al-Shamsi et al. suggested that clinic attendance in outpatient settings should be limited to the patient and one visitor [2]. Nevertheless, one of the pillars of patient-centered care has proven to be family involvement [14]. One study found that up to 46% of adult patients were accompanied by family members to routine visits with their physicians [14]. Family members, friends and caregivers mediate the patient's psychosocial and emotional support, encouragement and reassurance, thereby improving the communication processes during medical visits and influencing patients' satisfaction with the physician's care [2], [14]–[16]. Medical appointments are an anxiety-provoking experience for patients, especially for those facing a possible or existing malignant diagnosis. The word "distress" is mentioned by patients with cancer who were denied the option of having a family member or

BMJ Open

friend with them during medical appointments [17]. Although the respondents in this study endorsed vigilant sanitary precautions to prevent nosocomial infections, an overwhelming proportion (75.0%) supported the possibility of being accompanied by a significant other during medical consultations, irrespective of their demographic, disease-specific or pandemicspecific characteristics. The company of a trustworthy person seemed to be clearly important for our study's participants.

Other experts have managed to attenuate the detrimental effects of the pandemic on screening and provide follow-up care for patients with cancer by implementing telemedicine appointments [7], [11]. The use of telemedicine has been described as a method for patients and physicians to stay in touch and informed while reducing physical contact [2], [17]–[19]. Notably, 71.9% of the participants in this study approved implementation of telemedicine whenever possible and reasonable from an oncological viewpoint, in order to reduce face-to-face contact and minimize potential contact with persons infected with SARS-CoV-2, but maintain the required standards for treatment. Telemedicine appointments would be impossible in cases requiring physical examinations or imaging procedures, but it would be a good choice for offering a second opinion [11].

The WHO has stated that regular and widespread testing is crucial to contain the virus and stop the pandemic [7], [8]. The transmission of nosocomial infections, both patient-to-patient and patient-to-healthcare-personnel, has been reported previously [6]. These infections occur, presumably, by transmission from asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic carriers or persons with mild or atypical symptoms [6], [20]. Precautions are essential, as 17.9% to 33.3% of patients may have an asymptomatic COVID-19 infection [2]. While pre-operative testing has been recommended by various medical societies worldwide, and the testing of in-patients upon their admission to the hospital has been introduced by the vast majority of healthcare

facilities [21], regular testing of patients prior to ambulatory appointments to avoid nosocomial spread among HCWs or other patients, was not. Interestingly, 57.8% of our study's population indicated they would rather tolerate the inconvenience of repetitive testing before visiting a healthcare institution, in order to feel safe and avoid exposure to potentially lifethreatening infectious agents.

The protection of HCWs from COVID-19 serves both sides: maintaining medical care and protecting the vulnerable population from a possible fatal nosocomial infection with SARS-CoV-2 [9]. In Germany, HCWs were tested only if they were symptomatic or were eligible for the national contact-tracing program (documented contact with an infected person without adequate personal protective equipment). Nevertheless, data from the United Kingdom showed that up to 3% of asymptomatic HCWs were infected with SARS-CoV-2 [22]. According to mathematical models, regular polymerase-chain-reaction(PCR)-based screening of HCWs, irrespective of whether they are symptomatic or asymptomatic, could reduce their contribution to transmission by up to 33% [23]. This study showed that 93% of patients strongly supported the notion of broad screening programs for HCW, irrespective of their demographic, disease-specific or pandemic-specific factors.

HCWs have a significantly high risk for acquiring COVID-19, based on national and international data [23], [24]. According to some reports, HCWs acquired COVID-19 through nosocomial transmission in up to 29% of reported cases (China, January 2020) [6]. Thus, effective control of the source of infection is crucial in healthcare facilities. The use of personal protective equipment by HCW and patients in medical institutions was recommended by their national centers for disease control [2], [8], [13], [21], [25]. A meta-analysis conducted by lannone et al. found a significant benefit from wearing masks in mitigating the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 [26]. During an infection outbreak, wearing a N-95 mask or an FFP-2 respirator

BMJ Open

cuts the risk in half for clinical respiratory infections in HCWs, compared to wearing only a surgical mask [26], [27]. Furthermore, the protection of HCWs may reduce secondary transmission of the virus and nosocomial infections. During simulation tests of the spread of SARS-CoV-2 droplets/aerosols, medical masks and cloth face coverings were 57%–58% effective in protecting others and 37%–50% effective in protecting the wearer, while the N-95/FFP-2 masks were more effective in protecting others (effectivity: 86%–90%) as well as the wearer (effectivity: 96%–99%) [28].

341 Limitations

This study has several limitations due to its design (cross-sectional web-based survey). First, there might be an overrepresentation of patients worrying about their health status because of their recruitment from support groups and the underrepresentation of women without online access are two possible sources of bias. Nevertheless, a recent systematic review showed that Facebook-recruited samples were similarly representative as samples recruited via traditional methods [29]. Furthermore, as the patients responded directly to the questionnaire, social desirability bias was greatly limited.

Second, this study was conducted during the first months of 2021. In Germany, the first vaccine against COVID-19 was approved by emergency use authorization in December 2020 (Comirnaty[®], BioNTech Manufacturing, Germany), followed by the emergency authorization of two other vaccines in January 2021 (COVID-19 Vaccine Moderna, Moderna Biotech, USA and Vaxzevria, AstraZeneca Life Science, UK) [30]. Due to the strict criteria for prioritizing eligibility for vaccinations in Germany, the COVID-19 vaccines were inaccessible for a large proportion of the population during the time we conducted the survey, even for patients at risk, such as those with active or previous oncological disorders [31], [32]. We did not assess participants' vaccination status; however, we presumed that most of them were not

vaccinated because of national regulations during the survey period. Thus, we do not know whether the responses accurately depict the current state of the pandemic, as expectations may have changed due to the currently available vaccines.

362 Strengths

The COVID-19 pandemic changed the way patient care is delivered. Strict measures to contain the virus were implemented swiftly after the onset of the pandemic by experts in infectious diseases and politicians. Due to the course of the pandemic, there was no possibility to assess the needs and expectations of patients regarding specific hygiene measures before putting those in place. Our study identified several patient-approved contingency measures for the protection of patients and healthcare workers from COVID-19 infection, which are essential in terms to improve the staffs' preparedness to cope with the course of this pandemic or similar situations.

The high risk and vulnerable groups in our study seemed to approve the most vigilant and strict contingency programs designed to lower the risk of transmission in medical facilities, irrespective of demographic, disease-specific or pandemic-specific factors. Additionally, to our knowledge, this is the first study to assess the wishes of patients with respect to being accompanied by a person of trust during medical appointments during the pandemic. The possibility of being accompanied by a trustworthy person seemed to be non-negotiable for most of the participants in the study. Thus, in addition to the strict visitation policies for outpatients and rules restricting visitation for hospitalized patients, we also need innovative strategies to maintain and improve the experiences of patients during the COVID-19 pandemic, such as allowing, that patients are accompanied by a person of trust, provided that

BMJ Open

4	302
5 6 7	383
8 9 10	384
10 11 12	385
13 14 15	386
15 16 17	387
18 19 20 21	388
22 23 24	389
24 25 26	390
27 28 29	391
30 31	392
32 33 34	393
35 36 37	394
37 38 39	395
40 41 42	396
45 44	
45 46	397
47 48	398
49 50	399
51 52 53	400 401
54 55 56	402
57	403
58 59	404

382 they comply with strict precautions measures, for e.g. by providing a current negative SARS-CoV-2 test result or proof of immunization. 383

As we assessed participants' needs, fears and expectations, we followed the WHO 384 385 recommendation for two-way communication with populations at risk [8]. Our goal is to improve and optimize the public health measures, which could be implemented during a next 386 wave of the COVID-19 pandemic or other possible pandemics. 387

389 Conclusion

In conclusion, we showed that most patients at high risk for infection or severe course of 391 COVID-19 disease approve strict contingency measures, such as physical distancing rules, the 392 implementation of telemedicine and the use of highly effective protective masks, designed to 393 lower the transmission of COVID-19 in medical facilities. However, they also value the 394 presence of a significant other during medical consultations and procedures. 395

Acknowledgements: 397

- We thank 399
- the support group for persons at high risk for breast and/or ovarian cancer for their 400 engagement in the promotion of this survey. 401
- all participants for participating in our study. 402 403 Parts of the presented results are part of the doctoral thesis of Ms. Annika Droste. 404 60

2		
3 4 5	405	Author contributions:
6 7	406	RS and AD conceptualised the study and planned the data analysis, acquired the data and
8	407	drafted the manuscript. KS, WB, MS, and AH, offered intellectual input and provided critical
9 10	408	revision. RS and AD performed the data analysis. All authors contributed to the drafts and
11 12 13	409	approved the final version of the manuscript for publication.
14 15 16	410	Funding:
17 18	411	The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in
19	412	the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.
20 21 22 23	413	
23	414	Data availability:
25 26	415	Data are available on reasonable request to bona fide researchers.
27 28 29 30	416	
31 32	417	Conflicts of interests:
33 34	418	RS:
35 36 37	419	Honoraria: Roche Pharma AG, AstraZeneca, Streamedup!GmbH
38 39	420	
40 41 42	421	MS: received personal fees from AstraZeneca, BioNTech, Eisai, Lilly, MSD, Novartis, Pantarhei
43 44	422	Bioscience, Pfizer, Roche, and SeaGen. Institutional research funding from AstraZeneca,
45 46 47	423	BioNTech, Eisai, Genentech, German Breast Group, Novartis, Palleos, Pantarhei Bioscience,
48 49	424	Pierre-Fabre, and Roche. Travel reimbursement from Pfizer and Roche. In addition, M.S. is
50 51	425	named as an inventor on patent EP 2390370 B1 and granted patent EP 2951317 B1.
52 53 54	426	
55 56 57 58 59 60	427	AH:

3 4	428	Honc	Honoraria: AstraZeneca; Celgen; MedConcept GmbH, Med update GmbH; Medicultus; Pfizer;							
5 6 7	429	Prom	Promedicis GmbH; Softconsult; Roche Pharma AG; Streamedup!GmbH; Tesaro Bio Germany							
8 9	430	Gmb	GmbH, LEO Pharma							
10 11 12	431	Ad B	oard: PharmaMar; Promedicis GmbH; Roche Pharma AG; Tesaro Bio Germany GmbH,							
13 14	432	Astra	Zeneca, LEO Pharma, MSD Sharp&Dohme GmbH							
15 16 17	433									
17	434	Ref	erences:							
19 20 21	435 436	[1]	O. Müller, O., Neuhann, F., & Razum, "Epidemiology and control of COVID-19," <i>Dtsch. medizinische Wochenschrift</i> , vol. 1946 10, no. 145, pp. 670–674, 2020.							
22 23 24 25	437 438 439	[2]	H. O. AL-SHAMSI <i>et al.</i> , "A Practical Approach to the Management of Cancer Patients During the Novel Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic : An International Collaborative Group," <i>Oncologist</i> , vol. 25, pp. 1–10, 2020.							
26 27 28 29	440 441 442	[3]	"Bundesministerium für Gesundheit, Chronik Coronavirus," https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/coronavirus/chronik-coronavirus.html (last download on 15th November 2020)							
30 31 32 33	443 444 445	[4]	K. B. Kuchenbaecker <i>et al.</i> , "Risks of breast, ovarian, and contralateral breast cancer for BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutation carriers," <i>JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc.</i> , vol. 317, no. 23, pp. 2402–2416, 2017.							
34 35 36 37	446 447 448	[5]	S. Paluch-Shimon <i>et al.</i> , "Prevention and screening in BRCA mutation carriers and other breast/ovarian hereditary cancer syndromes: ESMO clinical practice guidelines for cancer prevention and screening," <i>Ann. Oncol.</i> , vol. 27, no. Supplement 5, pp. v103–v110, 2016.							
39 40 41	449 450 451	[6]	D. Wang <i>et al.,</i> "Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients with 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China," <i>JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc.</i> , vol. 323, no. 11, pp. 1061–1069, 2020.							
42 43 44 45	452 453 454	[7]	A. Madan, J. Siglin, and A. Khan, "Comprehensive review of implications of COVID-19 on clinical outcomes of cancer patients and management of solid tumors during the pandemic," <i>Cancer Med.</i> , vol. 9, no. 24, pp. 9205–9218, 2020.							
46 47 48 49 50 51 52	455 456 457 458 459	[8]	World Health Organization, "COVID - 19 Strategy Update," <i>https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/covid-strategy-update-14april2020.pdf?sfvrsn=29da3ba0_19; last access 14 September 2021</i> , 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/covid-strategy-update-14april2020.pdf?sfvrsn=29da3ba0_19. [Accessed: 14-Sep-2021].							
53 54 55	460 461	[9]	T. M. McMichael <i>et al.</i> , "Epidemiology of Covid-19 in a Long-Term Care Facility in King County, Washington," <i>N. Engl. J. Med.</i> , vol. 382, no. 21, pp. 2005–2011, 2020.							
55 56 57	462 463	[10]	M. Dai <i>et al.</i> , "Patients with cancer appear more vulnerable to SARS-CoV-2: A multicenter study during the COVID-19 outbreak," <i>Cancer Discov.</i> , vol. 10, no. 6, p. 783, 2020.							
58 59 60	464 465	[11]	M. Sonagli, R. Cagnacci Neto, F. P. M. Leite, and F. B. A. Makdissi, "The use of telemedicine to maintain breast cancer follow-up and surveillance during the COVID-19 pandemic," <i>J. Surg.</i>							

