# Study of Traditional and Complementary Medicine (TCM) Usage among Cancer Patients Receiving Chemotherapy in Hospital Melaka

Wong Kuo Zang<sup>1</sup>, Mastria Mohamed<sup>1</sup>, Loh Wan Ting<sup>1</sup>, Suhadah Ahad<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hospital Melaka, Ministry of Health Malaysia

#### **Abstract**

**Introduction:** Traditional and complementary medicine (TCM) is commonly used among cancer patients.

**Objective**: The aim of this study was to determine the prevalence, types, reasons and belief of TCM use among cancer patients receiving chemotherapy in Hospital Melaka. The study also compared the delay in seeking conventional treatment, chemotherapy adherence and satisfaction level of conventional treatment between TCM users and non-TCM users.

**Methods:** This was a cross-sectional study where data was collected from August to December 2016. A total of 141 cancer patients who were receiving chemotherapy at Hospital Melaka were recruited with written consent. All patients were directly interviewed with a structured questionnaire. The data were analysed using chi-square test and independent t-test in SPSS version 22.0 software.

**Results:** In this study, 68.8% respondents were TCM users. Types of TCM found to be commonly used were soursop fruits and leaves (42.27%), apricot seed (28.87%), butterfly wing leaf (26.80%) and Sabah snake grass (25.77%). The main reason of TCM use was to suppress the progression of cancer (77.30%) and most of them believed that TCM is able to do so (69.90%). TCM usage was associated with ethnicity and household income. Between TCM users and non-TCM users, there were significant differences in the number of weeks delay in seeking conventional treatment and satisfaction toward conventional treatment (p<0.01) but no significant difference in delay of chemotherapy schedule.

**Conclusion**: There was a high prevalence of TCM use among cancer patients receiving chemotherapy in Hospital Melaka and they believed that TCM can suppress the progression of cancer. The results also showed that the most commonly used TCM was Soursop fruits and leaves. TCM use may be contributing to delays in seeking conventional treatment but did not affect chemotherapy adherence. Non-TCM users had higher satisfaction level toward conventional treatment compared with TCM users.

Keywords: traditional and complementary medicine, TCM, cancer, chemotherapy, adherence

NMRR ID: NMRR-16-1255-31588

# Corresponding author:

Wong Kuo Zang Department of Pharmacy, Hospital Melaka, Jalan Mufti Haji Khalil, 75400 Melaka

Email: kuozang@moh.gov.my

#### Introduction

Cancer is the principal cause of death worldwide<sup>1</sup>. Based on the Malaysian National Cancer Registry (NCR) report 2007-2011, a total of 103,507 new cancer cases were diagnosed in Malaysia in the 5-year period<sup>2</sup>. Traditional and complementary medicine (TCM) is a form of health-related practice designed to prevent, treat, manage illnesses or preserve the mental and physical well-being of individuals. It includes practices such as traditional Malay medicine, Islamic medical practice, traditional Chinese medicine, traditional Indian medicine, homeopathy and complementary therapies, and excludes medical or dental practices utilised by registered medical or dental practitioners<sup>3</sup>. Nutritional therapy is described as a system of healing based on the belief that food provides the medicine we need to obtain and maintain a state of health whereby our food is our medicine<sup>4</sup>.

Previous studies conducted in Asian countries as well as in Malaysia showed high prevalence rate of TCM use among cancer patients<sup>5-11</sup>. However, the effectiveness and safety of using TCM upon diagnosis and in combination with conventional cancer treatment are the concern of breast surgeons, oncologist and the health care team<sup>9</sup>. Besides, TCM use was also found to be associated with delay in seeking conventional treatment among breast cancer patient which led to high incidences of progressive breast cancer and a low survival rate among Malaysian women with breast cancer <sup>12-13</sup>. A study that was done in Malaysia showed that 16.4% of cancer patients stopped the standard treatment while using TCM<sup>8</sup>.

Cancer patients generally perceive cancer as more frightening and less controllable compared to other chronic or life-threatening diseases. Thus, it is important for the healthcare provider to understand the factors motivating them to use TCM<sup>14</sup>. This study examined the prevalence, types, reasons and belief of TCM use among cancer patients receiving chemotherapy. It also compared TCM users and non-TCM users on the delay in seeking conventional treatment, chemotherapy adherence and satisfaction level of conventional treatment.

### **Methods**

This study was a cross-sectional study conducted among patients whom had solid tumor or hematology malignancies that were receiving chemotherapy in wards or day care centre of Hospital Melaka, Malaysia. Approval to conduct the study was obtained from the Medical Research & Ethnic Committee (MREC), Ministry of Health Malaysia with registration identity NMRR-16-1255-31588.

Data was collected from August to December 2016. All patients who fulfilled the inclusion criteria were recruited into the study. Participation in this study was voluntary with written informed consent. All participants were assured of their confidentiality and the right not to participate or to withdraw at any point during the study. All participants were directly interviewed using a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was in English and was extracted from a previous study "An Empirical Study on Traditional, Complementary and Alternative Medicine Usage among Malaysian Cancer Patients" by Nagashekhara et al. (2015). The permission to use the questionnaire had been obtained from the authors<sup>5</sup>.

Data were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0. Association between socio-demographic characteristics and TCM use were assessed using chi-square test. Independent t-test was carried out to determine if there was any significant difference between TCM users and non-TCM users in the delay in seeking conventional treatment, chemotherapy adherence, and satisfaction level of conventional treatment and healthcare professional's influence.

### Results

### Demographics

The characteristics of included patients were presented in Table 1. A total number of 141 respondents were interviewed whereby 94 (66.7%) were female and 47 (33.3%) were male. The mean age of respondents in this study was 52.3 (standard deviation (SD) 13.8) years old with maximum age of 74 years old and minimum age of 18 years old. There were 97 (68.8%) TCM users and 44 (32.2%) non-TCM users. The mean age was 51.7 (SD 13.9) years old and 53.4 (SD 13.7) years old for TCM users and non-TCM users respectively.

Majority of the respondents were Malay (65.2%), married (82.3%), with secondary education (44.7%), student (52.5%), monthly income in the range of RM0-RM2000 (67.4%) and living in rural area (58.9%). Among the respondents, 32 (22.7%) had breast cancer, 24 (17.0%) had non-Hodgkin lymphoma and 17 (12.1%) had ovarian cancer. Among all the socio-demographic variables, TCM use was found to be associated with ethnicity ( $\chi^2(2)$ =21.275, p<0.01) and household monthly income ( $\chi^2(3)$ =8.684, p<0.05), in which Malay and higher income patients had higher usage of TCM.

# Types of TCM used

The most frequently used TCM among respondents were soursop fruit or leaf (42.3%) followed by apricot seed (28.9%), butterfly wing leaf (26.8%) and Sabah snake grass (25.8%) as presented in Table 2.

### Reason, belief and perception of TCM use

Most of the TCM users stated that the reason of using TCM was to suppress the progression of cancer (77.3%) and to improve physical well-being (70.1%). More than half of TCM users (69.9%) believed that TCM could suppress the progression of cancer and 53.7% users believed that TCM would not cause any unwanted side effects as it is 'natural'. However, only 3.1% TCM users believed that TCM is more effective than the conventional treatment and 25.7% TCM users believed that TCM is safe to use together with conventional treatment. Moreover, it was noted that more than half of TCM users (60.8%) did not disclose to their doctors that they are using TCM. Among the TCM users, 48.5% said that TCM is somewhat helpful for their cancer followed by 21.6% somewhat not helpful, 20.6% very helpful and 9.3% not at all helpful. On the other hand, non-TCM users stated that they did not use TCM because they had never thought of using it (84.5%), satisfied with conventional treatment (82.2%), did not believe in its efficacy (71.1%) as well as discouragement from family, friends and doctors (68.9%).

As shown in Table 3, there were significant differences in the mean duration delayed in seeking conventional treatment (9.7 weeks versus 2.4 weeks, 95% confidence interval (CI) 2.683, 11.808) and patient's satisfaction score with conventional treatment (mean difference -8.488, 95% CI 10.201, 6.775) between TCM users and non-TCM users. There was no significant difference in the mean frequency of delayed chemotherapy between TCM users and non-TCM users.

