

Accepted Manuscript

BJGP OPEN

Evaluating the delay prior to primary care presentation in lung cancer patients

Kotecha Jalpa; Clark Allan; Burton Matthew; Chan Wei; Menzies Di; Dervedde Ulrike; Banham Rachel; Wilson Andrew; Martin William

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/BJGPO.2020.0130>

To access the most recent version of this article, please click the DOI URL in the line above.

Received 23 July 2020

Revised 04 November 2020

Accepted 13 November 2020

© 2020 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by BJGP Open. For editorial process and policies, see: <https://bjgpopen.org/authors/bjgp-open-editorial-process-and-policies>

When citing this article please include the DOI provided above.

Author Accepted Manuscript

This is an 'author accepted manuscript': a manuscript that has been accepted for publication in BJGP Open, but which has not yet undergone subediting, typesetting, or correction. Errors discovered and corrected during this process may materially alter the content of this manuscript, and the latest published version (the Version of Record) should be used in preference to any preceding versions

EVALUATING THE DELAY PRIOR TO PRIMARY CARE PRESENTATION IN LUNG CANCER PATIENTS

Jalpa Kotecha, MA (Cantab), MB, BS, MRCP Department of Rheumatology, St Georges University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Blackshaw Road, Tooting LONDON SW17 0QT

jalpa.kotecha@cantab.net

Allan Clark, BSc, PhD, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Chancellor Drive, Norwich NR4 7TJ

Allan.Clark@uea.ac.uk

Matthew Burton, MB, BS, MRCP, Department of Respiratory Medicine, Ipswich Hospital, Heath Road, Ipswich, Suffolk IP4 5PD

matthewjb@gmail.com

Wei Yee Chan, MB, BS, MRCP, Department of Haematology, University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, 235 Euston Road NW1 2BU

wychan@doctors.org.uk

Di Menzies, BSc (Hons), Department of Thoracic Surgery, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, Norwich NR4 7UY

di.menzies@nnuh.nhs.uk

Ulrike Dervedde, MD, Oncology Department, James Paget University Hospital, Lowestoft Road, Great Yarmouth NR31 6LA

Ulrike.Dervedde@jpaget.nhs.uk

Rachel Banham, RN, Community Nursing Office, Beauchamp House, Proctor Road, Chedgrave NR14 6HN

rachelbanham2009@hotmail.co.uk

Andrew M Wilson, MD, FRCP, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Chancellor Drive, Norwich NR4 7TJ

A.M.Wilson@uea.ac.uk

Craig Martin, FRCP, FRCR, PhD, Oncology Department, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, Norwich NR4 7UY

craighelene@gmail.com

Accepted Manuscript – BJGPO – BJGPO.2020.0130

EVALUATING THE DELAY PRIOR TO PRIMARY CARE PRESENTATION IN LUNG CANCER PATIENTS

ABSTRACT

Background: Little is known about “within-patient delay”, time from first symptom of lung cancer to contacting primary care.

Aim: Primary outcomes were length of within-patient delay and the proportion of total delay it represents. Secondary outcomes were factors causing delay and survival.

Design and Setting: Newly diagnosed lung cancer oncology patients at two hospitals in Norfolk.

Method: Patients completed questionnaires regarding onset of symptoms, whether they had delayed, and their reasons. GPs completed correlating questionnaires. Pathway times and other data were extracted from cancer registry and hospital records and outcomes obtained prospectively. Factors causing delay were compared using ratios of geometric means.

Results:

In 379 patients, mean within-patient delay and pre-secondary care delay were 188.6 and 241 days (61.4% and 78.5% of total delay respectively).

38.8% patients felt they had delayed. Patient-related causes of delay were denial (ratio of means (ROM) 4.36, $p=0.002$, 95% CIs 1.71-11.1), anxiety (3.36, 0.026, 1.16-9.76), non-recognition of symptoms (2.80, 0.004, 1.41-5.59) and smoking (1.76, 0.021, 1.09-2.86), respectively.