1 2			
3 ∡	466		<i>Oncol.</i> , vol. 123, no. 2, pp. 371–374, 2021.
5 6	467 468	[12]	F. P. M. Leite <i>et al.</i> , "How to maintain elective treatment of breast cancer during the COVID- 19 pandemic—A cancer center experience," <i>J. Surg. Oncol.</i> , vol. 123, no. 1, pp. 9–11, 2021.
7 8 9	469 470	[13]	E. Raymond, C. Thieblemont, S. Alran, and S. Faivre, "Impact of the COVID-19 Outbreak on the Management of Patients with Cancer," <i>Target. Oncol.</i> , vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 249–259, 2020.
10 11 12	471 472	[14]	J. L. Wolff and D. L. Roter, "Family presence in routine medical visits: A meta-analytical review," <i>Soc. Sci. Med.</i> , vol. 72, no. 6, pp. 823–831, 2011.
13 14 15 16	473 474 475	[15]	I. L. Leeds <i>et al.,</i> "Psychosocial Risks are Independently Associated with Cancer Surgery Outcomes in Medically Comorbid Patients," <i>Ann. Surg. Oncol.</i> , vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 936–944, 2019.
17 18 19	476 477	[16]	J. L. Wolff and D. L. Roter, "Hidden in plain sight," <i>Arch Intern Med.,</i> vol. 168, no. 13, pp. 1409–1415, 2008.
20 21 22 23	478 479 480	[17]	S. Dhada, D. Stewart, M. A. Hadi, and V. Paudyal, "Cancer Services During the COVID-19 Pandemic : Systematic Review of Patient's and Caregiver's Experiences," <i>Cancer Manag. Res.,</i> vol. 13, pp. 5875–5887, 2021.
24 25 26 27	481 482 483	[18]	C. Pécout <i>et al.,</i> "Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on patients affected by non- communicable diseases in Europe and in the USA," <i>Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health</i> , vol. 18, no. 13, p. 6697, 2021.
28 29 30 31	484 485 486	[19]	J. R. Dietz <i>et al.</i> , "Recommendations for prioritization, treatment, and triage of breast cancer patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. the COVID-19 pandemic breast cancer consortium," <i>Breast Cancer Res. Treat.</i> , vol. 181, no. 3, pp. 487–497, 2020.
32 33 34	487 488	[20]	Y. Bai <i>et al.</i> , "Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19," <i>JAMA</i> , vol. 323, no. 14, pp. 1406–1407, 2020.
35 36 37 38	489 490 491	[21]	S. Lee, P. Meyler, M. Mozel, T. Tauh, and R. Merchant, "Asymptomatic carriage and transmission of SARS-CoV-2: What do we know?," <i>Can. J. Anesth.</i> , vol. 67, no. 10, pp. 1424–1430, 2020.
39 40 41	492 493	[22]	L. Rivett <i>et al.</i> , "Screening of healthcare workers for SARS-CoV-2 highlights the role of asymptomatic carriage in COVID-19 transmission," <i>Elife</i> , vol. 9, p. e58728, 2020.
42 43 44 45	494 495 496	[23]	N. C. Grassly et al., "Report 16 : Role of testing in COIVD-19 control," https://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/bitstream/10044/1/78439/7/2020-04-23-COVID19-Report- 16.pdf; last access 14 SEptember 2021, 2020
46 47 48 49 50	497 498 499 500	[24]	M. Moehner and A. Wolik, "Analysis of the COVID-19 risk by occupational groups and industry in Germany," https://www.asu-arbeitsmedizin.com/wissenschaft/berufs-und- branchenbezogene-analyse-des-covid-19-risikos-deutschland; last access 15 September 2021, 2020
51 52 53	501 502	[25]	C. Del Rio and P. N. Malani, "COVID-19 - New Insights on a Rapidly Changing Epidemic," JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc., vol. 323, no. 14, pp. 1339–1340, 2020.
54 55 56 57	503 504 505	[26]	P. Iannone <i>et al.</i> , "The need of health policy perspective to protect Healthcare Workers during COVID-19 pandemic. A GRADE rapid review on the N95 respirators effectiveness," <i>PLoS One</i> , vol. 15, no. 6, p. e0234025, 2020.
58 59 60	506 507 508	[27]	J. Li <i>et al.,</i> "Protective efficient comparisons among all kinds of respirators and masks for health-care workers against respiratory viruses: A PRISMA-compliant network meta-analysis," <i>Med.</i> , vol. 100, no. 34, p. e27026, 2021.

1 2			
- 3 4 5	509 510	[28]	H. Ueki <i>et al.</i> , "Effectiveness of Face Masks in Preventing Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV- 2," <i>mSphere</i> , vol. 5, no. 5, pp. e00637-20, 2020.
6 7 8 9	511 512 513	[29]	L. Thornton, P. J. Batterham, D. B. Fassnacht, F. Kay-Lambkin, A. L. Calear, and S. Hunt, "Recruiting for health, medical or psychosocial research using Facebook: Systematic review," Internet Interv., vol. 4, pp. 72–81, 2016.
10 11 12 13	514 515 516	[30]	"Paul Ehrlich Institut," https://www.pei.de/DE/arzneimittel/impfstoffe/covid-19/covid-19- node.html;jsessionid=8CF8DAC1B932FAC17A5A43F47412EDB0.intranet222; last access 12 September 2021, 2021
14 15 16 17 18	517 518 519 520	[31]	"Bundesministerium für Gesundheit," https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/fileadmin/Dateien/3_Downloads/C/Coronavir us/Verordnungen/CoronaImpfV_BAnz_AT_01.04.2021_V1.pdf; last access 12 September 2021, 2021
19 20 21 22	521 522 523	[32]	"Robert Koch Institut," https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/Infekt/EpidBull/Archiv/2021/Ausgaben/05_21.pdf?blob=pu blicationFile; last access 12 September 2021, 2021
23 24	524		
25 26	525		
27	526		
28 29	527		
30 31			
32 33			
34 35			
36 37			
38 30			
40 41			
41			
43 44			
45 46			
47 48			
49 50			
51 52			
53 54			
54 55			
56 57			
58 59			
60			

How old are you? [___] years

Do you live in a stable partnership? (Yes – No)

How would you describe your home/private environment?

- Living alone (Yes No)
- Living with children under 18 years (Yes No)
- Living with older people (over 65 years) (Yes No)
- Living with my spouse/life partner (Yes No)
- others

What is your highest educational qualification?

Are/was you infected by the SARS-CoV-2-virus yourself? (Yes - No)

Is/was someone in your environment infected with the SARS-CoV-2-virus? (Yes - No)

How much, on average, did you reduce your social contact network in the last 12 months due to the covid-19-pandemic?

Not at all – a little – moderate – significant – very much

Questions about your risk of developing breast and/or ovarian cancer

To which risk group do you belong:

- I was diagnosed with a mutation in the BRCA1 or BRCA2 gene
- I was diagnosed with a different mutation (except BRCA1 or BRCA2 gene)
- I have an increased risk due to my family history, but I wasn't diagnosed with a gene mutation (yet)

Are/was you already suffering from breast and/or ovarian cancer (benign tumors excluded)

(multiple selection possible)

- no, I am not/was not previously diagnosed with invasive breast and/or ovarian cancer or the respective premalignant lesions (in situ)
- yes, I am/was diagnosed with insitu breast lesions
- yes, I am/was diagnosed with in situ ovarian/tubal lesions
- I am/was diagnosed with invasive breast cancer
- I am/was diagnosed with invasive ovarian cancer

Below we are interested in your opinion on hygiene measures in clinics during the covid-19pandemic:

BMJ Open

1. Would you have liked to be informed about hygiene protocols in advance of your appointment? (Yes - No - I don't know/does not apply)

2. Would more information about the prevailing hygiene protocols have had a positive influence on your behavior (e.g., meeting appointments)? Yes – No - I don't know/does not apply

3. Do you think that patients should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection before an ambulatory visit/appointment? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply

4. Do you think that medical personnel/physicians should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection on a regular basis? Yes – No - I don't know/does not apply

5. Do you think that appointments should be scheduled in such a way to ensure that distancing rules can be strictly observed? Yes – No - I don't know/does not apply

6. Should a relative or trustworthy person be allowed to accompany patients in the healthcare setting, despite the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No - I don't know/does not apply

7. Do you think/agree that appointments, which do not require one's physical presence (e.g., counseling appointments) should be conducted as teleconferences or video conferences during the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No - I don't know/does not apply

8. Do you think that medical personnel should at least wear an FFP-1 mask (surgical mask) during the COVID-19 pandemic? *Yes* – *No* – *I don't know/does not apply*

9. Do you think that medical personnel should always wear an FFP-2 mask masks during the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure patients' safety? Yes - no - I don't know/does not apply

STROBE Statement-	-Checklist of items	that should be included in	reports of cross-sectional studie
-------------------	---------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------

	ltem No	Recommendation	Page No			
Title and abstract	1	Patients' expectations of preventive measures of medical institutions during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in Germany in women with an increased risk for breast and ovarian cancer				
Introduction						
Background/rationale	2	During the COVID-19 pandemic, several strategies were implemented to contain the viral spread within medical institutions, in order to protect persons at higher risk for infection or severe course of the disease, such as patients with active cancers, cancer survivors or healthcare workers (HCW).	2			
Objectives	3	To identify patient-approved contingency measures for the protection of patients and healthcare workers from COVID-19 infection, and to use these findings to improve the staffs' preparedness to cope with the course of this pandemic or similar situations.	2			
Methods						
Study design	4	Cross-sectional web-based survey				
Setting	5	Web-based survey delivered by support groups of persons with increased risk for ovarian or breast cancer. 89 potential participants accessed the questionnaire. Data were collected anonymously. 80% (64/80) answered at least one question pertaining to hygiene management and expectations for preventive measures, and 20% (16/80) did not answer any questions pertaining to preventive measures related to the pandemic	8			
Participants	6	Women at increased risk for ovarian and breast cancer, irrespective if they had experienced an oncological diagnosis at the time point of the survey. All participants were aged 18 years or older. All participants gave consent to participate in the study.	5			
Variables	7	Outcomes: expectations regarding different contingency measures with respect to the COVID-19 pandemic	6			
Data sources/ measurement	8*					
Bias	9	Web-based survey, patient requirement by support groups. A recent systematic review showed that Facebook-recruited samples were similarly representative as samples recruited via traditional methods.	17			
Study size	10	All participants who responded at least one question with respect to contingency measures.	8			
Quantitative variables	11					
Statistical methods	12	(<i>a</i>) Data were analyzed using SPSS 26.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Descriptive statistics are expressed as mean, standard deviation (SD), median, interquartile range (IQR) or proportions (%), as appropriate. We used the Mann-Whitney-U-test, the χ^2 -test and the Fisher exact test to analyze the data for differences between the responders and non-responders to the survey's questions. The Mann-Whitney-U-test, χ^2 -test or Fisher exact test were used as appropriate, to compare differences of expectations according to demographic, disease-specific and pandemic-specific variables. The p-values were calculated using a 95% confidence interval. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Because the p-values were not adjusted for multiple testing, all results should be interpreted as exploratory.	7			
		(b) The significance level was set at p < 0.05 Significance between grous was assessed by.	7			

		(c) For descrip not answer th	otive analyse ne survey's c	es, missing data c questions.	onsisted of partic	ipants who die
Results						
Participants	13*	(a) 80% (64/8 management	0) answered and expect	d at least one que ations for prevent	stion pertaining t tive measures	to hygiene
		(b) Give reaso answered the	ons for non- questions	participation at ea	ach stage: partici	pants did not
Descriptive data	14*	(a)				
				Non- respondents	Respondents	p-value (Non- respondents
		Ó				group vs the Respondent group)
				Age		
		Real Port	Mean (SD)	46.64 (2.210) 47.50 (40.00-	42,85 (1.363) 43.00 (33.75-	0.1611
			Median (IQR)	54.00) (N=14)	51.25) (N=62)	
			Н	aving a stable re	lationship	
		Yes No	% of N % of N	100 (14/14)	90.6 (58/64) 9.4 (6/64)	0.2361
				Living alor		0.0.101
		Yes	% of N	100 (16/16)	90.6 (58/64)	0.340
		NO	% Of N	0 (0/16)	9.4 (6/64)	
				Living with childr	en < 18v	
		Yes	% of n/N	25.0 (4/16)	34.4 (22/64)	0.474 ²
		No	% of N	75.0 (12/16)	65.6 (42/64)	_
				Living with perso	ns >65v	
		Yes	% of N	12.5 (2/16)	6.2 (4/64)	0.3991
		No	% of N	87.5 (14/16)	93.8 (60/64)	
		Vaa	0/ 06 1	Living with a p	artner	0.0002
		No	% of N	37.5 (6/16)	39.1 (25/64)	0.909*
					, , , 	
			04 655	Education	n	
		Up to secondary level	% of N	84.6 (11/13)	48.4 (31/64)	0.017 ²
		education	0/ - 5 1	15 4 (2/42)		-
		lertiary level	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	51.6 (33/64)	

