

# Pain and Malnutrition in Elderly Cancer Patients: Examples of Southern Turkey

Sema Aytaç<sup>1</sup>, Özlem Ovayolu<sup>1</sup>, Sibel Serçe<sup>1</sup>, Nimet Ovayolu<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gaziantep University, Faculty of Health Science, Department of Nursing, Gaziantep, Türkiye.

<sup>2</sup> Sanko University, Faculty of Health Science, Department of Nursing, Gaziantep, Türkiye.

**Correspondence Author:** Sema Aytaç

**E-mail:** aytac.sema27@gmail.com

**Received:** 24.04.2021

**Accepted:** 01.02.2023

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** The prevalence of geriatric cancer disease is gradually increasing. Both the cancer diagnosis and many accompanying symptoms affect individuals bio-psycho-socially and impair the quality of life. This study was conducted to evaluate pain and nutritional status in geriatric cancer patients.

**Methods:** This descriptive study was conducted with geriatric cancer patients receiving treatment in the ambulatory chemotherapy outpatient clinic of a university and oncology hospital. The population of the study consisted of cancer patients receiving treatment in the hospital and the sample consisted of 215 geriatric cancer patients who were voluntary to participate in the study. The data of the study were collected using a questionnaire, the Visual Analog Scale (VAS), and the Mini Nutritional Assessment.

**Results:** The mean age of the patients was 69.3±4.7 years. Respiratory tract cancers ranked first (28.8%). 42.8% of the patients were at stage four and they frequently experienced symptoms such as fatigue, loss of appetite and poor nutrition. VAS mean score was 4.8±2.8, Mini nutritional assessment mean score was 9.2±3.0, and there was a negative significant correlation between the VAS and Mini nutritional assessment mean scores ( $p<0.001$ ).

**Conclusion:** It was determined that geriatric cancer patients experienced “moderate” pain, had a risk for malnutrition and as their pain levels increased, the risk for malnutrition increased.

**Keywords:** Geriatric Nursing, Cancer Pain, Nutrition Assessment

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Today the downward trend in the population growth rate and the increase of average life expectancy, have led to an increase rate in the elderly population within the general population and have caused our world to gradually enter a demographic ageing process. Thus, old age has remained on the agenda in both developed and developing countries and is becoming more and more important every passing day. As is known, chronic illnesses increase along with the increase of elderly population and average life expectancy in the world and in Turkey (1,2). Among the chronic diseases, 50% of cancer cases are encountered in people over 65 years of age, and cancers are in the second place among the causes of death in people over 65 years of age, after heart diseases. (3). Both the cancer diagnosis and many accompanying symptoms affect individuals bio-psycho-socially and impair the quality of life. Among the symptoms affecting patients negatively, “pain” comes first. Pain in cancer patients may impair their quality of life, lead to despair and prevent them from coping with the disease (2,4). Therefore, the treatment and management of symptoms related to cancer become more important (5). Pain in geriatric cancer patients also

appears as an important problem. The pain prevalence has been reported to be 28% in patients who have recently been diagnosed with cancer, 50-70% in patients receiving cancer treatment actively, and 64-80% in patients with advanced cancer (5). Pain in cancer is encountered at the rate of 50% in the early period and diagnosis of disease and at the rate of 75-80% in the advancing periods of disease. In the literature it is indicated that cancer pain significantly affects patients’ quality of life and becomes a greater source of fear than the death itself for patients and relatives in more than 70% of advanced cancer cases (6). However, the first step of pain control is pain assessment. This assessment should be made by a multidisciplinary health care team. Playing a key role in this team, nurses are an important and supplementary element of cancer care.

What makes nurses more important and distinctive in pain control than other team members is that they spend more time with the patient than other team members (7).

One of the factors affecting cancer patients negatively in many aspects is their nutritional status. Weight loss is the first

sign of an impaired nutrition and is frequently observed in geriatric patients (8). It has been reported that malnutrition is encountered in 40-80% of these patients during diagnosis (9), the malnutrition prevalence ranges from 25% to 70% (10-13) and this rate rises up to 83% in geriatric cancer patients (14).