These symptoms were associated with delay: finger swelling/discomfort (ROM=2.72, $p=0.009$, CIs 1.29-5.74), cough (2.53, <0.001 , 1.52-4.19), weight loss (2.41, <0.001 , 1.49-3.88), weakness (2.35, 0.001, 1.45-3.83), dyspnoea (2.30, 0.001, 1.40-3.80), voice change (1.90, 0.010, 1.17-3.10) and sputum (1.66, 0.039, 1.03-2.67), respectively, also having more than five symptoms (compared to 1-3) (3.69, <0.001 , 2.05-6.64).

No overall relation between within-patient delay and survival was seen.

Conclusion: Using smoking registers, awareness literature and self-care manuals, primary care staff could liaise with ever-smokers regarding their symptoms, to ensure early referral to secondary care.

HOW THIS FITS IN

Lung cancer patients present late, so there is much interest in reducing delay to treatment.

We studied the major phases of delay in lung cancer patients' pathways, and asked patients who delayed the reasons for their delay.

The delay before the patient first contacts primary care is over sixty percent of total delay to treatment and its commonest cause is non-recognition of the symptoms.

Public health measures and primary care networks need to ensure that at-risk people know the principal symptoms and, by using registers of ever-smokers, primary care staff could

liaise with them regarding their symptoms to encourage early referral to CT or secondary care.

KEYWORDS

Lung cancer

Causes of delay

Within-patient delay

Accepted Manuscript – BJGPO – BJGPO.2020.0130

EVALUATING THE DELAY PRIOR TO PRIMARY CARE PRESENTATION IN LUNG CANCER PATIENTS

INTRODUCTION

Lung cancer is the commonest cause of cancer death worldwide¹. Seventy percent of UK patients present in advanced stage², when curative surgery is not possible. Our overall five-year survival of 10%³ is low by international standards⁴. Recent approaches to improving results include: increasing awareness, screening, streamlining secondary care and earlier identification in primary care⁵.

Improved awareness campaigns have shown short-term benefits⁶⁻⁸, but are hard to sustain. Low-dose CT screening can improve mortality^{9,10}, but cost-effectiveness¹¹ and implementation are problematic^{12,5}. Despite targets in secondary care¹³, results remain poor. Interventions which target high-risk groups can improve respiratory consultation rates^{14,15}.

Another approach is to focus on avoidable prolongation in the time from presentation to treatment (delay) and its causes. Cohort studies have used questionnaire models^{16,17}, case-notes review¹⁸⁻¹⁹ and interview²⁰⁻²¹. The causes of delay include limited symptom awareness, anxiety, denial and being too busy²²⁻²⁵. Smokers are less likely than non-smokers to seek help for respiratory symptoms²⁶ and many of those at risk may normalise their symptoms^{27,28}.

Delay worsens prognosis in patients treated with curative intent^{29,30}. However, in lung cancer patients as a whole, the effect of delay is less clear, some authors showing a longer time from presentation to treatment associated with better survival^{31,32}, others with worse¹⁸. Possible reasons are that presenting symptoms can be non-specific¹⁷, with uncertainty as to when the disease began, or that studies concentrating on major symptoms only^{16,31} may miss earlier ones.

Audits of delay often start from the first contact with primary care³³ but ignore the earlier time from the first symptom. This “within-patient delay”³⁴ may be prolonged^{20,27,35}, and contribute to poor outcomes. No study has compared all phases to treatment quantitatively.

There is therefore a need to quantify the length of within-patient delay, the proportion of delay it represents, the principal factors causing delay, and how all these affect survival.

METHODS

Design, Setting and Governance: This cohort study involved questionnaires, tertiary care and cancer registry data, with outcomes obtained prospectively. Patients with a recent diagnosis of lung cancer were recruited from thoracic oncology clinics at the Norfolk and Norwich and James Paget University Hospitals between April 2008 and June 2012. The study was conducted according to good clinical practice.

Patient recruitment: All lung cancer patients were given an information pack and consent form with a freepost envelope, together with the patient questionnaire (PQ), by the doctor or research nurse at clinic. Patients were eligible if they provided written informed consent and were able to complete the 27-question questionnaire.