Table 1: The socio-demographic and clinical characteristics of TCM and non-TCM users (N=141)

Total respondents Gender Female Femal	Variables, n (%)	All	TCM user	Non-TCM user
Gender Female Female Female Male 47 (33.3) 29 (29.9) 18 (40.9) Ethnicity*  Malay 92 (65.2) 75 (77.3) 17 (38.6) Chinese 39 (27.7) 19 (19.6) 20 (45.5) Indian 10 (7.1) 3 (3.1) 7 (15.9)  Marital status Single 18 (12.8) 12 (12.4) 6 (13.6) Married 116 (82.3) 82 (84.5) 34 (77.3) Divorced or separated 7 (5.0) 3 (3.1) 4 (9.1)  Education level Never 12 (8.5) 5 (5.2) 7 (15.9) Primary 47 (33.3) 30 (30.9) 17 (38.6) Secondary 63 (44.7) 46 (47.4) 17 (38.6) Secondary 63 (44.7) 46 (47.4) 17 (38.6) Employment status Employed 1 (0.7) 1 (1.0) 0 Student 74 (52.5) 48 (49.5) 26 (59.1) Unemployed 26 (18.4) 17 (17.5) 9 (20.5) Retired 6 (4.3) 6 (6.2) 0 Self-employed 34 (24.1) 25 (25.8) 9 (20.5) Household monthly income* 0 - 2000 95 (66.7) 60 (61.9) 35 (79.5) 2001 - 4000 30 (21.3) 21 (21.7) 9 (20.4) 4001 - 6000 2 (1.4) 4001 - 6000 3 (21.3) 21 (21.7) 9 (20.4) 4001 - 6000 14 (9.9) 14 (14.4) 0 > 6000 2 (1.4) 2 (2.1) 0 House location Rural 83 (58.9) 59 (60.8) 24 (56.8) No 70 (49.6) 49 (50.5) 21 (47.7) Supplement taken before cancer Yes 55 (39.0) 42 (43.3) 13 (29.6) No Cancer stage Stage 1 7 (5.0) 7 (7.2) 0 Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0) Statisfied with conventional treatment Yes 120 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6) No 12 (85.5) 9 (9.3) 3 (6.8)				
Female Male 47 (33.3) 29 (29.9) 18 (40.9) Ethnicity*  Malay 92 (65.2) 75 (77.3) 17 (38.6) Chinese 39 (27.7) 19 (19.6) 20 (45.5) Indian 10 (7.1) 3 (3.1) 7 (15.9) Marital status  Single 18 (12.8) 12 (12.4) 6 (13.6) Married Divorced or separated 7 (5.0) 3 (3.1) 4 (9.1) Education level  Never 12 (8.5) 5 (5.2) 7 (15.9) Frimary 47 (33.3) 30 (30.9) 17 (38.6) Secondary 63 (44.7) 46 (47.4) 17 (38.6) Secondary 19 (13.5) 16 (16.5) 3 (6.8) Employed 10.7) 11 (1.0) 0 Student 74 (52.5) 48 (49.5) 26 (59.1) Unemployed 26 (18.4) 17 (17.5) 9 (20.5) Retired 64 (4.3) 6 (6.2) 0 Sef-employed 34 (24.1) 25 (25.8) 9 (20.5) Household monthly income*  0 - 2000 95 (66.7) 60 (61.9) 35 (79.5) 2001 - 4000 30 (21.3) 21 (21.7) 9 (20.4) 4001 - 6000 14 (9.9) 14 (14.4) 0 > 6000 2 (14.4) 2 (2.1) 0 (10.4) Chinese 10 (20.4) (20.		171	37 (00.0)	44(01.2)
Male         47 (33.3)         29 (29.9)         18 (40.9)           Ethnicity*         Malay         92 (65.2)         75 (77.3)         17 (38.6)           Chinese         39 (27.7)         19 (19.6)         20 (45.5)           Indian         10 (7.1)         3 (3.1)         7 (5.9)           Marital status         18 (12.8)         12 (12.4)         6 (13.6)           Married         116 (82.3)         82 (84.5)         34 (77.3)           Divorced or separated         7 (5.0)         3 (3.1)         4 (9.1)           Education level         12 (8.5)         5 (5.2)         7 (15.9)           Primary         47 (33.3)         30 (30.9)         17 (38.6)           Secondary         63 (44.7)         46 (47.4)         17 (38.6)           Employment status         Employment status         Employment status           Employment status         6 (6.2)         0           Self-		94 (66 7)	68 (70.1)	26 (59 1)
Ethnicity* Malay Malay 92 (65.2) 75 (77.3) 17 (38.6) Chinese 39 (27.7) 19 (19.6) 20 (45.5) Indian 10 (7.1) 3 (3.1) 7 (15.9) Marital status Single 18 (12.8) 12 (12.4) 6 (13.6) Married Divorced or separated 7 (5.0) 3 (3.1) 4 (9.1) Education level Never 12 (8.5) Frimary 47 (33.3) 30 (30.9) 17 (38.6) Secondary 63 (44.7) 46 (47.4) 17 (38.6) Tertiary 19 (13.5) Employment status Employed 1 (0.7) Student 7 (5.0) Self-employed 26 (18.4) 17 (17.5) Retired 6 (4.3) Self-employed 34 (24.1) 10 - 2000 201 - 4000 30 (21.3) 21 (21.7) 9 (20.4) 4001 - 6000 14 (9.9) 14 (14.4) 0 > 6000 2 (1.4) 10 - 0 House location Rural 83 (58.9) 9 (60.8) 12 (18.6) 13 (29.6) No 10 Stage 2 27 (19.1) 18 (18.6) 19 (20.5) 18 (18.6) 19 (20.5) 19 (2		` ,	` ,	` ,
Malay 92 (66.2) 75 (77.3) 17 (38.6) Chinese 39 (27.7) 19 (19.6) 20 (45.5) Indian 10 (7.1) 3 (3.1) 7 (15.9) Marital status  Single 18 (12.8) 12 (12.4) 6 (13.6) Married 116 (82.3) 82 (84.5) 34 (77.3) Divorced or separated 7 (5.0) 3 (3.1) 4 (9.1) Education level  Never 12 (8.5) 5 (5.2) 7 (15.9) Primary 47 (33.3) 30 (30.9) 17 (38.6) Secondary 63 (44.7) 46 (47.4) 17 (38.6) Tertiary 19 (13.5) 16 (16.5) 3 (6.8) Employment status  Employed 1 (0.7) 1 (1.0) 0 Student 74 (52.5) 48 (49.5) 26 (59.1) Unemployed 26 (18.4) 17 (17.5) 9 (20.5) Retired 6 (4.3) 6 (6.2) 0 Self-employed 34 (24.1) 25 (25.8) 9 (20.5) Household monthly income*  0 - 2000 95 (66.7) 60 (61.9) 35 (79.5) 2001 - 4000 30 (21.3) 21 (21.7) 9 (20.4) 4001 - 6000 14 (9.9) 14 (14.4) 0 > 6000 14 (9.9) 14 (14.4) 0 > 6000 2 (1.4) 2 (2.1) 0 House location Rural 83 (58.9) 59 (60.8) 24 (56.8) Urban 58 (41.1) 38 (39.2) 20 (43.2) Comorbidity Yes 71 (50.4) 48 (49.5) 23 (52.3) No 70 (49.6) 49 (50.5) 21 (47.7) Supplement taken before cancer Yes 55 (39.0) 42 (43.3) 13 (29.6) No 86 (61.0) 55 (56.7) 31 (70.5) Cancer stage Stage 1 7 (5.0) 7 (7.2) 0 Stage 2 27 (19.1) 18 (18.6) 9 (20.5) Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0) Stage 4 34 (24.1) 26 (26.8) 8 (18.2) Unknown 11 (7.8) 7 (7.2) 4 (9.1) Satisfied with conventional treatment Yes 120 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 9(9.3) 3 (8.8)		+1 (00.0)	20 (20.0)	10 (40.3)
Chinese Indian 10 (7.1) 3 (3.1) 7 (15.9) Marital status  Single 18 (12.8) 12 (12.4) 6 (13.6) Married 116 (82.3) 82 (84.5) 34 (77.3) Divorced or separated 7 (5.0) 3 (3.1) 4 (9.1) Education level  Never 12 (8.5) 5 (5.2) 7 (15.9) Primary 47 (33.3) 30 (30.9) 17 (38.6) Secondary 63 (44.7) 46 (47.4) 17 (38.6) Secondary 19 (13.5) 16 (16.5) 3 (6.8) Employment status  Employed 1 (0.7) 1 (1.0) 0 Student 74 (52.5) 48 (49.5) 26 (59.1) Unemployed 26 (18.4) 17 (17.5) 9 (20.5) Retired 6 (4.3) 6 (6.2) 0 Self-employed 34 (24.1) 25 (25.8) 9 (20.5) Household monthly income*  0 - 2000 95 (66.7) 60 (61.9) 35 (79.5) 2001 - 4000 30 (21.3) 21 (21.7) 9 (20.4) 4001 - 6000 14 (9.9) 14 (14.4) 0 > 6000 2 (1.4) 2 (2.1) 0 Olouse location Rural 83 (58.9) 59 (60.8) 24 (56.8) Urban 58 (41.1) 38 (39.2) 20 (43.2) Comorbidity Yes 71 (50.4) 48 (49.5) 23 (52.3) No 70 (49.6) 49 (50.5) 21 (47.7) Supplement taken before cancer Yes 55 (39.0) 42 (43.3) 13 (29.6) No 86 (61.0) 55 (56.7) 31 (70.5) Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0) Stage 3 36 (8.8) 11 (70.8) 7 (7.2) 4 (9.1) Satisfied with conventional treatment Yes 120 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6) No 12 (85.5) 9 (9.3) 3 (6.8)	•	92 (65.2)	75 (77 3)	17 (38 6)
Indian 10 (7.1) 3 (3.1) 7 (15.9)  Marital status  Single 18 (12.8) 12 (12.4) 6 (13.6)  Married 116 (82.3) 82 (84.5) 34 (77.3)  Divorced or separated 7 (5.0) 3 (3.1) 4 (9.1)  Education level  Never 12 (8.5) 5 (5.2) 7 (15.9)  Primary 47 (33.3) 30 (30.9) 17 (38.6)  Secondary 63 (44.7) 46 (47.4) 17 (38.6)  Secondary 63 (44.7) 46 (47.4) 17 (38.6)  Tertiary 19 (13.5) 16 (16.5) 3 (6.8)  Employment status  Employed 1 (0.7) 1 (1.0) 0  Student 74 (52.5) 48 (49.5) 26 (59.1)  Unemployed 26 (18.4) 17 (17.5) 9 (20.5)  Retired 6 (4.3) 6 (6.2) 0  Self-employed 34 (24.1) 25 (25.8) 9 (20.5)  Household monthly income* 0 - 2000 95 (66.7) 60 (61.9) 35 (79.5)  2001 - 4000 30 (21.3) 21 (21.7) 9 (20.4)  4001 - 6000 14 (9.9) 14 (14.4) 0  > 6000 2 (1.4) 2 (2.1)  House location  Rural 83 (58.9) 59 (60.8) 24 (56.8)  Urban 58 (41.1) 38 (39.2) 20 (43.2)  Comorbidity  Yes 71 (50.4) 48 (49.5) 23 (52.3)  No 86 (61.0) 55 (56.7) 31 (70.5)  Cancer stage  Stage 1 7 (5.0) 7 (7.2) 0  Stage 2 27 (19.1) 18 (18.6) 9 (20.5)  Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0)  Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0)  Stage 4 34 (24.1) 26 (26.8) 8 (18.2)  Unclassified with conventional treatment Yes 12 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6)  No 12 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	` ,	` ,	` ,