			I	
		Did yes have or		
	a(6.1.	Did you have CC	DVID-19	0.1001
Yes	% of N	0 (0/13)	4.7 (3/64)	0.429 ¹
No	% of N	100 (13/13)	95.3 (61/64)	
So	omeone in y	our social netwo	ork has had COVI	D-19
Yes	% of N	23.1 (3/13)	28.6 (18/63)	0.687 ²
No	% of N	76.9 (10/13)	71.4 (45/63)	
	R	eduction of socia	l network	
Madavata	0/ of N	15 4 (2/12)	15 C (10/CA)	0.0022
reduction	% OF N	15.4 (2/13)	15.6 (10/64)	0.9832
Large reduction	% of N	84.6 (11/13)	84.4 (54/64)	
	R	isk profiling for C	DC and BC	
BRCA 1 & 2	% of N	76.9 (10/13)	70.3 (45/64)	0.895 ³
Mutations other than	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	14.10 (9/64)	
BRCA 1 & 2				
Positive family	% of N	7.7 (1/13)	15.6 (10/64)	
history for				
BC or OC				
ŀ	laving a hist	tory of (in situ or	invasive) OC and	BC
Yes	% of N	73.3 (11/15)	64.1 (41/64)	0.496 ²
No	% of N	26.7 (4/15)	35.9 (23/64)	
	<u> </u>			
	Hav	ving a history of	invasive BC	0 0 - 2
Yes	% of N	60 (9/15)	56.20 (36/64)	0.792 ²
No	% of N	40 (6/15)	43.80 (28/64)	
	Hav	/ing a history of i	invasive OC	
Yes	% of N	6.7 (1/15)	1.6 (1/64)	0.260 ¹
No	% of N	93.3 (14/15)	98.4 (63/64)	
b)				
0) Ouestions		Ves	No	I don't
QUESCIUIS		in % of respondents (n/N)	in % of respondents (n/N)	know/doe not apply in % of
				responder (n/N)
Would you h	ave liked to	37.5%	37.5%	25.0%
be informed	about	(24/64)	(24/64)	(16/64)
hygiene prot	ocols in			
advance of y	our			
appointment	t?			
Would more	information	n 20.3%	31.3%	48.4%
about the pr	evailing	(13/64)	(20/64)	(31/64)
hygiene prot	ocols have			

1							
2			had a positive influence				
3			on your behavior (e.g.,				
4			meeting appointments)?				
5			Do you think that patients	57.8%	26.6%	15.6%	
6			should be tested for	(37/64)	(17/64)	(10/64)	
7			SARS-CoV-2 infection		(,,	(,,	
8			before an ambulatory				
9			visit/appointment?				
10			Do you think that madical	05.29/	1 60/	2 10/	
11			Do you think that medical	95.3%	1.0%	3.1%	
12			personnel/physicians	(61/64)	(1/64)	(2/64)	
12			should be tested for				
13			SARS-CoV-2 infection on a				
14			regular basis?				
15			Do you think that	93.8%	1.6%	4.7%	
16			appointments should be	(60/64)	(1/64)	(3/64)	
17			scheduled in such a way				
18			to ensure that distancing				
19			rules can be strictly				
20			observed?				
21			Should a relative or	75.0%	15.6%	0.4%	
22			Should a relative of	15.0%	15.0%	9.4%	
23			trustworthy person be	(48/64)	(10/64)	(6/64)	
24			allowed to accompany				
25			patients in the healthcare				
26			setting, despite the				
27			COVID-19 pandemic?				
28			Do you think/agree that	71.9%	21.9%	6.3%	
29			appointments, which do	(46/64)	(14/64)	(4/64)	
30			not require one's physical				
21			presence (e.g., counseling				
21			appointments) should be				
32			conducted as				
33			teleconferences or video				
34			telecontenences of video				
35			conferences during the				
36			COVID-19 pandemic?				
37			Do you think that medical	84.4%	7.8%	7.8%	
38			personnel should at least	(54/64)	(5/64)	(5/64)	
39			wear an FFP-1 mask				
40			(surgical mask) during the				
41			COVID-19 pandemic?				
42			Do you think that medical	68.8%	18.8%	12.5%	
43			personnel should always	(44/64)	(12/64)	(8/64)	
44			wear an FEP-2 mask		(
45			masks during the COVID-				
46			10 pandamis to apsure				
47			13 participate contents				
-17 48	Outron Lit	A F 4	patients salety:		the second se		
40	Outcome data	15*	1. Would you have liked to b	e informed abou	ut hygiene prot	ocols in advance	6
49			of your appointment? (Yes –	No – I don't kno	w/does not app	oly)	
50			2. Would more information a	bout the prevai	ling hygiene pro	otocols have had	
51			a positive influence on your b	ehavior (e.g., m	eeting appointr	ments)? <i>Yes – No</i>	
52			– I don't know/does not appl	У			
53			3. Do you think that patien	nts should be te	ested for SARS	-CoV-2 infection	
54			before an ambulatory visit/a	ppointment? Ye	s – No – I don'	t know/does not	
55			apply				
			A Do you think that medical	oersonnel/nhvsi	cians should be	tested for SARS-	
56			4 . D() V()() [1111] K 111/3. 111/2. 111/3.		Stario Should DC	COLORION DENID	
56 57			CoV-2 infection on a regular	hasis? Yes – No -	- I don't know/	does not annly	
56 57 58			CoV-2 infection on a regular	basis? Yes – No -	-Idon't know/d	does not apply	
56 57 58 59			CoV-2 infection on a regular 5. Do you think that appoin	basis? <i>Yes – No</i> - tments should	- I don't know/d be scheduled in	does not apply n such a way to	
56 57 58 59 60			CoV-2 infection on a regular 5. Do you think that appoin ensure that distancing rules	basis? Yes – No - tments should can be strictly	- <i>I don't know/d</i> be scheduled in observed? <i>Yes</i>	does not apply n such a way to 5 – No – I don't	

		6. Should a re	lative or tru	stworthy person	be allowed to acc	company patie		
		in the healtho	in the healthcare setting, despite the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No – I don know/does not apply					
		7. Do you thin	k/agree that	t appointments, v	vhich do not requ	ire one's physi		
		presence (e	presence (e.g., counseling appointments) should be conducted					
		$N_0 - I don't k$.es or video now/does ni	of annly	ng the covid-19	pandemic: re		
		8. Do you thi	8. Do you think that medical personnel should at least wear an FFP-1 mag					
		(surgical masl	k) during the	COVID-19 pande	emic? Yes – No – I	don't know/do		
		not apply						
		9. Do you thi	nk that med	lical personnel si	nould always wea	ar an FFP-2 ma		
		don't know/d	loes not appl	ly pandemic to e	nsure patients sa	alety? res – no		
	10	(-)						
Main results	16	(a)						
				Non-	Respondents	p-value		
				respondents		(Non-		
						group vs the		
						Respondent		
						group)		
				Age				
			Mean	46.64 (2.210)	42,85 (1.363)	0.1611		
			(SD) Median	47.50 (40.00- 54.00) (N-14)	43.00 (33.75- 51.25) (N-62)			
			(IQR)	54.00) (N-14)	51.25) (N-02)			
		Voc	H V of N	aving a stable re	lationship	0.2261		
		No	% of N	0(0(14))	90.0 (58/64)	0.230		
			70 UT IN	0 (0/14)	9.4 (0/04)			
				Living alor	le l			
		Yes	% of N	100 (16/16)	90.6 (58/64)	0.3401		
		No	% of N	0 (0/16)	9.4 (6/64)			
				Living with childr	en < 18y			
			0/ - f	25.0 (4/16)	24.4 (22.45.4)	0 4742		
		res	% OT	25.0 (4/16)	34.4 (22/64)	0.4742		
		No	% of N	75.0 (12/16)	65.6 (42/64)	-		
				/ 510 (12/10/				
				Living with perso	ons >65y			
		Yes	% of N	12.5 (2/16)	6.2 (4/64)	0.399 ¹		
		No	% of N	87.5 (14/16)	93.8 (60/64)	-		
				Living with a p	artner	1		
		Yes	% of N	62.5 (10/16)	60.9 (39/64)	0.909 ²		
		No	% of N	37.5 (6/16)	39.1 (25/64)	1		
				Educatio	n			
		Up to	% of N	84.6 (11/13)	48.4 (31/64)	0.017 ²		
		secondary						
		level						
		equication	1	1	1	1		

Tertiary	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	51.6 (33/64)				
level							
education							
	Did you have COVID-19						
Yes	% of N	0 (0/13)	4.7 (3/64)	0.429 ¹			
No	% of N	100 (13/13)	95.3 (61/64)				
Sc	omeone in y	our social netwo	rk has had COVI	D-19			
Yes	% of N	23.1 (3/13)	28.6 (18/63)	0.687 ²			
No	% of N	76.9 (10/13)	71.4 (45/63)				
		(10/10/					
	<u> </u>	eduction of social	l network				
	ĸ		network				
	0/ - f N	15 4 (2/42)		0.0003			
Noderate	% OT N	15.4 (2/13)	15.6 (10/64)	0.9834			
reduction	% of N	Q4 C (11 /12)	QA A (EA (CA)				
Large	% OT N	δ4.0 (11/13)	84.4 (54/64)				
reduction							
		iak anafiliaa faa C					
				0.00=2			
BRCA 1 & 2	% Of N	/6.9 (10/13)	/0.3 (45/64)	0.895°			
Mutations	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	14.10 (9/64)				
other than							
BKCA 1 & 2	0/ of N	77(1/12)	15 6 (10/64)				
family	70 UT IN	/./ (1/13)	15.0 (10/64)				
history for							
BC or OC							
	Laving a hist	tory of (in city or	invasiva) OC and	BC			
	aving d 111St	ory or (in situ or	invasivej UC ana				
Voc	0/ of N	72 2 (11 /15)	64 1 (41 (64)	0.4062			
res		/3.3 (11/15)	04.1 (41/64)	0.496			
No	% Of N	26.7 (4/15)	35.9 (23/64)				
		·					
	Hav	ving a history of i	nvasive BC				
Yes	% of N	60 (9/15)	56.20 (36/64)	0.792 ²			
No	% of N	40 (6/15)	43.80 (28/64)				
	Having a history of invasive OC						
Yes	% of N	6.7 (1/15)	1.6 (1/64)	0.260 ¹			
No	% of N	93.3 (14/15)	98.4 (63/64)				
L	<u> </u>	I	I				
Questions		Yes	No	l don't			
		in % of	in % of	know/does			
		respondents	respondents	not apply			
		(n/N)	(n/N)	in % of			
				respondents			
				(n/N)			
Would you h	ave liked to	37.5%	37.5%	(n/N) 25.0%			
Would you h be informed	ave liked to about	37.5% (24/64)	37.5% (24/64)	(n/N) 25.0% (16/64)			

		advance of vour			
		appointment?			
		Would more information	20.3%	31.3%	48.4%
		about the prevailing	(13/64)	(20/64)	(31/64)
		hygiene protocols have	(10) 0 1)	(_0, 0 .)	(0 _) 0 .)
		had a positive influence			
		on vour behavior (e.g.,			
		meeting appointments)?			
		Do you think that natients	57.8%	26.6%	15.6%
		should be tested for	(37/64)	(17/64)	(10/64)
		SABS-CoV-2 infection		(17704)	(10/04)
		before an ambulatory			
		visit/appointment?			
		Do you think that medical	95.3%	1.6%	3.1%
		personnel/physicians	(61/64)	(1/64)	(2/64)
		should be tested for		(1)04)	(2/04)
		SARS-CoV-2 infection on a			
		regular basis?			
		Do you think that	93.8%	1.6%	4 7%
		appointments should be	(60/64)	(1/64)	(3/64)
		scheduled in such a way		(1)04)	
		to ensure that distancing			
		rules can be strictly			
		observed?			
		Should a relative or	75.0%	15.6%	9.4%
		trustworthy nerson he	(48/64)	(10/64)	(6/64)
		allowed to accompany		(10/04)	
		patients in the healthcare			
		setting despite the			
		COVID-19 nandemic?			
		Do you think/agree that	71 9%	21.9%	6.3%
		annointments which do	(46/64)	(14/64)	(4/64)
		not require one's nhysical		(14/04)	(+) (+)
		nresence (e.g. counseling			
		appointments) should be			
		conducted as			
		teleconferences or video			
		conferences during the			
		COVID-19 nandemic?			
		Do you think that medical	84 4%	7.8%	7.8%
		nersonnel should at least	(54/64)	(5/64)	(5/64)
		wear an FFD-1 mack		(3) 04)	
		(surgical mask) during the			
		COVID-19 nandemic?			
		Do you think that medical	68.8%	18.8%	12 5%
		personnel should always	(44/64)	(12/64)	(8/6/)
		wear an FFD_2 mack	(++)(+)	(12/04)	
		masks during the COVID-			
		19 nandemic to ensure			
		natients' safety?			
			1		
Other analyses	17	No other analyses			
	±/				
Discussion	4.0	1 77 50/ - 5 1	nanta in di t		te he inf
" ou roculto	18	1. 37.5% of the partici	pants in this st	uay preferred	to be informe
Key results					· ·
Interpretation					

Interpretation					
Limitations					

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

ي. //www.pide

BMJ Open

Patients' expectations of preventive measures of medical institutions during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in Germany in women with an increased risk for breast and ovarian cancer: A cross-sectional web-based survey