Data collection:

Patient data: The patient questionnaire asked about symptoms and events which led to the diagnosis, with dates of onset. This was in two sections.

The first section concerned symptoms and began: “What was the first symptom which you feel was the beginning of this illness?” asking for the date or time in weeks since this developed. Exact dates were used if given, but where the patient gave only the month, the first of the month was used³⁶. Then followed nineteen questions on specific symptoms, asking whether they had suffered these or not and, if so, the starting date or time in weeks. These symptoms were: dyspnoea, cough, sputum, purulence, haemoptysis, wheeze, chest pain, weight loss, anorexia, weakness, taste change, dry mouth, pyrexia, voice weakness/hoarseness (defined as voice change), finger swelling/discomfort (surrogate for clubbing), metastatic symptoms, dysphagia, neck lumps and neck swelling. The questionnaire was self-administered and employed patient-friendly terms throughout. For example, rather than “dysphagia”, it asked “have you had any trouble swallowing?” Finally it asked about any other symptoms which they felt were part of the illness, with dates. This type of questionnaire, asking whether the patient suffered a symptom and, if so, date of onset, has been validated in the C-SIM questionnaire³⁷.

The second section asked whether they delayed in contacting their doctor and, if so, for what reason, when they saw him/her, the response, and how many times they saw him/her before being referred for a CXR or to secondary care. The questionnaire was reviewed early in the study, to ensure it was well-understood and being completed satisfactorily, and continued, following correction of one spelling error.

Primary care data: GPs received a letter explaining the purposes of the study. This also asked them to complete a short questionnaire, asking the date first consulted about the symptoms which led to the lung cancer diagnosis, how many further consultations took place, dates of all consultations and the date of referral to secondary care or for the CXR which led to secondary care referral.

Outcomes: Primary outcomes were the length of within-patient delay and the proportion of total delay which it represents. Secondary outcomes were factors causing delay, and the relation between these and survival.

Data handling and additional data retrieved: A research nurse recorded all questionnaire responses on a datasheet. Study researchers also retrieved data from hospital records and cancer registry, including: demographic patient data, age at diagnosis, date of diagnosis, postcode, index of multiple deprivation (IMD), tumour stage, site and histology, treatment intent (radical/palliative), smoking data (dates of starting and quitting, pack-years), asbestos exposure and patient status at close of study. Outcomes data were captured in October 2015, providing a minimum of 39 months follow-up. Dates needed to identify the phases in patients' pathways (see below) were retrieved from cancer registry.

Symptoms consistent with known metastases, such as bone pain with a corresponding scan, were defined as “metastatic symptoms”, and analysed along with other symptoms¹⁸. Non-specific symptoms such as abdominal pain were excluded from analysis.

Tumour, node and metastasis (TNM) and stage-grouping followed the International Union against Cancer and American Joint Committee on Cancer 7th edition³⁸. All questionnaires, demographic data and key pathway dates were carefully checked. Following compilation of questionnaire data, the datasheet was anonymised. Date of diagnosis was defined as the date of biopsy which gave the histological diagnosis or, where there was no histology, date of radiological procedure which gave the diagnosis³⁸. Survival was measured from date of diagnosis until death, or the time of assessment, if still alive. Our approaches to data collection, analysis and reporting are consistent with the Aarhus statement on the design and reporting of studies on early cancer diagnosis³⁹.

Pathway phases: Five validated patient pathway phases, modified from Olesen *et al*²⁰, were defined as in Supplementary Table 1. This also shows the source of data e.g. whether from patient or GP questionnaire. Start of within-patient delay was taken as the earliest date given in response to all relevant questions.

The PQ and GPQ both recorded the date the patient first saw their GP, but in case of discrepancy, the GPQ date was used. Similarly the GPQ and cancer registry both recorded the date of referral to secondary care. Discrepancy was rare but, if this occurred, the cancer registry was used in preference.