Marital status   Single				
Single         18 (12.8)         12 (12.4)         6 (13.6)           Married         116 (82.3)         82 (84.5)         34 (77.3)           Divorced or separated         7 (5.0)         3 (3.1)         4 (9.1)           Education level         7 (5.0)         3 (3.1)         4 (9.1)           Never         12 (8.5)         5 (5.2)         7 (15.9)           Primary         47 (33.3)         30 (30.9)         17 (38.6)           Secondary         63 (44.7)         46 (47.4)         17 (38.6)           Tertiary         19 (13.5)         16 (16.5)         3 (6.8)           Employment status         Employed         1 (0.7)         1 (1.0)         0           Student         74 (52.5)         48 (49.5)         26 (59.1)           Unemployed         26 (18.4)         17 (17.5)         9 (20.5)           Retired         6 (4.3)         6 (6.2)         0           Self-employed         34 (24.1)         25 (25.8)         9 (20.5)           Household monthly income*         0         2 (56.7)         60 (61.9)         35 (79.5)           2001 - 4000         30 (21.3)         21 (21.7)         9 (20.4)           4001 - 6000         1 (9.9)         14 (14.4)         0 <td></td> <td>10 (7.1)</td> <td>3 (3.1)</td> <td>7 (13.9)</td>		10 (7.1)	3 (3.1)	7 (13.9)
Married Divorced or separated         116 (82.3)         82 (84.5)         34 (77.3)           Divorced or separated         7 (5.0)         3 (3.1)         4 (9.1)           Education level         Never         12 (8.5)         5 (5.2)         7 (15.9)           Primary         47 (33.3)         30 (30.9)         17 (38.6)           Secondary         63 (44.7)         46 (47.4)         17 (38.6)           Tertiary         19 (13.5)         16 (16.5)         3 (6.8)           Employment status         Employment status           Employed         1 (0.7)         1 (1.0)         0           Student         74 (52.5)         48 (49.5)         26 (59.1)           Unemployed         26 (18.4)         17 (17.5)         9 (20.5)           Retired         6 (4.3)         6 (6.2)         0           Self-employed         34 (24.1)         25 (25.8)         9 (20.5)           Household monthly income*         0         200.0         95 (66.7)         60 (61.9)         35 (79.5)           2001 - 4000         30 (21.3)         21 (21.7)         9 (20.4)           4001 - 6000         14 (9.9)         14 (14.4)         0           > 6000         2 (1.4)         2 (2.1) <td></td> <td>18 (12 8)</td> <td>12 (12 4)</td> <td>6 (13 6)</td>		18 (12 8)	12 (12 4)	6 (13 6)
Divorced or separated   7 (5.0)   3 (3.1)   4 (9.1)     Education level                 Never                               Never		, ,	, ,	• •
Education level   Never		` ,	` '	` ,
Never         12 (8.5)         5 (5.2)         7 (15.9)           Primary         47 (33.3)         30 (30.9)         17 (38.6)           Secondary         63 (44.7)         46 (47.4)         17 (38.6)           Tertiary         19 (13.5)         16 (16.5)         3 (6.8)           Employment status         Employed         1 (0.7)         1 (1.0)         0           Student         74 (52.5)         48 (49.5)         26 (59.1)           Unemployed         26 (18.4)         17 (17.5)         9 (20.5)           Retired         6 (4.3)         6 (6.2)         0           Self-employed         34 (24.1)         25 (25.8)         9 (20.5)           Household monthly income*         0 - 2000         95 (66.7)         60 (61.9)         35 (79.5)           2001 - 4000         30 (21.3)         21 (21.7)         9 (20.4)           4001 - 6000         14 (9.9)         14 (14.4)         0           > 6000         2 (1.4)         2 (2.1)         0           House location         Rural         83 (58.9)         59 (60.8)         24 (56.8)           Urban         58 (41.1)         38 (39.2)         20 (43.2)           Comorbidity         Yes         71 (50.4)		7 (3.0)	3 (3.1)	4 (9.1)
Primary 47 (33.3) 30 (30.9) 17 (38.6) Secondary 63 (44.7) 46 (47.4) 17 (38.6) Tertiary 19 (13.5) 16 (16.5) 3 (6.8) Employment status  Employed 1 (0.7) 1 (1.0) 0 0 Student 74 (52.5) 48 (49.5) 26 (59.1) Unemployed 26 (18.4) 17 (17.5) 9 (20.5) Retired 6 (4.3) 6 (6.2) 0 Self-employed 34 (24.1) 25 (25.8) 9 (20.5) Household monthly income* 0 - 2000 95 (66.7) 60 (61.9) 35 (79.5) 2001 - 4000 30 (21.3) 21 (21.7) 9 (20.4) 4001 - 6000 14 (9.9) 14 (14.4) 0 > 6000 2 (1.4) 2 (2.1) 0 House location Rural 83 (58.9) 59 (60.8) 24 (56.8) Urban 58 (41.1) 38 (39.2) 20 (43.2) Comorbidity Yes 71 (50.4) 48 (49.5) 23 (52.3) No 70 (49.6) 49 (50.5) 21 (47.7) Supplement taken before cancer Yes 55 (39.0) 42 (43.3) 13 (29.6) No 86 (61.0) 55 (56.7) 31 (70.5) Cancer stage Stage 1 7 (5.0) 7 (7.2) 0 Stage 2 27 (19.1) 18 (18.6) 9 (20.5) Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0) Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0) Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0) Stage 4 34 (24.1) 26 (26.8) 8 (18.2) Unclassified 27 (19.1) 15 (15.5) 12 (27.3) Unknown 11 (7.8) 7 (7.2) 4 (9.1) Satisfied with conventional treatment Yes 120 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6) No 12 (8.5) 9 (9.3) 3 (6.8)		12 (0.5)	5 (5 O)	7 (15 0)
Secondary         63 (44.7)         46 (47.4)         17 (38.6)           Tertiary         19 (13.5)         16 (16.5)         3 (6.8)           Employment status         Employed         1 (0.7)         1 (1.0)         0           Student         74 (52.5)         48 (49.5)         26 (59.1)           Unemployed         26 (18.4)         17 (17.5)         9 (20.5)           Retired         6 (4.3)         6 (6.2)         0           Self-employed         34 (24.1)         25 (25.8)         9 (20.5)           Household monthly income*         0 - 2000         95 (66.7)         60 (61.9)         35 (79.5)           2001 - 4000         30 (21.3)         21 (21.7)         9 (20.4)           4001 - 6000         14 (9.9)         14 (14.4)         0           > 6000         2 (1.4)         2 (2.1)         0           House location         83 (58.9)         59 (60.8)         24 (56.8)           Urban         58 (41.1)         38 (39.2)         20 (43.2)           Comorbidity         Yes         71 (50.4)         48 (49.5)         23 (52.3)           No         70 (49.6)         49 (50.5)         21 (47.7)           Supplement taken before cancer         Yes         55 (3				
Tertiary 19 (13.5) 16 (16.5) 3 (6.8)  Employment status  Employed 1 (0.7) 1 (1.0) 0  Student 74 (52.5) 48 (49.5) 26 (59.1)  Unemployed 26 (18.4) 17 (17.5) 9 (20.5)  Retired 6 (4.3) 6 (6.2) 0  Self-employed 34 (24.1) 25 (25.8) 9 (20.5)  Household monthly income*  0 - 2000 95 (66.7) 60 (61.9) 35 (79.5)  2001 - 4000 30 (21.3) 21 (21.7) 9 (20.4)  4001 - 6000 14 (9.9) 14 (14.4) 0  > 6000 2 (1.4) 2 (2.1) 0   House location  Rural 83 (58.9) 59 (60.8) 24 (56.8)  Urban 58 (41.1) 38 (39.2) 20 (43.2)  Comorbidity  Yes 71 (50.4) 48 (49.5) 23 (52.3)  No 70 (49.6) 49 (50.5) 21 (47.7)  Supplement taken before cancer  Yes 55 (39.0) 42 (43.3) 13 (29.6)  No 86 (61.0) 55 (56.7) 31 (70.5)  Cancer stage  Stage 1 7 (5.0) 7 (7.2) 0  Stage 2 27 (19.1) 18 (18.6) 9 (20.5)  Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0)  Stage 4 34 (24.1) 26 (26.8) 8 (18.2)  Unclassified 27 (19.1) 15 (15.5) 12 (27.3)  Unknown 11 (7.8) 7 (7.2) 4 (9.1)  Satisfied with conventional treatment  Yes 120 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6)  No 12 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6)	•		` ,	