Thus, early evaluation and rapid intervention of nutritional status are of prime importance to prevent morbidity and mortality in this patient group (9). As is known, cancer patients intensely experience symptoms related to treatments such as anorexia, cachexia, taste changes, pain and malnutrition, besides symptoms caused by the disease process (15-17). Especially pain may prevent nutrition and lead to poor nutrition and malnutrition (18). Pain and malnutrition in elderly cancer patients should be routinely evaluated by nurses with appropriate assessment tools specific to the elderly individual, and pharmacological and non-pharmacological methods should be used in treatment (3). Therefore, this study was conducted to evaluate pain and nutritional status in geriatric cancer patients and contribute to the management of pain and nutritional problems.

## 2. METHODS

### 2.1. Design and Sample

This descriptive study was conducted with geriatric cancer patients receiving treatment in the ambulatory chemotherapy outpatient clinic of a university hospital and in an oncology hospital. The results of a previous study were used to calculate the sample size of the study (5,18). Necessary minimum sample size was calculated to be 215 with  $\alpha=0.05$  and the test power of  $(1-\beta)$  0.80.

Prior to starting the study, a mini mental test was applied to the individuals and the patients who obtained 24 points and above, were over the age of 65 years, were diagnosed with cancer, could communicate, and were voluntary to participate in the study, were included in the study. However, the patients who got less than 24 points from the mini mental test, were under the age of 65 years, and refused to participate in the study, were not included in the study.

### 2.2. Data Collection Process

The data of the study were collected using a questionnaire, the Visual Analog Scale (VAS) and Mini Nutritional Assessment Questionnaire-Short Form (MNA).

**Visual Analog Scale:** The scale is applied by marking on a straight line with a pen. On this line, the point of 0 cm indicates no pain and the point of 10 cm indicates worst pain. In the literature, it is stated that VAS is a reliable tool to be used in evaluating the pain level (19).

**Mini Nutritional Assessment Questionnaire-Short Form (MNA):** This form is used in identifying malnutrition in both clinic and outpatient clinic patients and evaluating the

outcomes of nutritional support treatments. It is accepted to be a valid measurement tool not only for revealing malnutrition in geriatric patients, but also for predetermining the risk for malnutrition. Also the European Society for Clinical Nutrition and Metabolism recommends this measurement tool particularly for the elderly (20,21). Turkish validity study of this form was conducted by Sarıkaya (2013). In the form, 0-7 points indicate "malnutrition", 8-11 points indicate "risk for malnutrition", and 12-14 points indicate "normal nutritional status" (22).

### 2.3. Procedure

The researchers applied the questionnaires to the patients who agreed to participate in the study via the face-to-face interview method in the clinic setting.

It took approximately ten minutes to apply the questionnaires. None of the patients wanted to leave the study or refused to answer the questions in the questionnaire.

### 2.4. Data Assessment

Statistical analyzes were reported using the SPSS 22.0 statistical software. The descriptive statistics were indicated via median and standard deviation values. In addition, the Student's t-Test, Kruskal-Wallis, Mann-Whitney U Test, and Spearman's correlation analysis were used. The value of  $p<0.05$  was accepted to be statistically significant.

### 2.5. Ethical Considerations

Before starting the study, informed consent form and necessary permissions from the ethics committee and the institution were obtained from the patients. The study approval was obtained from Gaziantep University Clinical Trials Ethics Committee (approval number: 2017/163)

## 3. RESULTS

Two hundred fifteen patients completed the study. It was determined that the mean age of the geriatric cancer patients was  $69.35\pm 4.74$  years. Of the patients, 43.3% were female, 44.2% were primary school graduate, 90.2% were married, 40.5% were unemployed, and 74.9% had a middle economic situation. In addition, When gender was evaluated with VAS mean scores; the women felt more pain than men and the difference between them was statistically significant ( $p<0.05$ ). The mean VAS score of geriatric cancer patients was  $4.8\pm 2.8$ , and the mean score of mini nutritional assessment was  $9.2\pm 3.0$ . However, the patients, who were university graduate, married, freelancer and had a good, had higher MNA mean scores ( $p>0.05$ ) (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Comparison of Socio-demographic characteristics and pain and mini nutritional assessment mean scores of the patients