Analysis: Dividing patients into two groups based around median delay, it was calculated that 193 patients in each cohort would give 80% power to detect a survival difference

between groups, with a hazard ratio of 1.337. Therefore a sample size of 386 participants was chosen. This also permitted the use of up to 38 variables in the regression analysis⁴⁰. Survival within phases was also studied using subgroups according to length of delay. Descriptive analyses were reported on all measured variables for the whole group. These included demographic, patient, tumour and symptom details, additional data as above and lengths of pathway phases (Supplementary Table 1).

Due to the non-normal distribution, the model was based on the logarithm of delay⁴¹. In order to aid interpretation, the resulting regression coefficients were exponentiated to give ratios of geometric means⁴². For analysis of within-patient delay and survival, all variables above were included, also whether patients delayed and for what reason, each symptom and the number of symptoms patients had. The final phase was not included in survival analysis since survival was measured from date of diagnosis.

These variables were assessed univariately using a regression model. All analyses were undertaken using STATA 14.1/SE (Texas, USA).

RESULTS

544 patients were recruited in order for 392 patient questionnaires to be returned. Thirteen were excluded - 2 non-lung primaries (thyroid and colorectal) and 11 questionnaires inadequately completed - leaving 379 for analysis. Of these, GP questionnaires were completed in 266 (70.2%) patients.

Supplementary Table 2 shows demographic, smoking and tumour data,, treatment intent, the number (%) of patients who delayed overall, commonest reasons for delaying, numbers (%s) of patients with various numbers of symptoms and the current status.

Of the 363 (95.8%) patients answering the first question and also completing details on the symptoms section of the questionnaire, 163 (37.7%) mentioned symptoms which started before the date they gave as the beginning of the illness.

Mean within-patient delay was 188.6 days, 61.4% of total delay (median 84 days). Mean pre-secondary care delay was 241 days, 78.5% of total delay (median 142 days) (Supplementary Table 3).

Supplementary Table 4 shows how smoking, delaying, symptoms and number of symptoms all affected the length of delay in patients contacting primary care.

Age, gender, IMD, stage, histology, tumour site and asbestos exposure were not found to influence within-patient delay.

As Supplementary Table 5 shows, survival was not altered by lengths of pathway phases, subgroups of within-patient delay, patients believing that they delayed, nor delay from various known causes. Stage and treatment intent strongly affected survival. Age, gender, IMD and asbestos exposure did not affect survival.

Supplementary Table 6 shows, in a *post-hoc* analysis, how within-patient delay affected survival, after excluding patients who developed early metastatic symptoms.

DISCUSSION

Summary

Within-patient delay, at 84 days median, is much the longest phase, over 60% of total mean delay. Likewise, pre-secondary care delay, median 142 days, is almost 80%. Current smokers delay longer. Denial, anxiety and failure to recognise the symptoms are the most significant factors causing delay.

Seven symptoms are individually associated with longer within-patient delay. Also, the greater the number of symptoms a patient has, the longer is their delay. However, no overall relation was seen between within-patient delay and survival, nor between any pathway phase and survival.

Strengths and limitations

Strengths: We accurately measured the time of the first symptom, by asking closed questions on a large number of lung cancer-related symptoms, thereby accurately measuring within-patient delay. We compared this length with that of later pathway phases. Factors causing this delay have been identified, with their frequency, their effect on delay and survival. We studied the relation between number of symptoms and delay. Finally, we have long-term survival data.

The seven symptoms associated with delay are intuitive. Dyspnoea, cough and sputum are all common to benign disease¹⁷, clubbing may not concern patients, weight loss and weakness may not initially cause anxiety and patients with voice weakness/loss from lung cancer are often seen at ENT before being referred to respiratory clinics, so delay can be expected with all these symptoms.

Limitations: A limitation is that all symptoms data and dates of medical contact were obtained retrospectively by questionnaires, with the possibility of recall bias. However, symptom recognition from a checklist of symptoms (as on the questionnaire) has been shown to improve recall⁴³. Also a breast cancer study, which explored reasons for delay, achieved meaningful results despite patients being approached 3 months to 5 years after diagnosis⁴⁴. In any case, we cross-referenced with primary care electronic records and secondary care databases³⁹, and the outcomes data were obtained prospectively.