Employment status Employed Student T4 (52.5) February Student T4 (52.5) February Student T4 (52.5) February T5 (60.2) February T6 (60.2) February T6 (60.2) February T6 (60.2) February T7 (50.0) February T7 (50.4) February T8 (50.4) February T9 (50.5) February T9 (50.5) February T9 (50.5) February T9 (50.5) February T9 (70.2) February T9 (70.2) February T9 (70.5) February	•			
Employed 1 (0.7) 1 (1.0) 0 Student 74 (52.5) 48 (49.5) 26 (59.1) Unemployed 26 (18.4) 17 (17.5) 9 (20.5) Retired 6 (4.3) 6 (6.2) 0 Self-employed 34 (24.1) 25 (25.8) 9 (20.5) Household monthly income* 0 - 2000 95 (66.7) 60 (61.9) 35 (79.5) 2001 - 4000 30 (21.3) 21 (21.7) 9 (20.4) 4001 - 6000 14 (9.9) 14 (14.4) 0 > 6000 2 (1.4) 2 (2.1) 0 House location Rural 83 (58.9) 59 (60.8) 24 (56.8) Urban 58 (41.1) 38 (39.2) 20 (43.2) Comorbidity Yes 71 (50.4) 48 (49.5) 23 (52.3) No 70 (49.6) 49 (50.5) 21 (47.7) Supplement taken before cancer Yes 55 (39.0) 42 (43.3) 13 (29.6) No 86 (61.0) 55 (56.7) 31 (70.5) Cancer stage Stage 1 7 (5.0) 7 (7.2) 0 Stage 2 27 (19.1) 18 (18.6) 9 (20.5) Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0) Stage 4 34 (24.1) 26 (26.8) 8 (18.2) Unclassified 27 (19.1) 15 (15.5) 12 (27.3) Unknown 11 (7.8) 7 (7.2) 4 (9.1) Satisfied with conventional treatment Yes 120 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6) No 12 (8.5) 9 (9.3) 3 (6.8)	•	19 (13.5)	16 (16.5)	3 (0.8)
Student         74 (52.5)         48 (49.5)         26 (59.1)           Unemployed         26 (18.4)         17 (17.5)         9 (20.5)           Retired         6 (4.3)         6 (6.2)         0           Self-employed         34 (24.1)         25 (25.8)         9 (20.5)           Household monthly income*         0 - 2000         95 (66.7)         60 (61.9)         35 (79.5)           2001 - 4000         30 (21.3)         21 (21.7)         9 (20.4)           4001 - 6000         14 (9.9)         14 (14.4)         0           > 6000         2 (1.4)         2 (2.1)         0           House location         84 (41.1)         38 (39.2)         20 (43.2)           Comorbidity         Yes         71 (50.4)         48 (49.5)         23 (52.3)           No         70 (49.6)         49 (50.5)         21 (47.7)           Supplement taken before cancer         Yes         55 (39.0)         42 (43.3)         13 (29.6)           No         86 (61.0)         55 (56.7)         31 (70.5)           Cancer stage         Stage 1         7 (5.0)         7 (7.2)         0           Stage 2         27 (19.1)         18 (18.6)         9 (20.5)           Stage 3         35 (24.8)	·	4 (0.7)	4 (4.0)	0
Unemployed Retired 6 (4.3) 6 (6.2) 0 Self-employed 34 (24.1) 25 (25.8) 9 (20.5)   Household monthly income*   0 - 2000 95 (66.7) 60 (61.9) 35 (79.5)   2001 - 4000 30 (21.3) 21 (21.7) 9 (20.4)   4001 - 6000 14 (9.9) 14 (14.4) 0   > 6000 2 (1.4) 2 (2.1) 0   House location   Rural 83 (58.9) 59 (60.8) 24 (56.8)   Urban 58 (41.1) 38 (39.2) 20 (43.2)   Comorbidity   Yes 71 (50.4) 48 (49.5) 23 (52.3)   No 70 (49.6) 49 (50.5) 21 (47.7)   Supplement taken before cancer   Yes 55 (39.0) 42 (43.3) 13 (29.6)   No 86 (61.0) 55 (56.7) 31 (70.5)   Cancer stage   Stage 1 7 (50.0) 7 (7.2) 0   Stage 2 27 (19.1) 18 (18.6) 9 (20.5)   Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0)   Stage 4 34 (24.1) 26 (26.8) 8 (18.2)   Unclassified 27 (19.1) 15 (15.5) 12 (27.3)   Unknown 11 (7.8) 7 (7.2) 4 (9.1)   Satisfied with conventional treatment   Yes 120 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6)   No 12 (8.5) 9 (9.3) 3 (6.8)	·	` ,	` '	
Retired       6 (4.3)       6 (6.2)       0         Self-employed       34 (24.1)       25 (25.8)       9 (20.5)         Household monthly income*       0 - 2000       95 (66.7)       60 (61.9)       35 (79.5)         2001 - 4000       30 (21.3)       21 (21.7)       9 (20.4)         4001 - 6000       14 (9.9)       14 (14.4)       0         > 6000       2 (1.4)       2 (2.1)       0         House location       83 (58.9)       59 (60.8)       24 (56.8)         Urban       58 (41.1)       38 (39.2)       20 (43.2)         Comorbidity       Yes       71 (50.4)       48 (49.5)       23 (52.3)         No       70 (49.6)       49 (50.5)       21 (47.7)         Supplement taken before cancer       Yes       55 (39.0)       42 (43.3)       13 (29.6)         No       86 (61.0)       55 (56.7)       31 (70.5)         Cancer stage       Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)		` ,	` ,	` ,
Self-employed       34 (24.1)       25 (25.8)       9 (20.5)         Household monthly income*       95 (66.7)       60 (61.9)       35 (79.5)         2001 - 4000       30 (21.3)       21 (21.7)       9 (20.4)         4001 - 6000       14 (9.9)       14 (14.4)       0         > 6000       2 (1.4)       2 (2.1)       0         House location       83 (58.9)       59 (60.8)       24 (56.8)         Urban       58 (41.1)       38 (39.2)       20 (43.2)         Comorbidity       Yes       71 (50.4)       48 (49.5)       23 (52.3)         No       70 (49.6)       49 (50.5)       21 (47.7)         Supplement taken before cancer       Yes       55 (39.0)       42 (43.3)       13 (29.6)         No       86 (61.0)       55 (56.7)       31 (70.5)         Cancer stage       Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2) </td <td></td> <td>` ,</td> <td>` ,</td> <td>• •</td>		` ,	` ,	• •
Household monthly income* 0 - 2000 95 (66.7) 60 (61.9) 35 (79.5) 2001 - 4000 30 (21.3) 21 (21.7) 9 (20.4) 4001 - 6000 14 (9.9) 14 (14.4) 0 > 6000 2 (1.4) 2 (2.1) 0  House location Rural 83 (58.9) 59 (60.8) 24 (56.8) Urban 58 (41.1) 38 (39.2) 20 (43.2)  Comorbidity Yes 71 (50.4) 48 (49.5) 23 (52.3) No 70 (49.6) 49 (50.5) 21 (47.7)  Supplement taken before cancer Yes 55 (39.0) 42 (43.3) 13 (29.6) No 86 (61.0) 55 (56.7) 31 (70.5)  Cancer stage Stage 1 7 (50.0) 7 (7.2) 0 Stage 2 27 (19.1) 18 (18.6) 9 (20.5) Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0) Stage 4 34 (24.1) 26 (26.8) 8 (18.2) Unclassified 27 (19.1) 15 (15.5) 12 (27.3) Unknown 11 (7.8) 7 (7.2) 4 (9.1)  Satisfied with conventional treatment Yes 120 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6) No 12 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6)		` ,		
0 - 2000       95 (66.7)       60 (61.9)       35 (79.5)         2001 - 4000       30 (21.3)       21 (21.7)       9 (20.4)         4001 - 6000       14 (9.9)       14 (14.4)       0         > 6000       2 (1.4)       2 (2.1)       0         House location         Rural       83 (58.9)       59 (60.8)       24 (56.8)         Urban       58 (41.1)       38 (39.2)       20 (43.2)         Comorbidity         Yes       71 (50.4)       48 (49.5)       23 (52.3)         No       70 (49.6)       49 (50.5)       21 (47.7)         Supplement taken before cancer         Yes       55 (39.0)       42 (43.3)       13 (29.6)         No       86 (61.0)       55 (56.7)       31 (70.5)         Cancer stage         Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (	• •	34 (24.1)	25 (25.8)	9 (20.5)
2001 - 4000       30 (21.3)       21 (21.7)       9 (20.4)         4001 - 6000       14 (9.9)       14 (14.4)       0         > 6000       2 (1.4)       2 (2.1)       0         House location         Rural       83 (58.9)       59 (60.8)       24 (56.8)         Urban       58 (41.1)       38 (39.2)       20 (43.2)         Comorbidity         Yes       71 (50.4)       48 (49.5)       23 (52.3)         No       70 (49.6)       49 (50.5)       21 (47.7)         Supplement taken before cancer         Yes       55 (39.0)       42 (43.3)       13 (29.6)         No       86 (61.0)       55 (56.7)       31 (70.5)         Cancer stage         Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment         Yes       12 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)     <		05 (00.7)	00 (04 0)	05 (70 5)