Characteristics	n (%)	VAS Mean±SD	MNA Mean±SD
<b>Gender</b>			
Female	93 (43.3)	5.51±2.7	9.40±3.04
Male	122 (56.7)	4.33±2.80	9.21±3.14
p		<b>0.002<sup>a</sup></b>	0.673 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Educational Background</b>			
Illiterate	62 (28.8)	5.12±2.76	9.22±3.17
Literate	26 (12.1)	5.11±2.83	8.30±2.51
Primary Education	95 (44.2)	4.87±3.05	9.26±3.27
High School	27 (12.6)	3.96±2.2	10.33±2.80
University	5 (2.3)	4.20±0.83	10.40±1.34
p		0.373 <sup>b</sup>	0.129 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Marital Status</b>			
Married	194 (90.2)	4.73±2.80	9.41±3.14
Single	21 (9.8)	5.90±2.89	8.23±2.50
p		0.072 <sup>c</sup>	0.054 <sup>c</sup>
<b>Occupation</b>			
Worker	12 (5.6)	4.16±2.94	10.16±3.71
Civil Servant	7 (3.3)	3.57±1.61	10.28±1.25
Freelancer	30 (14.0)	4.30±3.16	10.33±3.00
Unemployed	87 (40.5)	5.54±2.88	8.91±3.18
Other	79 (36.7)	4.50±2.56	9.10±2.98
p		<b>0.036<sup>b</sup></b>	0.105 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Economic Situation</b>			
High	9 (4.2)	3.33±1.73	10.77±2.2
Middle	161 (74.9)	4.78±2.80	9.59±3.02
Low	45 (20.9)	5.37±2.97	7.95±3.16
p		0.111 <sup>b</sup>	0.005 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Residence Place</b>			
District	90 (41.9)	4.62±2.55	9.01±2.85
Province	125 (58.1)	5.00±3.00	9.50±3.25
p		0.254 <sup>a</sup>	0.138 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>215 (100.0)</b>	<b>4.8±2.8</b>	<b>9.2±3.0</b>

<sup>a</sup>: Independent sample t test <sup>b</sup>Kruskal-Wallis test <sup>c</sup>: Mann Whitney U

Of the patients who participated in the study, 28.8% suffered from respiratory tract cancer, 42.8% were at stage four, 60.9% underwent chemotherapy, 61.9% had metastasis, 18.6% had another cancer patient in family, and 34.4% had comorbidities. When comparing some characteristics of the patients and VAS mean scores, it was determined that there was a significant difference between the disease stage, presence of metastasis and VAS mean scores ( $p < 0.05$ ). There was no statistically significant difference between MNA mean scores and disease stage. However, as the disease stage advanced, the MNA mean score decreased ( $p > 0.05$ ) (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Comparison of some characteristics and pain and mini nutritional assessment mean scores of the patients

Characteristics	n(%)	VAS Mean±SD	MNA Mean±SD
<b>Cancer Type</b>			
Respiratory Tract	62 (28.8)	4.4±3.07	9.58±3.26
Digestive System	61 (28.4)	4.72±2.75	8.60±3.25
Reproductive System	35 (16.3)	5.71±2.35	9.31±2.68
Urinary System	9 (4.2)	5.00±2.00	8.11±3.33
Lymphoma	23 (10.7)	4.60±3.08	10.04±3.22
Breast	25 (11.6)	5.12±2.90	10.00±2.38
p		0.372 <sup>a</sup>	0.170 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Duration of Disease (Month)</b>			
1-12	104 (48.4)	4.57±2.94	9.06±3.13
13-24	39 (18.1)	5.48±2.55	9.30±3.37
25-36	37 (17.2)	5.21±2.86	9.18±2.90
37 months and above	35 (16.3)	4.54±2.66	10.08±2.85
p		0.226 <sup>a</sup>	0.504 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Stage</b>			
1	27 (12.6)	3.33±2.63	10.07±2.38
2	56 (26.0)	4.41±2.77	9.67±3.31
3	40 (18.6)	5.25±2.62	9.60±3.16
4	92 (42.8)	5.38±2.83	8.70±3.05
p		<b>0.002<sup>a</sup></b>	0.099 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Treatment Type</b>			
Chemotherapy (CT)	131 (60.9)	5.06±2.87	9.58±3.15
Radiotherapy (RT)	5 (2.3)	4.60±2.70	9.20±1.64
CT+RT	26 (12.1)	4.92±2.62	8.19±3.57
RT+Surgery	3 (1.4)	7.33±2.88	8.33±4.04
CT+Surgery	29 (13.5)	3.82±2.66	9.00±2.97
CT+RT+Surgery	21 (9.8)	4.47±2.80	9.42±2.27
p		0.224 <sup>a</sup>	0.494 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Metastasis</b>			
Available	133 (61.9)	5.33±2.75	8.94±3.10
N/A	82 (38.1)	4.06±2.77	9.86±3.01
p		<b>0.001<sup>b</sup></b>	0.034 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Cancer Patient in Family</b>			
Available	40 (18.6)	4.90±2.98	9.45±3.70
N/A	175 (81.4)	4.83±2.79	9.26±2.95
p		0.895 <sup>b</sup>	0.767 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Comorbidities</b>			
Available	73 (34.0)	5.06±2.83	9.78±2.97
N/A	142 (66.0)	4.73±2.82	8.96±3.14
p		0.410 <sup>b</sup>	0.122 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>215 (100.0)</b>		