Since our patients were recruited from Oncology, we did not capture all incident cases. Had we included all patients receiving curative surgery, the relationship between within-patient delay and outcome might have been stronger, since early-stage patients are likely to have had less delay. However, our percentages of patients in stage III-IV (86.3%) are similar to those of national data in England and Wales (72-76%)². We therefore believe these findings apply to unselected lung cancer patients presenting in primary care.

In completing the questionnaire, over a third of patients mentioned symptoms starting before the date they gave as the beginning of the illness (see Results). They therefore experienced symptoms before realising that they were ill and needing help. This illustrates the difficulty patients have in recognising symptoms. Other lung cancer researchers have asked separately about the start of the illness and dates of symptoms¹⁷.

Much of the data is over five years old. The delay in reporting relates to our requiring long-term outcomes and having limited project staff. However since the nature of lung cancer

has not changed significantly, and outcomes remain poor despite government targets¹³, reducing within-patient delay is now an even more important aim.

Comparison with existing literature

Our results are consistent with an interview study which found 99 days median within-patient delay³⁵. The long delay before primary care is clinically important in view of published volume doubling times of 98 days in lung cancer⁴⁵. A case-control study found the incidence of symptoms was higher in cases than controls from as long as two years before diagnosis⁴⁶.

Our within-patient delay combines “appraisal delay” (time to recognise one needs healthcare help) and “help-seeking delay” (time to be seen)⁴⁷. Since only three patients (0.8%) reported difficulty in making a GP appointment as a cause of delay (Table 2), we believe this is reasonable.

Our study is the first to attempt accurately to compare pre-secondary with secondary care delay. The median primary care delay of 15 days is comparable to the recent National Audit³³ and our 2-week and 31-day waits well within target. An early interview-based study of pre-secondary care delay found a median of 32.5 days, but possibly early symptoms were missed²¹. The same study found that non-respiratory symptoms were associated with longer delay, but we have not found this ²¹.

Of the causes of delay patients gave, delay and anxiety are the most significant. However symptom non-recognition²³ and smoking are more common. Patients in denial may not recognise, or admit to recognising, their symptoms, and those with anxiety may overlook symptoms, so these factors are not independent. Only 35% of smokers who had suffered

cough or hoarseness over a three-month period sought help, compared with 55% of ex-/never-smokers⁴⁸, consistent with our finding that smokers delay longer. Longer pack-years of smoking are also associated with longer delay, as is COPD³⁵.

If we combine patients who mentioned symptoms before the date given for the start of the illness with the patients who declared symptom non-recognition as causing their delay, this shows that almost half our patients (46.7%) showed symptom non-recognition. In a recent UK population study, 38% of people could not recall any lung cancer symptoms⁴³. By contrast, international studies reported this percentage as 11.5%⁴⁹ to 17%⁵⁰.

Within-patient delay and survival

Within-patient delay is the longest phase, yet we saw no relationship between this and survival. Also, metastatic symptoms were not associated with delay (Supplementary Table 4), suggesting that a significant number of patients develop metastases early. In fact of 91 (24%) patients with metastatic symptoms, 34 (37.4%) developed these within three months of their first symptom.

After patients who developed metastatic symptoms within three months are excluded, in the remaining patients, those with a within-patient delay of 6-12 months had worse survival than those with short delay (Supplementary Table 6).

This suggests that two processes operate in lung cancer, both likely to worsen survival: metastases, which may occur early, and unpredictably, in lung cancer, and delay to treatment. This analysis would need to be repeated in larger series. However, this factor, the proportion of patients who develop early metastases, may explain contradictory findings in the literature between delay and survival, mentioned above^{18,31,32}.

Implications for research and practice

Since most delay occurs before any contact with primary care, this phase especially needs to be targeted. Action is needed in three areas: public health, primary care networks and practices.

Symptom non-recognition remains common, therefore increased awareness campaigns need to continue in public health and primary care networks. Current /ever-smokers are identifiable through smoking registers available in primary care⁵¹. A network nurse could liaise, by phone, text or email, with these at-risk people, ensuring they receive proactive education, using self-help manuals^{52,15}, checking for lung cancer symptoms and encouraging earlier referral for investigations or to secondary care. This is possible during the current Covid-19 crisis, and would require only modest funding.