Journal:	BMJ Open	
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-060038.R1	
Article Type:	Original research	
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-Apr-2022	
Complete List of Authors:	Schwab, Roxana; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology Droste, Annika; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics Stewen, Kathrin; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics Brenner, Walburgis; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics Schmidt, Marcus; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics Schmidt, Marcus; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics Hasenburg, Annette; Johannes Gutenberg University Hospital Mainz, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics	
Primary Subject Heading :	Obstetrics and gynaecology	
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health policy, Public health	
Keywords:	COVID-19, Health policy < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Breast tumours < ONCOLOGY, Gynaecological oncology < ONCOLOGY	
	•	

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

2 3		
4		Title
5 6	1	
7	2	2 nandemic in Germany in women with an increased risk for breast and ovarian cancer: A
o 9	4	cross-sectional web-based survey
10	-	·
11 12	5	
13	6	Roxana Schwab ¹ , Annika Droste ¹ , Kathrin Stewen ¹ , Walburgis Brenner ¹ , Marcus Schmidt ¹ ,
14 15	7	Annette Hasenburg ¹
16	8	
17	٥	1 University Medical Center Mainz Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics
18 19	10	Langenbeckstraße 1. D-55131 Mainz, Germany
20	11	
22	11	
23 24	12	Corresponding author:
25	13	Roxana Schwab, MD
20	14	University Medical Center Mainz,
28 29	15	Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics,
30 31	16	Langenbeckstraße 1, D-55131 Mainz, Germany
32 33	17	Tel.:+49 6131 170
34 35	18	Fax.Number: +49 6131 5692
36 37	19	e-mail: roxana.schwab@unimedizin-mainz.de
38 39	20	
40	21	
41 42	22	
43		
44 45	23	Keywords:
46	24	COVID-19, Health policy, Organisation of health services, Breast tumors, Gynecologic oncology
47 48		
49		
50 51	25	Word number (body text):
52	26	4341 words
53 54		
55	27	
56 57	28	
58 59	29	
60	30	
	50	1

 BMJ Open

5	32	
0 7	33	
8 9	34	
10 11	35	
12 13	36	
14 15	37	
16	20	Abstract
17 18 10	38	Abstract
20		
21 22	39	Objectives: To identify patient-approved contingency measures for the protection of
23		
24 25	40	patients and healthcare workers from COVID-19 infection, and to use these findings to
26 27	41	improve the staffs' preparedness to cope with the course of this pandemic or similar
28	42	
29 30	42	situations.
31 32		
33	43	Methods (design, setting, participants, interventions):
34 35		
36 37	44	We conducted a cross-sectional web-based survey of women with an increased risk for breast
38		
39 40	45	or ovarian cancer, regardless of whether they had experienced an active malignant disease
41 42	46	during the pandemic. A self-reported questionnaire, developed for this study, was used to
43 44	47	assess expectations and opinions about preventive measures within medical institutions.
45		
40 47	48	Results: Sixty-four (71.9%) of the 89 potential participants responded to at least one
48 49	10	
50 51	49	question regarding contingency measures within medical institutions. Approximately 37% of
52		
53 54	50	respondents preferred having information about their facility's hygiene protocols before
55 56	51	appointment; 57.8% of respondents endorsed regular SARS-CoV-2 testing of patients prior to
57 58	50	modical appointments and QE 2% and aread regular testing of healthcare workers (HCW)
59	52	medical appointments and 55.5% endorsed regular testing of nearthcare workers (HCW).
60	53	Additionally, 84.4% of respondents supported HCW's use of surgical masks and 68.8%

> supported HCW's use of masks with greater protection. Notably, 75.0% of respondents advocated for the presence of a significant other during medical consultations; 71.9% approved the use of telemedicine and 93.8% endorsed changes in appointment practices to enable social distancing. No significant associations were found between respondents' sociodemographic, disease-specific or pandemic-specific factors and their opinions on hygiene precautions.

Conclusions:

Patients at high risk for infection or severe course of COVID-19 disease approve strict contingency measures designed to lower the transmission of COVID-19 in medical facilities. Moreover, vulnerable groups may profit from contingency plans in healthcare facilities in order to follow preventive measures, avoid diagnostic delay or avoid worsening of preexisting ıŕa conditions. However, they also value the presence of a significant other during medical consultations and procedures.

Article Summary

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Due to the design of the study (cross-sectional web-based survey), overrepresentation of patients worrying about their health status and the underrepresentation of women without online access are two possible sources of bias.
- As the study was conducted during the first months of 2021, and vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 were inaccessible for a large proportion of the population at that time, we

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

85

1 2

3	
4	
5	
6 7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
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	

do not know whether the responses accurately depict the current state of the pandemic.

• Our study identified several patient-approved contingency measures for the protection of patients and healthcare workers from COVID-19 infection, which are essential in terms to improve the staffs' preparedness to cope with the course of this pandemic or similar situations.

84 Introduction

By the end of 2019, the novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which causes coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19), was first reported in China before spreading rapidly to other countries by the beginning of 2020. The World Health Organization (WHO) declared the outbreak a "public health emergency of international concern" on January 30, 2020 and a pandemic on March 11, 2020 [1].

Vulnerable groups, such as the aged population or patients with active cancers seem to have 91 a greater risk for acquiring SARS-CoV-2 infection, and severe COVID-19, requiring admission 92 93 to intensive care units and invasive ventilation. Moreover, older persons and patients with pre-existing malignant diseases have a significantly higher risk for fatal outcomes compared 94 95 to people in the general population without pre-existing medical conditions [2]. In order to 96 protect this vulnerable population from possible infection, it is crucial to implement effective contingency plans in healthcare facilities, such as in ambulatory healthcare services, hospitals 97 98 or nursing homes [3]. As a pandemic is a dynamic process, measures were implemented at

> various time points by different countries to prevent the spread of infection among the population and to protect persons at high risk for exposure, such as HCW. In Germany, the first widespread social distancing measures were implemented by the government at the end of March 2020 [1], [4]. As a result, healthcare facilities imposed specific safety protocols, general visitation guidelines and outpatient visitation policies in accordance with national and institutional regulations [3]. Subsequently, family members and visitors were temporarily banned from joining ambulatory and hospitalized patients, with few exceptions, depending on the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Persons with hereditary cancers, such as women at high risk for breast and ovarian cancer, require regular medical appointments. Women with mutations in breast cancer genes 1 and 2 (BRCA 1 & 2) have a cumulative risk of up to 75% by 80 years of age for developing breast cancer and a cumulative risk of up to 44% by the age of 80 for developing ovarian cancer [5]. Even if they do not undergo active cancer treatment or follow-up care, this group of patients requires regular medical monitoring and risk-reducing surgical interventions to prevent and detect a malignant disease at early stage [6].

114 Aim of the study

Vulnerable groups are on one hand dependent on a reliable and functioning health-care system, and on the other they are at increased risk for adverse medical outcomes related to a SARS-CoV-2 infection. To our knowledge, this is the first study to assess and identify patientoriented and patient-approved contingency measures in persons at an increased risk for breast and ovarian cancer. Additionally, to improve preparedness for future pandemics or similar situations, it is crucial to identify if specific demographic or disease-specific factors influence the decision-making process regarding the prevention of SARS-CoV-2 transmission.

1 2 3 4 5	122	Materials and Methods
7 8 9	123	Study participants
) 10 11	124	The target population was made up of approximately 1300 German-speaking persons at
12 13	125	increased risk for breast and ovarian cancer being subscribed (actively or passively) at an
14 15 16	126	internet platform of patients support groups for hereditary breast cancer or ovarian cancer
17 18	127	during the period of recruitment. Recruitment was conducted via a direct link to the survey
19 20 21	128	and an online invitation to participate distributed via the internet platforms of patients
22 23	129	support groups. The survey was limited to individuals visiting the website who were aged 18
24 25	130	years or older and who gave electronic informed consent to participate in the study. The
26 27 28	131	survey was completely anonymous to encourage honest and unbiased responses. Participants
29 30	132	received no incentives for completion of the survey. Due to the recruitment method used in
31 32 22	133	this study it was not possible to calculate response rates, nevertheless we expected for this
34 35	134	descriptive survey approximately 100 participants. Power analyses were conducted using
36 37	135	PROC POWER, SAS Version 9.4 for estimation of confidence interval (power >99.9%;
38 39 40 41	136	proportions 0.65-0.90; half-width confidence interval 0.10).
41 42 43	137	Data collection and measures
44 45	138	The survey was active from 29 th January to 22th February 2021. A questionnaire targeting the
46 47	139	expectations and needs of persons with respect to hygiene measures related to the COVID-19
48 49 50	140	pandemic was developed based on a review of relevant literature [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12],
51 52	141	[13], [14], [15], [16] [17]. The data was collected anonymously, and they included participants'
53 54 55	142	self-reported sociodemographic and clinical information. The expectations and opinions of the
55 56 57	143	women with respect to the safety precautions of healthcare facilities and institutions for
58 59 60	144	preventing the spread of the virus were assessed were assessed using the following questions:

2	
3	1
4 5	
6	1
7 8	
9	1
10	
12	1
13	1
14 15	-
16	1
17 18	T
19	1
20 21	
22	1
23 24	-
25	1
26 27	
27	1
29	
30 31	1
32	
33 34	1
35	
36 27	1
38	
39	1
40 41	4
42	T
43 44	1
45	
46 47	1
48	-
49 50	1
50	
52	1
53 54	1
55	T
56 57	1
58	1
59	

1

45 1. Would you have liked to be informed about hygiene protocols in advance of your appointment? (Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply) 46 .47 2. Would more information about the prevailing hygiene protocols have had a positive influence on your behavior (e.g., meeting appointments)? Yes - No - I don't know/does not.48 apply 49 3. Do you think that patients should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection before an ambulatory 50 51 visit/appointment? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply 4. Do you think that medical personnel/physicians should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection 52 53 on a regular basis? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply .54 5. Do you think that appointments should be scheduled in such a way to ensure that distancing rules can be strictly observed? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply 55 6. Should a relative or a close person be allowed to accompany patients in the healthcare 56 setting, despite the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply 57 7. Do you think/agree that appointments, which do not require one's physical presence (e.g., 58 counseling appointments) should be conducted as teleconferences or video conferences 59 60 during the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply 61 8. Do you think that medical personnel should at least wear an FFP-1 mask (surgical mask) during the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply 62 .63 9. Do you think that medical personnel should always wear an FFP-2 mask masks during the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure patients' safety? Yes – no – I don't know/does not apply .64 A full copy of the questions which were considered for the present evaluation can be found in 65 the supplement file 1 (Supplement_file_1). 66

167

60

1 2		
3	168	Patient and public involvement
4 5	169	No patient involved. Patients support groups for hereditary breast cancer or ovarian cancer
6 7 8	170	supported the survey by distribution of the link via their internet platforms.
9	171	
10 11	172	Statistics
12 13	173	For descriptive analyses, missing data consisted of participants who did not answer the
14 15 16	174	survey's questions. Data were analyzed using SPSS 26.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).
17 18	175	Descriptive statistics are expressed as mean, standard deviation (SD), median, interquartile
19 20 21	176	range (IQR) or proportions (%), as appropriate. We used the Mann-Whitney-U-test, the χ^2 -test
22 23	177	and the Fisher exact test to analyze the data for differences between the responders and non-
24 25 26	178	responders to the survey's questions [18].
27 28 29	179	The Mann-Whitney-U-test (used for continuous variables), χ^2 -test (used for categorical
30 31	180	variables) or Fisher exact test (used for categorical variables) were used as appropriate, to
32 33 34	181	compare differences of expectations according to demographic, disease-specific and
35 36	182	pandemic-specific variables [18]. The p-values were calculated using a 95% confidence
37 38 30	183	interval. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Because the p-values were
40 41 42	184	not adjusted for multiple testing, all results should be interpreted as exploratory.
43 44	185	Ethics approval
45 46 47	186	This study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and adhered to the
48 49	187	principles of best clinical practices. Prior to the data collection, all patients gave their informed
50 51 52	188	consent, allowing us to collect the data and publish the results. The participants' privacy and
53 54 55	189	confidentiality were guaranteed following German and European laws and regulations.
56 57	190	This survey was approved by the ethical review board of the medical association of Rhineland-
58 59 60	191	Palatinate (approval number 15612).

Results

193 Demographic characteristics of the study group

Although 89 potential participants accessed the questionnaire ("clicks"), 11% (9/89) did not answer any of the questions; 80% (64/80) answered at least one question pertaining to hygiene management and expectations for preventive measures, and 20% (16/80) did not answer any questions pertaining to preventive measures related to the pandemic. To understand the differences between respondents and non-respondents, we analyzed the demographic, pandemic-specific and clinical characteristics of both groups (Table 1). No significant differences were found between the two groups regarding demographic, pandemic-specific or clinical variables, except for a higher educational level of the respondents compared to non-respondents.