4001 - 6000       14 (9.9)       14 (14.4)       0         > 6000       2 (1.4)       2 (2.1)       0         House location       Rural       83 (58.9)       59 (60.8)       24 (56.8)         Urban       58 (41.1)       38 (39.2)       20 (43.2)         Comorbidity       Yes       71 (50.4)       48 (49.5)       23 (52.3)         No       70 (49.6)       49 (50.5)       21 (47.7)         Supplement taken before cancer       Yes       55 (39.0)       42 (43.3)       13 (29.6)         No       86 (61.0)       55 (56.7)       31 (70.5)         Cancer stage       Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment       Yes       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (85.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)		` ,	` ,	` ,
> 6000		` ,	` '	` , '
House location Rural 83 (58.9) 59 (60.8) 24 (56.8) Urban 58 (41.1) 38 (39.2) 20 (43.2)  Comorbidity Yes 71 (50.4) 48 (49.5) 23 (52.3) No 70 (49.6) 49 (50.5) 21 (47.7)  Supplement taken before cancer Yes 55 (39.0) 42 (43.3) 13 (29.6) No 86 (61.0) 55 (56.7) 31 (70.5)  Cancer stage Stage 1 7 (5.0) 7 (7.2) 0 Stage 2 27 (19.1) 18 (18.6) 9 (20.5) Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0) Stage 4 34 (24.1) 26 (26.8) 8 (18.2) Unclassified 27 (19.1) 15 (15.5) 12 (27.3) Unknown 11 (7.8) 7 (7.2) 4 (9.1)  Satisfied with conventional treatment Yes 120 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6) No 12 (8.5) 9 (9.3) 3 (6.8)		` '	` '	
Rural 83 (58.9) 59 (60.8) 24 (56.8) Urban 58 (41.1) 38 (39.2) 20 (43.2)  Comorbidity Yes 71 (50.4) 48 (49.5) 23 (52.3) No 70 (49.6) 49 (50.5) 21 (47.7)  Supplement taken before cancer Yes 55 (39.0) 42 (43.3) 13 (29.6) No 86 (61.0) 55 (56.7) 31 (70.5)  Cancer stage Stage 1 7 (5.0) 7 (7.2) 0 Stage 2 27 (19.1) 18 (18.6) 9 (20.5) Stage 3 35 (24.8) 24 (24.7) 11 (25.0) Stage 4 34 (24.1) 26 (26.8) 8 (18.2) Unclassified 27 (19.1) 15 (15.5) 12 (27.3) Unknown 11 (7.8) 7 (7.2) 4 (9.1)  Satisfied with conventional treatment Yes 120 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6) No 12 (8.5) 9 (9.3) 3 (6.8)		2 (1.4)	2 (2.1)	0
Urban       58 (41.1)       38 (39.2)       20 (43.2)         Comorbidity       Yes       71 (50.4)       48 (49.5)       23 (52.3)         No       70 (49.6)       49 (50.5)       21 (47.7)         Supplement taken before cancer       Yes       55 (39.0)       42 (43.3)       13 (29.6)         No       86 (61.0)       55 (56.7)       31 (70.5)         Cancer stage       To (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment       Yes       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (8.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)		00 (50 0)	<b>50</b> (00 0)	0.4 (=0.0)
Comorbidity       Yes       71 (50.4)       48 (49.5)       23 (52.3)         No       70 (49.6)       49 (50.5)       21 (47.7)         Supplement taken before cancer         Yes       55 (39.0)       42 (43.3)       13 (29.6)         No       86 (61.0)       55 (56.7)       31 (70.5)         Cancer stage         Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment         Yes       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (85.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)		` ,		` ,
Yes       71 (50.4)       48 (49.5)       23 (52.3)         No       70 (49.6)       49 (50.5)       21 (47.7)         Supplement taken before cancer       70 (49.6)       49 (50.5)       21 (47.7)         Supplement taken before cancer       55 (39.0)       42 (43.3)       13 (29.6)         No       86 (61.0)       55 (56.7)       31 (70.5)         Cancer stage       54 (24.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Yes       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (8.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)		58 (41.1)	38 (39.2)	20 (43.2)
No       70 (49.6)       49 (50.5)       21 (47.7)         Supplement taken before cancer         Yes       55 (39.0)       42 (43.3)       13 (29.6)         No       86 (61.0)       55 (56.7)       31 (70.5)         Cancer stage         Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment         Yes       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (8.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)				/
Supplement taken before cancer       Yes       55 (39.0)       42 (43.3)       13 (29.6)         No       86 (61.0)       55 (56.7)       31 (70.5)         Cancer stage       Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment       Yes       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (8.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)				
Yes     55 (39.0)     42 (43.3)     13 (29.6)       No     86 (61.0)     55 (56.7)     31 (70.5)       Cancer stage     7 (5.0)     7 (7.2)     0       Stage 2     27 (19.1)     18 (18.6)     9 (20.5)       Stage 3     35 (24.8)     24 (24.7)     11 (25.0)       Stage 4     34 (24.1)     26 (26.8)     8 (18.2)       Unclassified     27 (19.1)     15 (15.5)     12 (27.3)       Unknown     11 (7.8)     7 (7.2)     4 (9.1)       Satisfied with conventional treatment     120 (85.1)     81 (83.5)     39 (88.6)       No     12 (8.5)     9 (9.3)     3 (6.8)		70 (49.6)	49 (50.5)	21 (47.7)
No       86 (61.0)       55 (56.7)       31 (70.5)         Cancer stage       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (8.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)	· ·			
Cancer stage         Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment       Yes       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (8.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)		` ,	` ,	` ,
Stage 1       7 (5.0)       7 (7.2)       0         Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment         Yes       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (8.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)		86 (61.0)	55 (56.7)	31 (70.5)
Stage 2       27 (19.1)       18 (18.6)       9 (20.5)         Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (8.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)				
Stage 3       35 (24.8)       24 (24.7)       11 (25.0)         Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment       Yes       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (8.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)		` ,	, ,	
Stage 4       34 (24.1)       26 (26.8)       8 (18.2)         Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment       Yes       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (8.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)				` ,
Unclassified       27 (19.1)       15 (15.5)       12 (27.3)         Unknown       11 (7.8)       7 (7.2)       4 (9.1)         Satisfied with conventional treatment       Yes       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (8.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)		, ,	` '	, ,
Unknown 11 (7.8) 7 (7.2) 4 (9.1) Satisfied with conventional treatment Yes 120 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6) No 12 (8.5) 9 (9.3) 3 (6.8)	•	` ,	` '	• •
Satisfied with conventional treatment       120 (85.1)       81 (83.5)       39 (88.6)         No       12 (8.5)       9 (9.3)       3 (6.8)	Unclassified	` ,	` '	12 (27.3)
Yes 120 (85.1) 81 (83.5) 39 (88.6) No 12 (8.5) 9 (9.3) 3 (6.8)	Unknown	11 (7.8)	7 (7.2)	4 (9.1)
No 12 (8.5) 9 (9.3) 3 (6.8)				
		` ,		, ,
Not sure 9 (6.4) 7 (7.2) 2 (4.5)		• •	, ,	3 (6.8)
* association between variables and TCM use was observed (Chi-square test)	Not sure			2 (4.5)