In addition, every primary care consultation, COPD review or health check in ever-smokers can be used for opportunistic questioning regarding lung cancer awareness and relevant symptoms.

We plan to report separately our study of symptoms in early detection of lung cancer in primary care.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

This work was supported by the Anthony Long Charitable Trust (grant number 130208).

The trial was approved by Norfolk Research Ethics Committee on 13 August 2007 (ref no: 07/H0310 /105).

The authors declare no conflicts of interest

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the staff at the Norfolk and Norwich and James Paget University Hospitals, Lilian Wiles for recording patient questionnaire data, Professor Amanda Howe and Dr Ashley Liston for helpful comments, Helene Martin for her patience during preparation of this manuscript and, especially, our patients who provided the information to make this study possible.

REFERENCES

1. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I et al. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians* 2018.68(6), 394-424..

2. Cancer Research UK. *Lung cancer incidence statistics*. Available from:
<https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/lung-cancer/incidence#heading=Three> [Accessed 8th July 2020].
3. Cancer Research UK. *Lung cancer statistics*. Available from:
<https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/lung-cancer#heading=Two> [Accessed 8th July 2020].
4. Arnold M, Rutherford MJ, Bardot A et al. Progress in cancer survival, mortality and incidence in seven high-income countries 1995-2014 (ICBP SURVMARK-2): a population-based study. *Lancet Oncology*. 2019; 20(11):1493-1505. Available from:
doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(19)30456-5
5. Rogers TK. Minimising diagnostic delay in lung cancer. *Thorax* 2019;74:319-320.
doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2018-212927
6. Athey VL, Suckling RJ, Tod AM et al. Early diagnosis of lung cancer: evaluation of a community-based social marketing intervention. *Thorax* 2012;67:412–7.
7. Kennedy MPT, Cheyne L, Darby M et al. Lung cancer stage-shift following a symptom awareness campaign. *Thorax* 2018;73:1128–36 doi: 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2018-212756
8. Ironmonger L, Ohuma E, Ormiston-Smith N et al. An evaluation of the impact of large-scale interventions to raise public awareness of a lung cancer symptom. *Br J Cancer* 2015;112:207–16. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2014.596

9. Aberle DR, Adams AM, Berg CD et al. Reduced lung cancer mortality with low-dose computed tomographic screening. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:395–409 doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1102873.
10. De Koning H, Van Der Aalst C, Ten Haaf K, Oudkerk M. Effects of volume CT lung cancer screening: mortality results of the Nelson randomised-controlled population based trial, 2018. Available: <http://www.ascopost.com/News/593002019>.
11. Villanti AC, Jiang Y, Abrams DB, Pyenson BS. A cost-utility analysis of lung cancer screening and the additional benefits of incorporating smoking cessation interventions. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e71379 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0071379>
12. Manners D, Emery J, Brims FJ, Pettigrew S. Lung cancer screening - practical challenges of confining participation to those who might benefit. *Aust N Z J Public Health* 2016;40:205–6
13. <https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/about-cancer/cancer-in-general/treatment/access-to-treatment/waiting-times-after-diagnosis> (Accessed 15 October 2020)
14. Smith S, Fielding S, Murchie P et al. Reducing the time before consulting with symptoms of lung cancer: a randomised controlled trial in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract* 2013;63:e47–e54 . DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp13X660779>
15. Emery JD, Murray SR, Walter FM et al. The chest Australia trial: a randomised controlled trial of an intervention to increase consultation rates in smokers at risk of

lung cancer. *Thorax* 2019;74:362–70 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2018-212506>