Table 1: Demographic and clinical characteristics of the total study sample

		Non-respondents	Respondents	p-value (Non- respondents group vs the Respondents group)
		Age		
	Mean (SD)	46.64 (2.210)	42,85 (1.363)	0.1611
	Median (IQR)	47.50 (40.00-54.00)	43.00 (33.75-51.25)	
		(N=14)	(N=62)	
		Having a stable relation	nship	
Yes	% of N	100 (14/14)	90.6 (58/64)	0.236 ¹
No	% of N	0 (0/14)	9.4 (6/64)	
		Living alone		
Yes	% of N	100 (16/16)	90.6 (58/64)	0.340 ¹
No	% of N	0 (0/16)	9.4 (6/64)	
		Living with children <	18y	
Yes	% of n/N	25.0 (4/16)	34.4 (22/64)	0.474 ²

No	% of N	75.0 (12/16)	65.6 (42/64)		
		Living with persons >6	55у		
Yes	% of N	12.5 (2/16)	6.2 (4/64)	0.399 ¹	
No	% of N	87.5 (14/16)	93.8 (60/64)		
		Living with a partne	r		
Yes	% of N 62.5 (10/16) 60.9 (39/64)		0.909 ²		
No	% of N	37.5 (6/16)	39.1 (25/64)		
		Education			
Up to secondary level education	% of N	84.6 (11/13)	48.4 (31/64)	0.017 ²	
Tertiary level education	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	51.6 (33/64)		
		Did you have COVID-	19		
Yes	% of N	0 (0/13)	4.7 (3/64)	0.429 ¹	
No	% of N	100 (13/13)	95.3 (61/64)		
	Somoono in 1	your cocial notwork ba	a had COVID 10		
	Someone in	your social network ha			
Yes	% of N	23.1 (3/13)	28.6 (18/63)	0.687 ²	
No	% of N	76.9 (10/13)	71.4 (45/63)		
	R	eduction of social netv	work		
Moderate	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	15.6 (10/64)	0.983 ²	
Large reduction	% of N	84.6 (11/13)	84.4 (54/64)		
		(,,			
	R	isk profiling for OC an	d BC		
BRCA 1 & 2	% of N	76.9 (10/13)	70.3 (45/64)	0.895 ³	
Mutations other	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	14.10 (9/64)		
than BRCA 1 & 2					
Positive family history for BC or OC	% of N	7.7 (1/13)	15.6 (10/64)		
	Having a his	tory of (in situ or invas	sive) OC and BC		
~		70.0 (4 ((-)		0.000	
res	% OT N	/3.3 (11/15)	64.1 (41/64)	0.496 ²	
INO	% UI N	20.7 (4/15)	35.9 (23/64)		
	Ha	ving a history of invasi	ive BC		
Yes	% of N	60 (9/15)	56.20 (36/64)	0.792 ²	
No	% of N	40 (6/15)	43.80 (28/64)		
	Ha	ving a history of invasi	ve OC		
Yes	% of N	6.7 (1/15)	1.6 (1/64)	0.260 ¹	
No	% of N	93.3 (14/15)	98.4 (63/64)		

04 05 06 07	N = total number of women who answered the question, n = number of respondents to the specific answer, SD = standard deviation, y = years, BRCA 1 & 2 = breast cancer genes 1 and 2, BC = breast cancer, OC = ovarian cancer; Values in bold indicate statistical significance, as the level of significance was set to $p < 0.05$ (1 = Mann Whitney II test; $^{2} = y^{2}$ test; 2 sided; $^{3} =$ Fisher exact test; 2 sided)			
07	was set to $p < 0.05$ (* = Mann-Whitney-U-test; * = χ *-test, Z-sided; * = Fisher exact test, Z-sided).			
00	Original shout provertive measures			
09	Opinions about preventive measures			
10	Approximately 37.5% of the respondents would have preferred to be informed about their			
11	facility's specific hygiene protocols prior to their appointment, an equal proportion did not			
12	care to be informed and a slightly smaller proportion had no opinion on this topic (Table 2).			
13	Only 20.3% of the respondents indicated that being informed about hygiene protocols would			
14	have changed their behavior, whereas the majority of respondents either had no opinion or			
15	denied any possible influence of the information on their behavior (Table 2).			
16	The majority of respondents endorsed regular testing of patients for SARS-CoV-2 prior to visits			
17	to healthcare facilities. However, a much larger proportion of respondents supported the			
18	regularly testing of HCW (Table 2).			
19	The proportion of respondents that endorsed changes in appointment practices to enable			
20	social distancing in medical institutions and waiting wards was also quite high. Despite social			
21	distancing requirements for visitors in medical institutions, the vast majority of respondents			
22	(75.0%) supported the possibility of being accompanied by a significant other during medical			
23	consultations, and 71.9% approved the implementation of telemedicine while 21.9%			
24	disapproved this option (Table 2).			
25	With regard to wearing protective gear, a relatively high proportion of respondents (84.4%)			
26	agreed that HCW should wear surgical masks (not cloth masks) to stop the spread of SARS-			
27	CoV-2, compared to the much smaller proportions who did not consider surgical masks to be			
28	necessary or had no opinion on the topic. Fewer respondents (66.8%) agreed that HCW wear			
	04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28			

Yes

No

l don't

masks with a higher level of protection (i.e., the FFP-2 mask), while more respondents disagreed and others had no opinion (Table 2). Table 2: Participants' opinions and expectations of hygiene measures during the COVID-19 pandemic Questions

	in % of respondents (n/N)	in % of respondents (n/N)	know/does not apply in % of respondents (n/N)
Would you have liked to be informed about hygiene protocols in advance of your	37.5% (24/64)	37.5% (24/64)	25.0% (16/64)
Would more information about the prevailing hygiene protocols have had a positive influence on your behavior (e.g., meeting appointments)?	20.3% (13/64)	31.3% (20/64)	48.4% (31/64)
Do you think that patients should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection before an ambulatory visit/appointment?	57.8% (37/64)	26.6% (17/64)	15.6% (10/64)
Do you think that medical personnel/physicians should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection on a regular basis?	95.3% (61/64)	1.6% (1/64)	3.1% (2/64)
Do you think that appointments should be scheduled in such a way to ensure that distancing rules can be strictly observed?	93.8% (60/64)	1.6% (1/64)	4.7% (3/64)
Should a relative or a close person be allowed to accompany patients in the healthcare setting, despite the COVID-19 pandemic?	75.0% (48/64)	15.6% (10/64)	9.4% (6/64)
Do you think/agree that appointments, which do not require one's physical presence (e.g., counseling appointments) should be conducted as teleconferences or video conferences during the COVID-19 pandemic?	71.9% (46/64)	21.9% (14/64)	6.3% (4/64)
Do you think that medical personnel should at least wear an FFP-1 mask (surgical mask) during the COVID-19 pandemic?	84.4% (54/64)	7.8% (5/64)	7.8% (5/64)
Do you think that medical personnel should always wear an FFP-2 mask masks during the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure patients' safety?	68.8% (44/64)	18.8% (12/64)	12.5% (8/64)

Page 14 of 37

5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
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	

246

1 2 3

4

N = total number of women who answered the question, n = number of respondents to the specificanswer

Factors influencing decision making related to hygiene practices during the pandemic We examined group differences using the Mann-Whitney-U-test to identify subsets of patients with similar expectations and assess differences between those who had definite opinions of the facilities' hygiene management during the pandemic and answered "yes" (vs "no") to the questions and their counterparts. Missing data included all participants who did not answer the relevant question or did not have a definite opinion of the topic ("do not know/does not apply").

None of the demographic, pandemic-specific or disease-specific factors were found to have a
significant influence on the respondents' opinions with respect to the hygiene measures
implemented during the pandemic (all p-values > 0.05) (Table 3).

Table 3: Influence of demographic, disease-specific and pandemic-specific factors on
 expectations regarding the prevention of SARS-CoV-2 transmission

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Age	0.441 ¹	0.373	0.316	0.100	0.102	0.487	0.263	0.729	0.821
		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Stable partnership	0.999 ³	0.508	0.645	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.368	0.999
(no vs yes)		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Living alone (yes vs	0.348 ³	0.508	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.577	0.133	0.999	0.567
no)		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Living with children	0.104 ²	0.676	0.537	0.999	0.999	0.784	0.179	0.646	1.846
(yes vs no)		3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
Living with an elderly	0.999 ³	0.508	0.296	0.999	0.999	0.541	0.999	0.999	0.999
person (yes vs no)		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Living with a partner	0.233 ²	0.208	0.824	0.999	0.999	0.922	0.098	0.999	0.962
(yes vs no)		2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
Tertiary level	0.558 ²	0.717	0.793	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.542	0.999	0.244
education (yes vs		3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2
no)									

3 ⊿		Having had COVID	0.999 ³	0.547	0.535	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.556	0.999	0.522
5		(yes vs no)		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
6		Someone in their	0.123 ²	0.648	0.596	0.999	0.999	0.551	0.982	0.308	0.096
/ 8		social network		3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
9		having COVID (ves									
10		vs no)									
11 12		Poduction of appial	0.0003	0.260	0.512	0.000	0.000	0 000	0.442	0.577	0.622
13			0.999*	0.300	0.512	0.999	0.999	0.000	0.442	0.577	0.022
14		contact (serious and		5	2	5	3	2	2	3	2
15 16		very serious									
17		reduction vs low									
18		reduction)									
19 20		Risk profiling for OC	0.578 ³	0.604	0.263	0.129	0.295	0.744	0.793	0.450	0.452
20		and BC (-/+ family		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
22 23		history but no									
24		mutation vs BRCA1									
25		& 2 vs a mutation									
26 27		other than BRCA)									
28		Having a history of in	0.768 ²	0.930	0.836	0.999	0.999	0.163	0.179	0.999	0.185
29 30		situ or invasive BC		2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
31		or OC (yes vs no)									
32 33		History of invasive	0.999 ³	0.353	0.887	0.999	0.999	0.249	0.383	0.639	0.573
34		BC (yes vs no)		2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
35 36		History of invasive	0.999 ³	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999
37		OC (yes vs no)		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
38 39	249	1- Would you have like	d to be ir	nformed a	about hy	giene pro	tocols in	advance	e of your	appointm	nent?, 2-
40	250	Would more information	n about tl	he preva	iling hygi	ene proto	ocols hav	ve had a	positive	influence	on your
41 42	251	behavior (e.g., meeting	appointm	nents)?, 3	3- Do you	ı think tha	at patient	ts should	be teste	d for SAF	RS-CoV-
43	252	2 infection before an an	nbulatory	visit/app	ointment	?, 4- Do <u>:</u>	you think	that me	dical pers	sonnel/ph	nysicians
44 45	253	should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection on a regular basis?, 5- Do you think that appointments									

should be scheduled in such a way to ensure that distancing rules can be strictly observed? 6- Should a relative or a close person be allowed to accompany patients in the healthcare setting, despite the COVID-19 pandemic? 7- Do you think/agree that appointments, which do not require one's physical presence (e.g., counseling appointments) should be conducted as teleconferences or video conferences during the COVID-19 pandemic? 8- Do you think that medical personnel should at least wear an FFP-1 mask (surgical mask) during the COVID-19 pandemic? 9- Do you think that medical personnel should always wear an FFP-2 mask masks during the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure patients' safety?; vs = versus, BC = breast cancer, OC = ovarian cancer. The significance level was set at p < 0.05 (1 = Mann-Whitney-U-test; 2 = χ^{2} -test, 2-sided; 3 = Fisher exact test, 2-sided).

264 Discussion

Our analysis provides a descriptive analysis of participants' expectations for preventive healthcare measures in medical institutions during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in Germany. During a pandemic, the implementation of strict contingency plans in medical institutions is vital. In the beginning of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, in January 2020, 41% of the novel infections seemed to be hospital acquired [19], fueling the spread of the virus among the wider population. Viral transmission to patients in healthcare facilities will affect the population with a higher incidence of pre-existing medical conditions, and thus, with a higher risk for a severe course of the disease [20]. Additionally, infection among HCW could lead to shortages of qualified personnel to care for the patients, bringing the healthcare system to the brink of decompensation. Thus, adequate and effective protection of both patients and HCW are of paramount importance [21].

Persons, including patients with pre-existing medical conditions might be very sensitive to the proper adherence to contingency plans in medical institutions. This is understandable because the risks for severe and fatal COVID-19 is higher in the aged population and in persons with comorbidities [7], [20], [22]. One study found that patients with cancer were 10-fold more susceptible to acquiring nosocomial infections with the SARS-CoV-2 virus than were patients without cancer [7]. The observed 49% reduction in outpatient appointments for breast-cancer follow-up during the pandemic [11], [12] was either a result of responses to hygiene plans or protocols within medical institutions or because of patients' worries about becoming infected with COVID-19 while visiting healthcare facilities. Nevertheless, the implementation of appropriate contingency measures may reinforce vulnerable groups to attend necessary

Page 17 of 37

1 2

BMJ Open

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9 10	
10	
11	
12	
1/	
14	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
3/	
38	
39 40	
40 41	
41 42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

287 medical consultations, e.g. during medical emergencies, as well as mandatory diagnostic 288 procedures in order to act in an appropriate and timely manner to avoid possible harm or 289 excess deaths due to the pandemic [23], [24]. Accordingly, a study assessing medical outcomes 290 during the COVID-19 pandemic in rural Japanese nursing homes did not observe an increased 291 risk of emergencies by implementing appropriate contingency measures [3].

For reassurance, 37.5% of the participants in this study preferred to be informed of the healthcare facility's hygiene protocols in advance of medical appointments. More interestingly, over 20% of participants stated that receiving prior information about safety protocols during the COVID-19 pandemic would have strengthened their adherence to medical appointments. The dissemination of information that is valuable, transparent and proactive has been recognized previously by the WHO as an essential tool to overcome various difficulties or insecurities triggered by the pandemic [21].