<sup>\*</sup> association between variables and TCM use was observed (Chi-square test)

Table 2: Types of TCM used

Non-pharmacological, n (%)			
Tai chi	3 (3.1)	Aromatherapy	1 (1.0)
Ceragem bed	3 (3.1)	Relaxing exercise	1 (1.0)
Massage	3 (3.1)	Qi Gong	1 (1.0)
Yoga	1 (1.0)	-	, ,
Pharmacological, n (%)			
Soursop fruit or leaf	41 (42.3)	Lingzhi	3 (3.1)
Apricot seed/ Vitamin B17	28 (28.9)	Miracle water (Air Ajaib)	3 (3.1)
Butterfly wing leaf	26 (26.8)	Lemon/ morning elixir	2 (2.1)
Sabah Snake grass	25 (25.8)	Stem cell product	2 (2.1)
Habbatus Sauda /Black seed	10 (10.3)	Olive oil	2 (2.1)
Traditional Malay Medicines	8 (8.3)	Royal jelly	1 (1.0)
Traditional Chinese Medicine	7 (7.2)	Ginseng	1 (1.0)
Nutritional beverages	7 (7.2)	Jering/ Jenkol	1 (1.0)
Vitamins and minerals tablet	6 (6.2)	Hydrogenised drinking water	1 (1.0)
Antioxidant capsule/tablet	5 (5.2)	Rodent tuber	1 (1.0)
Honey	5 (5.2)	Beet root	1 (1.0)
Pomegranate fruit	5 (5.2)	Date palm	1 (1.0)
Unknown product	5 (5.2)	Betel	1 (1.0)
Alkaline water	4 (4.1)	Homeopathy	1 (1.0)
Spirulina	4 (4.1)	Traditional Indian Medicine	1 (1.0)
Chorella	3 (3.1)		` ,

Table 3: Comparisons between TCM users and non-TCM users (N=141)

•		`	,	
Variables	TCM users (n=97), mean (SD)	Non-TCM users (n-44), mean (SD)	Mean difference (95% CI)	<i>P</i> -value
Patient's satisfaction score with conventional treatment	20.2 (6.68)	28.7 (3.57)	-8.488 (10.201, -6.775)	0.000
Number of weeks delayed in seeking conventional treatment	9.7 (21.06)	2.4 (5.50)	7.245 (2.683, 11.808)	0.002
Frequency of chemotherapy delayed	0.13 (0.45)	0.07 (0.33)	0.066 (-0.084, 0.215)	0.385

#### **Discussion**

This study showed high prevalence of TCM use among cancer patients in Hospital Melaka which supported the findings of other studies done in Malaysia<sup>5,7,8,15</sup>. TCM use has become more common and widely acceptable among cancer patients. This could be that chronic, painful, debilitating or fatal conditions such as cancer are perceived more frightening than other chronic or life-threatening diseases and led to high usage of TCM<sup>16,17</sup>. Studies conducted in other Asian countries reported a high prevalence of TCM use as well. For example, the prevalence of TCM use was 60.9% in Thailand, 55% in Singapore, 60.9% in Palestine and 93.4% in China<sup>6,10,11,18</sup>. A meta-analysis of 152 studies from 18 western countries such as New Zealand, United States, Australia, Canada and the Europe reported that the combined prevalence for current use of TCM across all studies was 40% which is lower than this study<sup>19</sup>. This could be explained by the differences in culture and religions across the population as well as different definitions of TCM<sup>6,8</sup>.