16. Koyi H, Hillerdal G, Branden E. Patient's and doctor's delays in the diagnosis of chest tumors. *Lung Cancer*. 2002; 35(1):53-57.
17. Walter FM, Rubin G, Bankhead C et al. Symptoms and other factors associated with time to diagnosis and stage of lung cancer: a prospective cohort study. *Br J Cancer*. 2015; 112 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S6-S13. Available from: [doi:10.1038/bjc.2015.30](https://doi.org/10.1038/bjc.2015.30)
18. Buccheri G, Ferrigno D. Lung cancer: clinical presentation and specialist referral time, *Eur Resp J*. 2004;24:898-904
[doi:10.1183/09031936.04.00113603](https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.04.00113603)
19. Salomaa E-R, Sällinan S, Hiekkänen H, Liippo K. Delays in the diagnosis and treatment of lung cancer. *Chest* 2005;128(4):2282-2288
doi.org/10.1378/chest.128.4.2282
20. Olesen F, Hansen RP, Vedsted P. Delay in diagnosis: the experience in Denmark. *Br J Cancer* 2009; 101(Suppl 2): S5-S8 [doi: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6605383](https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjc.6605383)
21. Bjerager M, Palshof T, Dahl R, Olesen F. Delay in diagnosis of lung cancer in general practice *Br J Gen Pract* 2006;56(532):863-868 [PMCI D:PMC1927095](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1927095/)
22. Macleod U, Mitchell ED, Burgess C et al. Risk factors for delayed presentation and referral of symptomatic cancer: evidence for common cancers. *Br J Cancer*. 2009; 101 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S92-S101. Available from: [doi: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6605398](https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjc.6605398)

23. Bowen EF, Rayner CF. Patient and GP led delays in the recognition of symptoms suggestive of lung cancer. *Lung Cancer*. 2002;37(2):227-228. Available from: doi:10.1016/s0169-5002(02)00143-5
24. Hackett TP, Cassem NH, Raker JW. Patient delay in cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 1973; 289(1):14–20. Available from: doi: 10.1056/NEJM197307052890104
25. Birring SS, Peake MD. Symptoms and the early diagnosis of lung cancer. *Thorax*. 2005;60(4):268-269. Available from: doi: 10.1136/thx.2004.032698
26. Walabyeki J, Adamson J, Buckley HL et al. Experience of, awareness of and help-seeking for potential cancer symptoms in smokers and non-smokers: A cross-sectional study. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(8):e0183647. Available from: doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0183647
27. Corner J, Hopkinson J, Fitzsimmons D et al. Is late diagnosis of lung cancer inevitable? Interview study of patients' recollections before diagnosis. *Thorax*. 2005; 60(4):314–319. Available from: doi: 10.1136/thx.2004.029264
28. Brindle L, Pope C, Corner J et al. Eliciting symptoms interpreted as normal by patients with early-stage lung cancer: could GP elicitation of normalised symptoms reduce delay in diagnosis? Cross-sectional interview study. *BMJ Open*. 2012;2: e001977. Available from: doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001977
29. Christensen ED, Harvald T, Jendresen M et al. The impact of delayed diagnosis of lung cancer on the stage at the time of the operation. *Eur J Cardiothoracic Surg* 1997;12(6) :880-884. doi.10.1016/S1010

30. O'Rourke N, Edwards R. Lung cancer treatment waiting times and tumour growth. *Clin Oncol (Roy Coll Radiol)* 2000; 12(3):141-144
31. Myrdal G, Lambe M, Hillerdal G et al. Effect of delays on prognosis in patients with non-small cell lung cancer. *Thorax*. 2004; 59:45-49.
32. Diaconescu R, Lafond C, Whittom R. Treatment delays in non-small cell lung cancer and their prognostic implications *J Thoracic Oncol* 2011; 6(7):1254-1259
33. Swann R, McPhail S, Witt J et al. Diagnosing cancer in primary care: results from the National Cancer Diagnosis Audit. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2018; 68(666):e63-e72. Available from: doi: 10.3399/bjgp17X694169
34. Moody A, Muers M, Forman D. Delays in managing lung cancer. *Thorax*. 2004; 59;1-3. Available from: <https://thorax.bmj.com/content/59/1/1.1> [Accessed 10th July 2020]
35. Smith SM, Campbell NC, MacLeod U et al. Factors contributing to the time taken to consult with symptoms of lung cancer: a cross-sectional study. *Thorax* 2009;64:523–31. DOI: 10.1136/thx.2008.096560
36. Allgar VL, Neal RD. Delays in the diagnosis of six cancers: analysis of data from the national survey of NHS patients: Cancer. *Br J Cancer*. 2005; 92(11): 1959-1970. Available from: doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6602587
37. Neal RD, Nafees S, Pasterfield D et al. Patient-reported measurement of time to diagnosis in cancer: development of the Cancer Symptom Interval Measure (C-SIM) and randomised controlled trial of method of delivery. *BMC Health Services Research* 2014;14:3.