299 The use of physical distancing to limit exposure to potentially infectious aerosols, was widely 300 recommended [13], [20], [21]. Approximately 93.8% of participants in this study expected adherence to the recommended physical distancing rules in waiting rooms. The 301 302 recommended physical distancing protocol had a decisive influence on the visiting policies of 303 medical institutions [20]. Al-Shamsi et al. suggested that clinic attendance in outpatient settings should be limited to the patient and one visitor [2]. Nevertheless, one of the pillars of 304 305 patient-centered care has proven to be family involvement [14]. One study found that up to 306 46% of adult patients were accompanied by family members to routine visits with their physicians [14]. Family members, friends and caregivers mediate the patient's psychosocial 307 308 and emotional support, encouragement and reassurance, thereby improving the communication processes during medical visits and influencing patients' satisfaction with the 309 310 physician's care [2], [14], [25], [26]. Medical appointments are an anxiety-provoking

experience for patients, especially for those facing a possible or existing malignant diagnosis [27]. The word "distress" is mentioned by patients with cancer who were denied the option of having a family member or friend with them during medical appointments [15]. Although the respondents in this study endorsed vigilant sanitary precautions to prevent nosocomial infections, an overwhelming proportion (75.0%) supported the possibility of being accompanied by a significant other during medical consultations, irrespective of their demographic, disease-specific or pandemic-specific characteristics. The company of a trustworthy person seemed to be clearly important for our study's participants.

Other experts have managed to attenuate the detrimental effects of the pandemic on screening and provide follow-up care for patients with cancer by implementing telemedicine appointments [11], [20]. The use of telemedicine has been described as a method for patients and physicians to stay in touch and informed while reducing physical contact [2], [15], [28], [29]. Notably, 71.9% of the participants in this study approved implementation of telemedicine whenever possible and reasonable from an oncological viewpoint, in order to reduce face-to-face contact and minimize potential contact with persons infected with SARS-CoV-2, but maintain the required standards for treatment. Telemedicine appointments would be impossible in cases requiring physical examinations or imaging procedures, but it would be a good choice for offering a second opinion [11].

The WHO has stated that regular and widespread testing is crucial to contain the virus and stop the pandemic [20], [21]. The transmission of nosocomial infections, both patient-topatient and patient-to-healthcare-personnel, has been reported previously [19]. These infections occur, presumably, by transmission from asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic carriers or persons with mild or atypical symptoms [19], [30]. Precautions are essential, as 17.9% to 33.3% of patients may have an asymptomatic COVID-19 infection [2]. While pre-

Page 19 of 37

BMJ Open

operative testing has been recommended by various medical societies worldwide, and the testing of in-patients upon their admission to the hospital has been introduced by the vast majority of healthcare facilities [31], regular testing of patients prior to ambulatory appointments to avoid nosocomial spread among HCWs or other patients, was not. Interestingly, 57.8% of our study's population indicated they would rather tolerate the inconvenience of repetitive testing before visiting a healthcare institution, in order to feel safe and avoid exposure to potentially life-threatening infectious agents.

The protection of HCWs from COVID-19 serves both sides: maintaining medical care and protecting the vulnerable population from a possible fatal nosocomial infection with SARS-CoV-2 [22]. In Germany, HCWs were tested only if they were symptomatic or were eligible for the national contact-tracing program (documented contact with an infected person without adequate personal protective equipment). Nevertheless, data from the United Kingdom showed that up to 3% of asymptomatic HCWs were infected with SARS-CoV-2 [16]. According to mathematical models, regular polymerase-chain-reaction(PCR)-based screening of HCWs, irrespective of whether they are symptomatic or asymptomatic, could reduce their contribution to transmission by up to 33% [17]. This study showed that 93% of patients strongly supported the notion of broad screening programs for HCW, irrespective of their demographic, disease-specific or pandemic-specific factors.

HCWs have a significantly high risk for acquiring COVID-19, based on national and international data [17], [32]. According to some reports, HCWs acquired COVID-19 through nosocomial transmission in up to 29% of reported cases (China, January 2020) [19]. Thus, effective control of the source of infection is crucial in healthcare facilities. The use of personal protective equipment by HCW and patients in medical institutions was recommended by their national centers for disease control [2], [13], [21], [31], [33]. A meta-analysis conducted by

lannone et al. found a significant benefit from wearing masks in mitigating the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 [8]. During an infection outbreak, wearing a N-95 mask or an FFP-2 respirator cuts the risk in half for clinical respiratory infections in HCWs, compared to wearing only a surgical mask [8], [9]. Furthermore, the protection of HCWs may reduce secondary transmission of the virus and nosocomial infections. During simulation tests of the spread of SARS-CoV-2 droplets/aerosols, medical masks and cloth face coverings were 57%-58% effective in protecting others and 37%–50% effective in protecting the wearer, while the N-95/FFP-2 masks were more effective in protecting others (effectivity: 86%–90%) as well as the wearer (effectivity: 96%–99%) [10].

368 Limitations

This study has several limitations due to its design (cross-sectional web-based survey). First, there might be an overrepresentation of patients worrying about their health status because of their recruitment from support groups and the underrepresentation of women without online access are two possible sources of bias. Nevertheless, a recent systematic review showed that Facebook-recruited samples were similarly representative as samples recruited via traditional methods [34], [35]. Furthermore, as the patients responded directly to the questionnaire, social desirability bias was greatly limited. Moreover, as we did not reach the expected number of participants, we potentially may have underestimated the importance of some specific demographic, disease-specific and pandemic-specific factors on expectations regarding the prevention of SARS-CoV-2 transmission, although this is unlikely.

379 Next, this study was conducted during the first months of 2021. In Germany, the first vaccine
 380 against COVID-19 was approved by emergency use authorization in December 2020
 381 (Comirnaty[®], BioNTech Manufacturing, Germany), followed by the emergency authorization
 382 of two other vaccines in January 2021 (COVID-19 Vaccine Moderna, Moderna Biotech, USA

BMJ Open

and Vaxzevria, AstraZeneca Life Science, UK) [36]. Due to the strict criteria for prioritizing eligibility for vaccinations in Germany, the COVID-19 vaccines were inaccessible for a large proportion of the population during the time we conducted the survey, even for patients at risk, such as those with active or previous oncological disorders [37], [38]. We did not assess participants' vaccination status; however, we presumed that most of them were not vaccinated because of national regulations during the survey period. Thus, we do not know whether the responses accurately depict the current state of the pandemic, as expectations may have changed due to the currently available vaccines.

Finally, the obtained results reflected the needs and expectations of women who were at increased risk for BC and OC during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the results are not necessarily generalizable to other vulnerable groups or to other life adversities.

Strengths

The COVID-19 pandemic changed the way patient care is delivered. Strict measures to contain the virus were implemented swiftly after the onset of the pandemic by experts in infectious diseases and politicians. Due to the course of the pandemic, there was no possibility to assess the needs and expectations of patients regarding specific hygiene measures before putting those in place. Our study identified several patient-approved contingency measures for the protection of patients and healthcare workers from COVID-19 infection, which are essential in terms to improve the staffs' preparedness to cope with the course of this pandemic or similar situations.

The high risk and vulnerable groups in our study seemed to approve the most vigilant and strict contingency programs designed to lower the risk of transmission in medical facilities, irrespective of demographic, disease-specific or pandemic-specific factors. Additionally, to our

knowledge, this is the first study to assess the wishes of patients with respect to being accompanied by a person of trust during medical appointments during the pandemic. The possibility of being accompanied by a close person seemed to be non-negotiable for most of the participants in the study. Thus, in addition to the strict visitation policies for outpatients and rules restricting visitation for hospitalized patients, we also need innovative strategies to maintain and improve the experiences of patients during the COVID-19 pandemic, such as allowing, that patients are accompanied by a person of trust, provided that they comply with strict precautions measures, for e.g. by providing a current negative SARS-CoV-2 test result or proof of immunization. As we assessed participants' needs, fears and expectations, we followed the WHO recommendation for two-way communication with populations at risk [21]. Our goal is to improve and optimize the public health measures, which could be implemented during a next wave of the COVID-19 pandemic or other possible pandemics. Conclusion In conclusion, we showed that most patients at high risk for infection or severe course of COVID-19 disease approve strict contingency measures, such as physical distancing rules, the implementation of telemedicine and the use of highly effective protective masks, designed to lower the transmission of COVID-19 in medical facilities. However, they also value the presence of a significant other during medical consultations and procedures.

1 2		
3 4	120	Acknowledgements:
5	429	/ annowiedgements.
6 7		
8 9	431	We thank
10 11 12	432 433	 the support group for persons at high risk for breast and/or ovarian cancer for their engagement in the promotion of this survey.
13 14 15 16	434 435	 all participants for participating in our study. Parts of the presented results are part of the doctoral thesis of Ms. Annika Droste.
17 18 19	436	
20 21	437	Author contributions:
22 23	438	RS and AD conceptualized the study and planned the data analysis, acquired the data,
24 25	439	performed data analysis and drafted the manuscript. KS, WB, MS, and AH, offered
26	440	substantially intellectual input to analysis and interpretation of data. All authors contributed
27 28 20	441	to the manuscript drafts and approved the final version of the manuscript for publication.
30 31 32	442	Funding:
33 34	443	The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in
35 36	444	the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.
37 38 39	445	
40 41	446	Data availability:
41 42 43	447	Data are available on reasonable request to bona fide researchers.
44 45 46	448	
47 48	449	Conflicts of interests:
49 50	450	RS:
51 52 53	451	Honoraria: Roche Pharma AG, AstraZeneca, Streamedup!GmbH
54 55	452	
56 57 58	453	MS: received personal fees from AstraZeneca, BioNTech, Eisai, Lilly, MSD, Novartis, Pantarhei
59 60	454	Bioscience, Pfizer, Roche, and SeaGen. Institutional research funding from AstraZeneca,

3 4 5	455	BioN	Tech, Eisai, Genentech, German Breast Group, Novartis, Palleos, Pantarhei Bioscience,						
5 6 7	456	Pierre	e-Fabre, and Roche. Travel reimbursement from Pfizer and Roche. In addition, M.S. is						
8 9	457	name	ed as an inventor on patent EP 2390370 B1 and granted patent EP 2951317 B1.						
10 11	458								
12 13 14	459	AH:							
15 16	460	Hono	Honoraria: AstraZeneca; Celgen; MedConcept GmbH, Med update GmbH; Medicultus; Pfizer;						
17 18 10	461	Prom	Promedicis GmbH; Softconsult; Roche Pharma AG; Streamedup!GmbH; Tesaro Bio Germany						
20 21	462	Gmbl	GmbH, LEO Pharma						
22 23	463	Ad Board: PharmaMar; Promedicis GmbH; Roche Pharma AG; Tesaro Bio Germany GmbH,							
24 25 26	464	Astra	Zeneca, LEO Pharma, MSD Sharp&Dohme GmbH						
27 28	465								
29 30 31	466	Ref	erences:						
32 33	467 468	[1]	O. Müller, O., Neuhann, F., & Razum, "Epidemiology and control of COVID-19," <i>Dtsch. medizinische Wochenschrift</i> , vol. 145, no. 10, pp. 670–674, 2020.						
34 35 36 37	469 470 471	[2]	H. O. Al-Shamsi <i>et al.</i> , "A Practical Approach to the Management of Cancer Patients During the Novel Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic : An International Collaborative Group," <i>Oncologist</i> , vol. 25, pp. 1–10, 2020.						
38 39 40 41	472 473 474	[3]	R. Ohta, Y. Ryu, and C. Sano, "Effects of implementation of infection control measures against covid-19 on the condition of japanese rural nursing homes," <i>Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health</i> , vol. 18, no. 11, 2021.						
42 43 44 45	475 476 477	[4]	"Bundesministerium für Gesundheit, Chronik Coronavirus," https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/coronavirus/chronik-coronavirus.html (last download on 15th November 2020)						
46 47 48 49 50	478 479 480	[5]	K. B. Kuchenbaecker <i>et al.,</i> "Risks of breast, ovarian, and contralateral breast cancer for BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutation carriers," <i>JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc.</i> , vol. 317, no. 23, pp. 2402–2416, 2017.						
50 51 52 53	481 482 483	[6]	S. Paluch-Shimon <i>et al.</i> , "Prevention and screening in BRCA mutation carriers and other breast/ovarian hereditary cancer syndromes: ESMO clinical practice guidelines for cancer prevention and screening," <i>Ann. Oncol.</i> , vol. 27, no. Supplement 5, pp. v103–v110, 2016.						
54 55 56 57	484 485	[7]	M. Dai <i>et al.</i> , "Patients with cancer appear more vulnerable to SARS-CoV-2: A multicenter study during the COVID-19 outbreak," <i>Cancer Discov.</i> , vol. 10, no. 6, p. 783, 2020.						
58 59 60	486 487 488	[8]	P. Iannone <i>et al.</i> , "The need of health policy perspective to protect Healthcare Workers during COVID-19 pandemic. A GRADE rapid review on the N95 respirators effectiveness," <i>PLoS One</i> , vol. 15, no. 6, p. e0234025, 2020.						