Ethnicity and household monthly income were found to be associated with TCM usage in this study. This was supported by the findings of Raja Lexshimi RG et al. in 2013 whereby high prevalence

of TCM use was found among the Malay and Chinese ethnic groups<sup>9</sup>. A few studies observed that TCM users tend to be higher earners as TCMs are more affordable to this group of population<sup>6,9,20,21</sup>. For other socio-demographic variables, conflicting findings have been reported. Several studies in Malaysia reported education level was linked to higher prevalence of TCM use<sup>7,8,20,21</sup>. It was suggested that better educated patients tend to be more critical towards conventional therapy and are more aware of TCM treatment. However, some other studies had reported similar findings to the present study that education level is not associated with TCM usage <sup>6,9</sup>.

In this study, TCM was classified into pharmacological and non-pharmacological treatment and it was found that the usage of natural products was much higher than the others. The four most popular natural products were soursop fruit and leaf, apricot seed, butterfly wing leaf and Sabah snake grass. A study by Raja Lexshimi RG *et al.* in 2013 found that nutritional supplements (41.8%), herbal products (40.2%) and multivitamin (33.6%) were the most frequently used TCM, and Sabah snake grass was identified the most commonly used herbs among the herbal products<sup>9</sup>.

Soursop fruit is also named Graviola. Several laboratory studies reported that soursops have beneficial effects such as anticonvulsant, antiparasitic, anti-arthritic, antimalarial, antidiabetic, hepatoprotective and anticancer. Furthermore, soursop extracts were reported to have significant anti-cancer properties in a number of cancer cell lines both in vitro and in vivo<sup>22</sup>. However, a systematic review on soursop's anticancer properties proposed that further studies are required to verify the exact anticancer properties and the mechanism of action of its anticancer properties. More robust and systematic clinical trials are necessary to test and verify its true validity and safety before confirmed as a therapeutic anti-cancer agent<sup>22,23</sup>.

Christia vespertilionis, commonly known as butterfly wing is an ornamental plant in cultivated gardens in South East Asia because of its uniquely shaped trifoliate leaves. In traditional medicine, this plant is believed to treat snake bites, tuberculosis, heal bone fractures, increase blood circulation, bronchitis and cold<sup>24</sup>. The extracts of Christia vespertilionis revealed antiproliferative and proapoptotic effects in all human medullary thyroid carcinoma (MTC) and human small intestinal neuroendocrine tumor (SI-NET) cell lines<sup>25</sup>. There was no comprehensive evidence concerning the phytochemistry, pharmacology and toxicology of this plant, and safety assessment and clinical trials were required before it can be integrated into the treatment of cancer<sup>26</sup>.

Amygdalin is a cyanogenic glycoside plant compound found naturally in apricot kernels. It is also found in kernel of peaches and bitter almonds. Laetrile is a semi-synthetic form of amygdalin. The anti-cancer property of amygdalin is believed to come from the cyanide released from the enzymatic degradation of amygdalin<sup>27</sup>. Another theory claimed that cancers were due to the deficiency of a vitamin, named 'vitamin B17', which was the name given to amygdalin by a chemist E.T. Krebs<sup>28</sup>. Nevertheless, there was no reliable evidence supporting the alleged effects of laetrile for curative effects in cancer patients<sup>28,29</sup>. Yet, it had high risk of developing serious adverse effects from cyanide poisoning especially after oral ingestion of laetrile. Hence, the United States Food and Drugs Administration (FDA) and the European Commission had banned its use<sup>28</sup>.

Sabah snake grass (Clinacanthus nutans) has been traditionally used as natural medicine in Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand for treating certain diseases such as skin rashes, insect bites, diabetes mellitus, fever and diuretics<sup>30</sup>. Phytochemical constituents of Clinacanthus nutans present in chloroform extract may be used as an alternate adjunctive or chemopreventive regimen for patients at risk of cancers as it possessed antioxidant and antiproliferative properties against cultured cancer cell lines<sup>31</sup>. An animal study found that Clinacanthus nutans possessed potential antitumour and immunomodulatory properties<sup>30</sup>. However, different ways of extraction may produce different cytotoxic activity. Hence, further studies were recommended on potential use of these extracts as anticancer and pharmaceutical applications<sup>32</sup>.

The finding on reasons of using TCM in this study was supported by other studies, where most of the respondents used TCM to suppress the progression of cancer and improve physical well-

being<sup>33,34</sup>. TCM users believed that they are harmless and would do more "good" than "harm" to their general well-being<sup>35</sup>. TCM users are willing to try any form of therapy that could cure them or at least stabilise their life-threatening conditions. However, this is opposed by clinical practise as it may cause moderate to severe life threatening events and unknown possible side effects<sup>36</sup>.

One of the reasons for delay in seeking treatment was the strong cultural belief in traditional medicine<sup>37</sup>. In a study done by Hisham & Yip in 2004 on 1,526 women with newly diagnosed breast cancer, about 45% presented at a late stage of the disease<sup>38</sup>. Delays in seeking conventional medical care had not only led to increased burden of the disease but also increased cost<sup>39</sup>. The results of this study conformed to a study done by Nagashekhara et al. in 2015 where increase in patient satisfaction with conventional treatment was correlated with a decrease in use of TCM<sup>5</sup>. Cancer patients that use TCM were often found among those not satisfied with conventional treatment due to side effects, worsening of symptoms or spreading of cancers<sup>40</sup>.

In this study, there were 60.8% of TCM users that did not inform their doctors about their TCM usage. According to Farooqui et al. (2015), the major reason given for nondisclosure was "it is not important for the doctors to know about TCM use", and this could indicate patients' lack of knowledge regarding the harmful interactions of TCM with conventional therapies<sup>7</sup>.

The main limitation of this study was that the subjects were interviewed at a hospital setting hence there was a possibility that patients were somewhat restrained in providing the complete account of their TCM use to please the interviewers. Patients may not admit that he or she is taking TCM simply due to the fear of being scolded by their doctors. Additionally, even though standardisation on the verbal delivery of the questionnaires in Malay and Mandarin was conducted before starting the data collection, some difficulties were still encountered by the interviewers in assisting the respondents to answer the questionnaire that was written in English.

## Conclusion

This study found that there was a high prevalence of TCM use among cancer patients and soursop, apricot seed, butterfly wing leaves and Sabah snake grass were the common types of TCM used. This finding further supported the claims that there is a growing interest in TCM use especially among cancer patients. Most of TCM users agreed that they used TCM to suppress the progression of cancer and they believed that TCM are able do so. On top of that, a significant difference was found between TCM users and non-TCM users in patient's satisfaction level with conventional treatment and the delay in seeking conventional treatment. This issue should be raised to physicians and oncologists. Future studies may focus on the perceived benefits or adverse effects of TCM use on cancer progression, the amount of TCM used per patients and the costs incurred for TCM use.

### **Acknowledgement**

The authors would like to thank Madam Saidatul Raihan for her encouragement and guidance in conducting the study and the Director General of Health Malaysia for his permission to publish this article. Our appreciations also go to all that had contributed to this study, especially to the participants whom had spent their valuable time in answering the questionnaires.

#### **Conflict of Interest Statement**

No external funding was received and the authors declared no conflict of interest.