38. Goldstraw, P, Crowley, JJ, on behalf of the IASLC International Staging Project. The International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer International Staging Project on Lung Cancer. *J Thorac Oncol*. 2006; 1(4):281–286. Available from:
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1556-0864\(15\)31581-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1556-0864(15)31581-1)
39. Weller D, Vedsted P, Rubin G et al. The Aarhus statement: improving design and reporting of studies on early cancer diagnosis. *Br J Cancer*. 2012;106(7):1262-1267. Available from: doi:10.1038/bjc.2012.68
40. Vittinghoff E, McCulloch CE. Relaxing the rule of ten events per variable in logistic and Cox regression. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2007;165(6):710-8. Available from:
doi:10.1093/aje/kwk052
41. Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistics notes: the use of transformation when comparing two means. *BMJ*. 1996;312:1153. Available from:
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.312.7039.1153>
42. Bland JM, Altman DG. Transforming data. *BMJ*. 1996; 312(7033):770. Available from:
doi:10.1136/bmj.312.7033.770
43. Heath J, Paulishak M, Kasalaes C et al. Reasons symptomatic breast cancer patients delay seeking medical care. *J Unexplored Med Data*. 2019;4:3. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20517/2572-8180.2018.01>
44. Henschke CI, Yankelevitz DF, Yip R et al. Lung cancers diagnosed at annual CT screening: volume doubling times. *Radiology* 2012;263:578–83. doi: 10.1148/radiol.12102489.

45. Ades AE, Biswas M, Welton NJ, Hamilton W. Symptom lead time distribution in lung cancer: natural history and prospects for early diagnosis. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2014; 43(6):1865-1873 Available from: doi:10.1093/ije/dyu174.
46. Friedemann Smith C, Whitaker KL, Winstanley K, Wardle J. Smokers are less likely than non-smokers to seek help for a lung cancer 'alarm' symptom. *Thorax.* 2016;71:659-661. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2015-208063>
47. Simon AE, Juszczyk D, Smyth N et al. Knowledge of lung cancer symptoms and risk factors in the UK: development of a measure and results from a population-based survey. *Thorax.* 2012;67(5):426-32. Available from: doi: 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2011-200898.
48. Crane M, Scott N, O'Hara BJ et al. Knowledge of the signs and symptoms and risk factors of lung cancer in Australia: mixed methods study. *BMC Public health.* 2016; 16:508 Available from: doi: 10.1186/s12889-016-3051-8.
49. Hanson HM, Raag M, Adrat M, Laisaar T. Awareness of lung cancer symptoms and risk factors in general population. *Open Journal of Respiratory Diseases.* 2017; 7:1-11. Available from: doi: 10.4236/ojrd.2017.71001.
50. Walter F, Webster A, Scott S, Emery J. The Andersen Model of Total patient delay: a systematic model of its application in cancer diagnosis. *J Health Serv Res Policy.* 2012;17(2):110-118. Available from: doi: 10.1258/jhsrp.2011.010113
51. Atkinson MD, Kennedy JI, John A et al. Development of an algorithm for determining smoking status and behaviour over the life course from UK electronic primary care

records. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making* 2017;17:2 doi

10.1186/s12911-016-0400-6.

52. Smith SM, Murchie P, Devereux G et al. Developing a complex intervention to reduce time to presentation with symptoms of lung cancer. *Br J Gen Practice* 2012;62(602):e605-e615 doi: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp12X654579>

Accepted Manuscript – BJGPO – BJGPO.2010.0130