Page 25 of 37

1 2 3 4 5 6	489 490 491	[9]	J. Li <i>et al.,</i> "Protective efficient comparisons among all kinds of respirators and masks for health-care workers against respiratory viruses: A PRISMA-compliant network meta-analysis," <i>Med.</i> , vol. 100, no. 34, p. e27026, 2021.
7 8 9	492 493	[10]	H. Ueki <i>et al.</i> , "Effectiveness of Face Masks in Preventing Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV- 2," <i>mSphere</i> , vol. 5, no. 5, pp. e00637-20, 2020.
10 11 12 13	494 495 496	[11]	M. Sonagli, R. Cagnacci Neto, F. P. M. Leite, and F. B. A. Makdissi, "The use of telemedicine to maintain breast cancer follow-up and surveillance during the COVID-19 pandemic," <i>J. Surg. Oncol.</i> , vol. 123, no. 2, pp. 371–374, 2021.
14 15 16	497 498	[12]	F. P. M. Leite <i>et al.,</i> "How to maintain elective treatment of breast cancer during the COVID- 19 pandemic—A cancer center experience," <i>J. Surg. Oncol.</i> , vol. 123, no. 1, pp. 9–11, 2021.
17 18 19	499 500	[13]	E. Raymond, C. Thieblemont, S. Alran, and S. Faivre, "Impact of the COVID-19 Outbreak on the Management of Patients with Cancer," <i>Target. Oncol.</i> , vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 249–259, 2020.
20 21 22	501 502	[14]	J. L. Wolff and D. L. Roter, "Family presence in routine medical visits: A meta-analytical review," <i>Soc. Sci. Med.</i> , vol. 72, no. 6, pp. 823–831, 2011.
23 24 25 26	503 504 505	[15]	S. Dhada, D. Stewart, M. A. Hadi, and V. Paudyal, "Cancer Services During the COVID-19 Pandemic : Systematic Review of Patient's and Caregiver's Experiences," <i>Cancer Manag. Res.</i> , vol. 13, pp. 5875–5887, 2021.
20 27 28	506 507	[16]	L. Rivett <i>et al.,</i> "Screening of healthcare workers for SARS-CoV-2 highlights the role of asymptomatic carriage in COVID-19 transmission," <i>Elife</i> , vol. 9, p. e58728, 2020.
29 30 31 32 33	508 509 510	[17]	N. C. Grassly et al., "Report 16 : Role of testing in COIVD-19 control," https://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/bitstream/10044/1/78439/7/2020-04-23-COVID19-Report- 16.pdf; last access 14 SEptember 2021, 2020
34 35	511 512	[18]	A. Kaur and R. Kumar, "Comparative Analysis of Parametric and Non-Parametric Tests," J. Comuter Math. Sci., vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 336–342, 2015.
30 37 38 39	513 514 515	[19]	D. Wang <i>et al.,</i> "Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients with 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China," <i>JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc.</i> , vol. 323, no. 11, pp. 1061–1069, 2020.
40 41 42 43	516 517 518	[20]	A. Madan, J. Siglin, and A. Khan, "Comprehensive review of implications of COVID-19 on clinical outcomes of cancer patients and management of solid tumors during the pandemic," <i>Cancer Med.</i> , vol. 9, no. 24, pp. 9205–9218, 2020.
44 45 46 47 48 49 50	519 520 521 522 523	[21]	World Health Organization, "COVID - 19 Strategy Update," https://www.who.int/docs/default- source/coronaviruse/covid-strategy-update-14april2020.pdf?sfvrsn=29da3ba0_19; last access 14 September 2021, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.who.int/docs/default- source/coronaviruse/covid-strategy-update-14april2020.pdf?sfvrsn=29da3ba0_19. [Accessed: 14-Sep-2021].
50 51 52	524 525	[22]	T. M. McMichael <i>et al.</i> , "Epidemiology of Covid-19 in a Long-Term Care Facility in King County, Washington," <i>N. Engl. J. Med.</i> , vol. 382, no. 21, pp. 2005–2011, 2020.
55 54	526	[23]	N. E. Sharpless, "COVID-19 and cancer," Science (80)., vol. 368, no. 6497, p. 1290, 2020.
55 56 57 58	527 528 529	[24]	M. Amit, S. Tam, T. Bader, A. Sorkin, and A. Benov, "Pausing cancer screening during the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2pandemic: Should we revisit the recommendations?," <i>Eur. J. Cancer</i> , vol. 134, no. January, pp. 86–89, 2020.
59 60	530 531	[25]	I. L. Leeds <i>et al.</i> , "Psychosocial Risks are Independently Associated with Cancer Surgery Outcomes in Medically Comorbid Patients," <i>Ann. Surg. Oncol.</i> , vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 936–944,

3 ⊿	532		2019.
4 5 6 7	533 534	[26]	J. L. Wolff and D. L. Roter, "Hidden in plain sight," <i>Arch Intern Med.</i> , vol. 168, no. 13, pp. 1409–1415, 2008.
7 8 9 10 11	535 536 537	[27]	J. Wittenborn, L. Wagels, T. Kupec, S. Iborra, L. Najjari, and E. Stickeler, "Anxiety in women referred for colposcopy: a prospective observational study," <i>Arch. Gynecol. Obstet.</i> , vol. 305, no. 3, pp. 625–630, 2022.
12 13 14	538 539 540	[28]	C. Pécout <i>et al.</i> , "Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on patients affected by non- communicable diseases in Europe and in the USA," <i>Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health</i> , vol. 18, no. 13, p. 6697, 2021.
16 17 18	541 542 543	[29]	J. R. Dietz <i>et al.</i> , "Recommendations for prioritization, treatment, and triage of breast cancer patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. the COVID-19 pandemic breast cancer consortium," <i>Breast Cancer Res. Treat.</i> , vol. 181, no. 3, pp. 487–497, 2020.
20 21	544 545	[30]	Y. Bai <i>et al.</i> , "Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19," <i>JAMA</i> , vol. 323, no. 14, pp. 1406–1407, 2020.
22 23 24 25	546 547 548	[31]	S. Lee, P. Meyler, M. Mozel, T. Tauh, and R. Merchant, "Asymptomatic carriage and transmission of SARS-CoV-2: What do we know?," <i>Can. J. Anesth.</i> , vol. 67, no. 10, pp. 1424–1430, 2020.
20 27 28 29 30 31	549 550 551 552	[32]	M. Moehner and A. Wolik, "Analysis of the COVID-19 risk by occupational groups and industry in Germany," https://www.asu-arbeitsmedizin.com/wissenschaft/berufs-und- branchenbezogene-analyse-des-covid-19-risikos-deutschland; last access 15 September 2021, 2020
32 33 34	553 554	[33]	C. Del Rio and P. N. Malani, "COVID-19 - New Insights on a Rapidly Changing Epidemic," JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc., vol. 323, no. 14, pp. 1339–1340, 2020.
35 36 37	555 556 557	[34]	L. Thornton, P. J. Batterham, D. B. Fassnacht, F. Kay-Lambkin, A. L. Calear, and S. Hunt, "Recruiting for health, medical or psychosocial research using Facebook: Systematic review," Internet Interv., vol. 4, pp. 72–81, 2016.
39 40 41 42 43	558 559 560 561	[35]	J. F. Ebert, L. Huibers, B. Christensen, and M. B. Christensen, "Paper-or web-based questionnaire invitations as a method for data collection: Cross-sectional comparative study of differences in response rate, completeness of data, and financial cost," <i>J. Med. Internet Res.</i> , vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2018.
44 45 46 47	562 563 564	[36]	"Paul Ehrlich Institut," https://www.pei.de/DE/arzneimittel/impfstoffe/covid-19/covid-19- node.html;jsessionid=8CF8DAC1B932FAC17A5A43F47412EDB0.intranet222; last access 12 September 2021, 2021
48 49 50 51 52	565 566 567 568	[37]	"Bundesministerium für Gesundheit," https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/fileadmin/Dateien/3_Downloads/C/Coronavir us/Verordnungen/CoronaImpfV_BAnz_AT_01.04.2021_V1.pdf; last access 12 September 2021, 2021
53 54 55 56	569 570 571	[38]	"Robert Koch Institut," https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/Infekt/EpidBull/Archiv/2021/Ausgaben/05_21.pdf?blob=pu blicationFile; last access 12 September 2021, 2021
57 58	572		
59 60	573		
	574		

1 2 3	575			
4 5 6				
7 8 9				
10 11 12				
12 13 14				
15 16 17				
18 19 20				
21 22 23				
24 25 26				
27 28 29				
30 31 32				
33 34 35				
36 37				
39 40				
41 42 43				
44 45 46				
47 48 49				
50 51 52				
53 54 55				
56				

How old are you? [___] years

Do you live in a stable partnership? (Yes – No)

How would you describe your home/private environment?

- Living alone (Yes No)
- Living with children under 18 years (Yes No)
- Living with older people (over 65 years) (Yes No)
- Living with my spouse/life partner (Yes No)
- others

What is your highest educational qualification?

Are/was you infected by the SARS-CoV-2-virus yourself? (Yes - No)

Is/was someone in your environment infected with the SARS-CoV-2-virus? (Yes – No)

How much, on average, did you reduce your social contact network in the last 12 months due to the covid-19-pandemic?

Not at all – a little – moderate – significant – very much

Questions about your risk of developing breast and/or ovarian cancer

To which risk group do you belong:

- I was diagnosed with a mutation in the BRCA1 or BRCA2 gene
- I was diagnosed with a different mutation (except BRCA1 or BRCA2 gene)
- I have an increased risk due to my family history, but I wasn't diagnosed with a gene mutation (yet)

Are/was you already suffering from breast and/or ovarian cancer (benign tumors excluded)

(multiple selection possible)

- no, I am not/was not previously diagnosed with invasive breast and/or ovarian cancer or the respective premalignant lesions (in situ)
- yes, I am/was diagnosed with insitu breast lesions
- yes, I am/was diagnosed with in situ ovarian/tubal lesions
- I am/was diagnosed with invasive breast cancer
- I am/was diagnosed with invasive ovarian cancer

Below we are interested in your opinion on hygiene measures in clinics during the covid-19pandemic:

 Would you have liked to be informed about hygiene protocols in advance of your appointment? (Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply)

2. Would more information about the prevailing hygiene protocols have had a positive influence on your behavior (e.g., meeting appointments)? Yes – No - I don't know/does not apply

3. Do you think that patients should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection before an ambulatory visit/appointment? Yes – No – I don't know/does not apply

4. Do you think that medical personnel/physicians should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection on a regular basis? Yes – No - I don't know/does not apply

5. Do you think that appointments should be scheduled in such a way to ensure that distancing rules can be strictly observed? Yes – No - I don't know/does not apply

6. Should a relative or a close person be allowed to accompany patients in the healthcare setting, despite the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No - I don't know/does not apply

7. Do you think/agree that appointments, which do not require one's physical presence (e.g., counseling appointments) should be conducted as teleconferences or video conferences during the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No - I don't know/does not apply

8. Do you think that medical personnel should at least wear an FFP-1 mask (surgical mask) during the COVID-19 pandemic? *Yes* – *No* – *I don't know/does not apply*

9. Do you think that medical personnel should always wear an FFP-2 mask masks during the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure patients' safety? Yes – no – I don't know/does not apply

STROBE Statement-	-Checklist of items	that should be included in	reports of cross-sectional studie
-------------------	---------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------

	ltem No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	Patients' expectations of preventive measures of medical institutions during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in Germany in women with an increased risk for breast and ovarian cancer	1
Introduction			I
Background/rationale	2	During the COVID-19 pandemic, several strategies were implemented to contain the viral spread within medical institutions, in order to protect persons at higher risk for infection or severe course of the disease, such as patients with active cancers, cancer survivors or healthcare workers (HCW).	2
Objectives	3	To identify patient-approved contingency measures for the protection of patients and healthcare workers from COVID-19 infection, and to use these findings to improve the staffs' preparedness to cope with the course of this pandemic or similar situations.	2
Methods			
Study design	4	Cross-sectional web-based survey	
Setting	5	web-based survey delivered by support groups of persons with increased risk for ovarian or breast cancer. 89 potential participants accessed the questionnaire. Data were collected anonymously. 80% (64/80) answered at least one question pertaining to hygiene management and expectations for preventive measures, and 20% (16/80) did not answer any questions pertaining to preventive measures related to the pandemic	8
Participants	6	Women at increased risk for ovarian and breast cancer, irrespective if they had experienced an oncological diagnosis at the time point of the survey. All participants were aged 18 years or older. All participants gave consent to participate in the study.	5
Variables	7	Outcomes: expectations regarding different contingency measures with respect to the COVID-19 pandemic	6
Data sources/ measurement	8*		
Bias	9	Web-based survey, patient requirement by support groups. A recent systematic review showed that Facebook-recruited samples were similarly representative as samples recruited via traditional methods.	17
Study size	10	All participants who responded at least one question with respect to contingency measures.	8
Quantitative variables	11		
Statistical methods	12	(a) Data were analyzed using SPSS 26.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Descriptive statistics are expressed as mean, standard deviation (SD), median, interquartile range (IQR) or proportions (%), as appropriate. We used the Mann-Whitney-U-test, the χ^2 -test and the Fisher exact test to analyze the data for differences between the responders and non-responders to the survey's questions. The Mann-Whitney-U-test, χ^2 -test or Fisher exact test were used as appropriate, to compare differences of expectations according to demographic, disease-specific and pandemic-specific variables. The p-values were calculated using a 95% confidence interval. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Because the p-values were not adjusted for multiple testing, all results should be interpreted as exploratory.	7
		(b) The significance level was set at p < 0.05 Significance between grous was assessed by.	7