# References

- 1. Torre, L.A.; Bray, F.; Siegel, R.L. Global Cancer Statistics, 2012. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians. 2015, 65(2), 87–108.
- 2. Azizah, A.M.; Nor Saleha, I.T.; Noor Hashimah, A. Malaysian National Cancer Registry Report 2007-2011. National Cancer Registry, Ministry of Health Malaysia. 2016.
- 3. National Policy of Traditional and Complementary Medicine. Traditional and Complementary Medicine Division. Ministry of Health Malaysia. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 2007.
- 4. A handbook of Traditional and Complementary Medicine Programme in Malaysia. Traditional and Complementary Medicine Division. Ministry of Health Malaysia. 2011.
- 5. Nagashekhara, M.; Murthy, V.; Tumkur, A. An Empirical Study on Traditional, Complementary and Alternative Medicine Usage among Malaysian Cancer Patient. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2015, 16 (15), 6237-6241.
- 6. Putipun, P.; Sutheechet, N.; Ratanamongkol, P. A Survey of Complementary and Alternative Medicine Use in Cancer Patients Treated with Radiotherapy in Thailand. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med.* 2012, 1-6.
- Farooqui, M.; Hassali, M. A.; Shatar, A. K. A. Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicines Among Malaysian Cancer Patients: A Descriptive Study. J Tradit Complement Med. 2016, 6(4), 321-326.
- 8. AL-Naggar, R.A.; Bobryshev, Y.V.; Abdulghani, M. Complementary Alternative Medicine Use among Cancer Patients in Malaysia. *World Journal of Medical Sciences*. 2013, 8(2), 157-164.
- 9. Raja Lexshimi, R.G.; Oranye, N.O.; Ho, S. E. Complementary and Alternative Medicine Use among Breast Cancer Patients in a Tertiary Hospital in Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Public Health Medicine*. 2013, 13(1), 11-19.
- 10. Ali-Shtayeh, M.S.; Jamous, R.M.; Jamous, R.M. Herbal Preparation Use By Patients Suffering from Cancer in Palestine. *Complement Ther Clin Pract.* 2011, 17(4), 235–240.
- 11. Teng, L.; Jin, K.; He, K. Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine by Cancer Patients at Zhejiang University Teaching Hospital Zhuji Hospital, China. *Afr J Tradit Complement Altern Med.* 2010, 7(4), 322–330.
- 12. Norsa'adah, B.; Rahmah, M.A.; Rampal, K.G. Understanding Barriers to Malaysian Women with Breast Cancer Seeking Help. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2012, 13(8), 3723-30.
- 13. Yusuf, A.; Ahmad, Z.; Keng, S. L. Quality of Life in Malay and Chinese Women Newly Diagnosed with Breast Cancer in Kelantan, Malaysia. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2013, 14(1), 435-440.
- 14. Paltiel, O.; Avitzour, M.; Peretz, T. Determinants of The Use of Complementary Therapies by Patients with Cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 2001, 19(9), 2439-2448.
- 15. Shaharudin, S.H.; Sulaiman, S.; Emran, N. A. The Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine among Malay Breast Cancer Survivors. *Altern Ther Health Med.* 2011, 17(1), 50–56.
- 16. Shin, J. Y.; Kim, S. Y.; Park, B. Predictors of Complementary and Alternative Medicine Use in Cancer Care: Results of A Nationwide Multicenter Survey in Korea. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med.* 2012, 1-9.
- 17. Siti, Z.M.; Tahir, A.; Ida Farah, A. Use of Traditional and Complementary Medicine in Malaysia: A Baseline Study. *Complement Ther Med.* 2009, 17(5-6), 292-299.
- 18. Chow, W. H.; Chang, P. Lee, S. C. Complementary and Alternative Medicine among Singapore Cancer Patients. *Ann Acad Med Singapore*. 2010, 39(2), 129–135.
- 19. Horneber, M.; Bueschel, G.; Dennert, G. How Many Cancer Patients Use Complementary and Alternative Medicine: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Integr Cancer Ther*.2012, 11(3),187-203.
- 20. Lengacher, C. A.; Bennet, M. P.; Kip, K. E. Frequency of Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine in Women with Breast Cancer. *Oncol Nurs Forum.* 2002, 29(10), 1445-1452.
- 21. Moschen, R. G.; Kemmler, G.; Schweigkofler, H. Use of Alternative/ Complementary Therapy in Breast Cancer Patients—A Psychological Perspective. *Support Care Cancer* 2011, 9(4), 267-274.
- 22. Ioannis, P.; Anastasis. S.; Andreas, Y. Graviola: A Systematic Review on Its Anticancer Properties. *Am J Cancer Prev* 2015, 3(6), 128-131.
- 23. Damle, S. G. Cancer: Forbidden Cures? Contemp Clin Dent 2015, 6(1), 3-4.
- 24. Bunawan, H.; Bunawan, S. N.; Baharum, S. N. The Red Butterfly Wing (Christia Vespertilionis): A Promising Cancer Cure in Malaysia. *Int J Pharm Pharm Sci.* 2015, 7(8),1.

- 25. Hofer, D.; Schwach, G.; Ghaffari-Tabrizi, N. Christia Vespertilionis Plant Extracts as Novel Antiproliferative Agent Against Human Neuroendocrine Tumor Cells. Oncol Rep. 2013, 29(1), 2219-2226.
- 26. Dash, G.K. An Appraisal of Christia vespertilionis (L.F.) Bakh. F.: A Promising Medicinal Plant. *International Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemical Research.* 2016, 8(6), 1037-1039.
- 27. Herbert, V. Laetrile: The Cult of Cyanide Promoting Poison for Profit. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1979, 32(1), 1121-1158.
- 28. Milazzo, S.; Horneber, M. Laetrile Treatment for Cancer (Review). *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* [Online] 2015; 1(4). http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD005476.pub4/pdf (Published online: Apr 18, 2015).
- 29. Milazzo, S.; Lejeune, S.; Ernst, E. Laetrile for Cancer: A Systematic Review of The Clinical Evidence. *Supportive Care Cancer 2007*, 15(6), 583-595.
- 30. Alam, A.; Ferdosh, S.; Ghafoor, K. Clinacanthusnutans: A Review of The Medicinal Uses, Pharmacology And Phytochemistry. *Asian Pac J Trop Med*.2016, 9(4), 402-409.
- 31. Yong, Y. K.; Tan, J. J.; Teh, S. S. Clinacanthusnutans Extracts are Antioxidant with Antiproliferative Effect on Cultured Human Cancer Cell Lines. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med.* 2013, 13(1),1-8.
- 32. Sulaiman, I. S. C.; Basri, M.; Chan, K. W. In Vitro Antioxidant, Cytotoxic and Phytochemical Studies of Clinacanthusnutans Landau Lead Extracts. *Afr JPharm Pharmacol.* 2015; 9(34),861-874.
- 33. Shaharudin, S. H.; Sulaiman, S.; Emran, N. A. The Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine among Malay Breast Cancer Survivors. *Altern Ther Health Med.* 2011, 17(1), 50-56.
- 34. Molassiotis, A.; Fernadez-Ortega, P.; Pud, D. Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine in Cancer Patients: A European survey. *Ann Oncol.* 2005, 16(4), 655-663.
- 35. Vivien, Y. W. C.; Er, A. C.; Mohd Noor, N. A. Chinese Culture and Cancer among Malaysian Chinese Cancer Survivors. *Asian Social Science*. 2013, 9(14), 30-41.
- 36. Niggemann, B.; Grüber, C. Side-effects of Complementary and Alternative Medicine. *Allergy*. 2003, 58(8), 707–716.
- 37. Khaw, K. W.; Ramli, N.; Rahmat, K. Ptosis due to Cavernous Sinus Syndrome as A Rare Presentation of Advanced Breast Metatstasis in Patient with Delayed Diagnosis. *Malays Fam Physician*. 2012, 7(1), 31-33.
- 38. Hisham, A. N.; Yip, C. H. Overview of Breast Cancer in Malaysian Women: A Problem with Late Diagnosis. *Asian J Surg.* 2004, 27(2), 130-3.
- 39. Knight, A.; Hwa, Y. S.; Hashim, H. Complementary Alternative Medicine Use amongst Breast Cancer Patients in the Northern Region of Peninsular Malaysia. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2015, 16(8), 3125-3130.
- 40. Poonthananiwatkul, B.; Howard, R. L.; Williamson, E. M.; Lim, R. H. Cancer Patients Taking Herbal Medicines: A Review of Clinical Purposes, Associated Factors, and Perceptions of Benefit or Harm. *J Ethnopharmacol.* 2015, 175(1), 58-66.