		(c) For descri not answer th	ptive analyse ne survey's c	es, missing data c juestions.	onsisted of partic	ipants who di	
Results							
Participants	13*	(a) 80% (64/8 management	0) answered	at least one que ations for prevent	stion pertaining t tive measures	to hygiene	
		(b) Give reaso answered the	ons for non- questions	participation at ea	ach stage: partici	pants did not	
Descriptive data	14*	(a)					
				Non- respondents	Respondents	p-value (Non- respondents group vs the	
		0				Respondent group)	
				Age			
		R	Mean (SD)	46.64 (2.210) 47.50 (40.00-	42,85 (1.363) 43.00 (33.75-	0.1611	
			(IQR)	54.00) (N=14)	51.25) (N=62)		
		Having a stable relationship					
		Yes No	% of N % of N	100 (14/14)	90.6 (58/64) 9.4 (6/64)	0.2361	
				Living alor			
		Yes	% of N	100 (16/16)	90.6 (58/64)	0.3401	
		No	% of N	0 (0/16)	9.4 (6/64)		
				Living with childr	en < 18y		
		Yes	% of n/N	25.0 (4/16)	34.4 (22/64)	0.474 ²	
		No	% of N	75.0 (12/16)	65.6 (42/64)	-	
				Living with perso	ons >65y		
		Yes	% of N	12.5 (2/16)	6.2 (4/64)	0.399 ¹	
		No	% of N	87.5 (14/16)	93.8 (60/64)	-	
				Living with a n	artner		
		Yes	% of N	62.5 (10/16)	60.9 (39/64)	0.909 ²	
		No	% of N	37.5 (6/16)	39.1 (25/64)		
				Education	 n		
		Up to secondary level	% of N	84.6 (11/13)	48.4 (31/64)	0.017 ²	
		education	0/ of N		E1 6 (22 /CA)	-	
		level	% OT N	15.4 (2/13)	51.6 (33/64)		

		Did you have C	OVID-19		
Yes	% of N	0 (0/13)	4.7 (3/64)	0.4291	
No	% of N	100 (13/13)	95.3 (61/64)		
So	omeone in y	our social netw	 ork has had COVII	D-19	
Yes	% of N	23.1 (3/13)	28.6 (18/63)	0.687 ²	
No	% of N	76.9 (10/13)	71.4 (45/63)		
	R	eduction of socia	al network		
Moderate	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	15.6 (10/64)	0.9832	
reduction Large	% of N	84.6 (11/13)	84.4 (54/64)		
reduction					
	R	isk profiling for	OC and BC		
BRCA 1 & 2	% of N	76.9 (10/13)	70.3 (45/64)	0.895 ³	
Mutations	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	14.10 (9/64)	-	
BRCA 1 & 2					
Positive family	% of N	7.7 (1/13)	15.6 (10/64)		
history for					
BC or UC					
F	laving a hist	tory of (in situ o	r invasive) OC and	I BC	
Yes % of N		73.3 (11/15)	64.1 (41/64)	0.496 ²	
No	% of N	26.7 (4/15)	35.9 (23/64)		
	Hav	ving a history of	invasive BC		
Yes	% of N	60 (9/15)	56.20 (36/64)	0.792 ²	
No	% of N	40 (6/15)	43.80 (28/64)		
	Hav	/ing a history of	invasive OC		
Yes	% of N	6.7 (1/15)	1.6 (1/64)	0.2601	
No	% of N	93.3 (14/15)	98.4 (63/64)		
Duestions		Voc	No	I don't	
นแรงเปปาร		in % of respondent (n/N)	in % of respondents (n/N)	know/do not apply in % of	
				responde (n/N)	
Would you have liked to be informed about hygiene protocols in advance of your		37.5% (24/64)	37.5% (24/64)	25.0% (16/64)	
appointment? Would more information about the prevailing bygione protocols basis		n 20.3%	31.3%	48.4%	

1									
2			had a positive influence						
3			on your behavior (e.g.,						
4			meeting appointments)?						
5			Do you think that patients	57.8%	26.6%	15.6%			
6			should be tested for	(37/64)	(17/64)	(10/64)			
7			SARS-CoV-2 infection		(,,				
8			before an ambulatory						
9			visit/appointment?						
10			Do you think that modical	05.29/	1 60/	2 10/			
11			Do you think that medical	95.3%	1.0%	3.1%			
12			personnel/physicians	(61/64)	(1/64)	(2/64)			
12			should be tested for						
13			SARS-CoV-2 infection on a						
14			regular basis?						
15			Do you think that	93.8%	1.6%	4.7%			
10			appointments should be	(60/64)	(1/64)	(3/64)			
17			scheduled in such a way						
18			to ensure that distancing						
19			rules can be strictly						
20			observed?						
21			Should a relative or a	75.0%	15.6%	9.1%			
22			close person be allowed	(19/64)	(10/64)	9.470 (6/6A)			
23			close person be allowed	(40/04)	(10/04)	(0/04)			
24			to accompany patients in						
25			the healthcare setting,						
26			despite the COVID-19						
27			pandemic?						
28			Do you think/agree that	71.9%	21.9%	6.3%			
29			appointments, which do	(46/64)	(14/64)	(4/64)			
30			not require one's physical						
31			presence (e.g., counseling						
27			appointments) should be						
5Z			conducted as						
33			teleconferences or video						
34			conforances during the						
35									
36			COVID-19 pandemic:	0.4.40/	7.00/	7.00/			
37			Do you think that medical	84.4%	7.8%	7.8%			
38			personnel should at least	(54/64)	(5/64)	(5/64)			
39			wear an FFP-1 mask						
40			(surgical mask) during the						
41			COVID-19 pandemic?						
42			Do you think that medical	68.8%	18.8%	12.5%			
43			personnel should always	(44/64)	(12/64)	(8/64)			
44			wear an FFP-2 mask						
45			masks during the COVID-						
46			19 nandemic to ensure						
47			nationts' safety?						
48	Outrease data	45*	patients safety:				6		
40	Outcome data	15*	1. Would you have liked to b	e informed abou	it hygiene prote	ocols in advance	6		
49			of your appointment? (Yes –	No – I don't kno	w/does not app	nly)			
50			2. Would more information about the prevailing hygiene protocols have had						
51 52			a positive influence on your b	oehavior (e.g., m	eeting appointr	nents)? <i>Yes – No</i>			
52			– I don't know/does not apply						
53			3. Do you think that patients should be tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection						
54			before an ambulatory visit/a	ppointment? Ye	s – No – I don'i	t know/does not			
55			apply			-			
56			4. Do you think that medical	oersonnel/nhvsi	cians should be	tested for SARS-			
57			CoV-2 infection on a regular	basis? Yes – No -	- I don't know/c	does not annly			
58			5 Do you think that appoin	tments should	he scheduled in	n such a way to			
59			ensure that distancing rules	can be strictly	ohserved? Ver	$= N_0 = I don't$			
60			know/doos not apply	an be strictly	ubserveu: 185	= 100 - 100111			
			know/does not apply						
1

	 6. Should a relative or a close person be allowed to accompany patient the healthcare setting, despite the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No – I d know/does not apply 7. Do you think/agree that appointments, which do not require one's phys presence (e.g., counseling appointments) should be conducted teleconferences or video conferences during the COVID-19 pandemic? Y No – I don't know/does not apply 8. Do you think that medical personnel should at least wear an FFP-1 n (surgical mask) during the COVID-19 pandemic? Yes – No – I don't know/conot apply 9. Do you think that medical personnel should always wear an FFP-2 n masks during the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure patients' safety? Yes – n don't know/does not apply 					
Main results	16 (a)					
		6		Non- respondents	Respondents	p-value (Non- respondents group vs the Respondent group)
		Age				
			Mean (SD) Median (IQR)	46.64 (2.210) 47.50 (40.00- 54.00) (N=14)	42,85 (1.363) 43.00 (33.75- 51.25) (N=62)	0.1611
		Having a stable relationship				
	Yes No		% of N % of N	100 (14/14) 0 (0/14)	90.6 (58/64) 9.4 (6/64)	0.2361
				Living alor		
	Yes		% of N	100 (16/16)	90.6 (58/64)	0.340 ¹
	No		% of N	0 (0/16)	9.4 (6/64)	ļ
			I.	Living with childr	en < 18y	
	Yes		% of n/N	25.0 (4/16)	34.4 (22/64)	0.474 ²
	No		% of N	75.0 (12/16)	65.6 (42/64)	
				living with perso	ns >65v	
	Yes		% of N	12.5 (2/16)	6.2 (4/64)	0.399 ¹
	No		% of N	87.5 (14/16)	93.8 (60/64)	
			04 C	Living with a p	artner	0.0553
	Yes		% of N	62.5 (10/16) 37 5 (6/16)	60.9 (39/64) 39 1 (25/64)	0.9092
			70 UT IN	37.3 (01/0)	37.1 (23/04)	
			I	Educatio	n	I
	Up t secc	o ondary	% of N	84.6 (11/13)	48.4 (31/64)	0.017 ²
	edu	ı cation				

Tertiary	% of N	15.4 (2/13)	51.6 (33/64)			
level						
education						
	1	Did you have CO	VID-19			
Yes	% of N	0 (0/13)	4.7 (3/64)	0.429 ¹		
No	% of N	100 (13/13)	95.3 (61/64)			
So	omeone in y	our social netwo	rk has had COVII	D-19		
Yes	% of N	23.1 (3/13)	28.6 (18/63)	0.687 ²		
No	% of N	76.9 (10/13)	71.4 (45/63)			
	Re	eduction of social	network			
Moderate	% of N	15 4 (2/13)	15.6 (10/64)	U 0835		
reduction		13.7 (2/13)	10.0 (10/04)	0.000		
	% of N	84.6 (11/13)	84.4 (54/64)			
reduction		5 (11, 10)	5(5.), 6.)			
	R	isk profiling for O	C and BC			
BRCA 1 & 2	% of N	76 9 (10/13)	70 3 (45/64)	<u>በ ጸዓ5</u> 3		
Mutations	% of N	15 4 (2/12)	14 10 (9/64)	0.055		
other than		13.7 (2/13)	17.10 (5/04)			
BRCA 1 & 2						
Positive	% of N	7.7 (1/13)	15.6 (10/64)			
family		(-/ /	(/ /			
history for						
BC or OC						
F	laving a hist	tory of (in situ or	invasive) OC and	BC		
	-		-			
Yes	% of N	73.3 (11/15)	64.1 (41/64)	0.496 ²		
No	% of N	26.7 (4/15)	35.9 (23/64)			
	,					
	Hav	ving a history of i	nvasive BC			
Yes	% of N	60 (9/15)	56 20 (36/64)	n 792		
No	% of N	10 (6/1E)	13 80 (28/64)	0.752		
	70 UT IN	40 (0/ 13)	+3.00 (20/04)			
		uing a history of t				
Voc						
res	70 OT IN	0.7 (1/15)	1.0 (1/04)	0.200*		
INO	% OT N	93.3 (14/15)	98.4 (63/64)			
Questions		Yes	NO	I don't		
		IN % OF	IN % Of	know/does		
		respondents	respondents	not apply		
				III % 01		
Would you b	ave liked to	37 5%	37 5%	25.0%		
he informed	ave likeu lu	(24/64)	(74/64)	(16/6/)		
hvøiene nrot	ocols in	(24) 04)	(24) 04)	(10/04)		
Linglene prot						

		advance of your			
		appointment?			
		Would more information	20.3%	31.3%	48.4%
		about the prevailing	(13/64)	(20/64)	(31/64)
		hygiene protocols have			
		had a positive influence			
		on your behavior (e.g.,			
		meeting appointments)?			
		Do you think that patients	57.8%	26.6%	15.6%
		should be tested for	(37/64)	(17/64)	(10/64)
		SARS-CoV-2 infection			
		before an ambulatory			
		visit/appointment?			
		Do you think that medical	95.3%	1.6%	3.1%
		personnel/physicians	(61/64)	(1/64)	(2/64)
		should be tested for		(<i>i</i> = <i>i</i>	
		SARS-CoV-2 infection on a			
		regular basis?			
		Do you think that	93.8%	1.6%	4.7%
		appointments should be	(60/64)	(1/64)	(3/64)
		scheduled in such a way			
		to ensure that distancing			
		rules can be strictly			
		observed?			
		Should a relative or a	75.0%	15.6%	9.1%
		close person he allowed	(48/64)	(10/64)	(6/64)
		to accompany patients in	(+0/0+)	(10/04)	(0/04)
		the healthcare setting			
		dospito the COVID 10			
		handomic2			
		partuerine:	71.09/	21.0%	6.29/
		Do you think/agree that	11.9%	21.9%	0.3%
		appointments, which do	(40/04)	(14/04)	(4/64)
		not require one's physical			
		presence (e.g., counseling			
		appointments) should be			
		conducted as			
		teleconferences or video			
		conferences during the			
		COVID-19 pandemic?	04.421	7.001	7.00/
		Do you think that medical	84.4%	7.8%	7.8%
		personnel should at least	(54/64)	(5/64)	(5/64)
		wear an FFP-1 mask			
		(surgical mask) during the			
		COVID-19 pandemic?			
		Do you think that medical	68.8%	18.8%	12.5%
		personnel should always	(44/64)	(12/64)	(8/64)
		wear an FFP-2 mask			
		masks during the COVID-			
		19 pandemic to ensure			
		patients' safety?			
	-	(b)			
		(c)			
Other analyses	17	No other analyses			
Discussion					
Kev results	18	1. 37.5% of the partici	pants in this st	udy preferred	to be informe
		the healthcare facil	ity's hygiene r	rotocols in ad	vance of me
-,		the nearthcare facil	ity 3 Hygiene k		vance of me

60

BMJ Open

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

JE, "www.pi "//www.epide.