<sup>a</sup>: Kruskal-Wallis test <sup>b</sup>: Independent sample t test

In this study, 33.9% had pain in the abdominal area, 47.4% experienced pain for 6-11 months, 25.6% had a condition triggering pain, 77.2% had pain at intervals, 36.7% had tingling pain, 45.1% took medications to decrease the pain, and 36.7% took nonopioid analgesics. When comparing the pain-related characteristics and VAS mean scores of the patients, it was found that the patients, who had pain in the waist-back area, described 'constant' and 'stabbing' pain

as pain frequency and took strong opioids, had higher VAS mean scores ( $p < 0.05$ ). It was determined that the patients, who had pain in the extremity and abdominal area, had experienced pain for a year or more and took strong opioids, had lower MNA mean scores ( $p < 0.05$ ) (Table 3).

**Table 3.** Comparison of pain-related characteristics and pain and mini nutritional assessment mean scores of the patients

Characteristics	n(%)	VAS Mean±SD	MNA Mean±SD
<b>Area of Pain</b>			
Chest	25 (11.6)	5.48±2.46	9.40±3.29
Waist-Back	49 (22.8)	5.87±2.54	9.22±2.60
Extremities	28 (13.0)	5.14±2.67	8.64±3.49
Abdomen	74 (33.9)	5.67±2.19	8.78±3.05
No Specific Area	39 (18.1)	1.35±1.73	10.7±2.99
p		<b>0.000<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>0.011<sup>a</sup></b>
<b>Duration of Pain (Month)</b>			
0-5	102 (20.0)	5.36±2.51	9.27±3.11
6-11	31 (47.4)	5.61±2.40	8.77±2.88
12 months and above	39 (14.4)	6.43±2.03	8.38±3.04
Constant	43 (18.1)	1.62±1.87	10.55±2.93
p		<b>0.000<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>0.008<sup>a</sup></b>
<b>Frequency of Pain</b>			
Constant	49 (22.8)	7.63±2.11	7.67±2.80
Intermittent	166 (77.2)	4.02±2.46	9.77±3.02
p		<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>Type of Pain</b>			
Throbbing	20 (9.3)	4.70±2.02	9.10±3.43
Tingling	79 (36.7)	5.67±2.60	9.46±2.64
Stabbing	55 (25.6)	5.98±2.29	8.25±3.43
Burning	22 (10.2)	5.31±2.14	8.90±2.75
Undescribable	39 (18.1)	1.38±1.78	10.74±2.94
p		<b>0.000<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>0.005<sup>a</sup></b>
<b>Situations Decreasing Pain</b>			
Taking Medications	97 (45.1)	6.29±2.29	9.02±3.04
Changing Position	4 (1.9)	6.50±2.51	9.00±2.70
Resting	48 (22.3)	5.29±2.14	7.95±2.91
N/A	66 (30.7)	2.28±2.18	10.69±2.83
p		<b>0.000<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>0.000<sup>a</sup></b>
<b>Situations Increasing Pain</b>			
Cold Weather	5 (42.8)	7.20±2.38	9.40±2.88
Moving	63 (2.3)	6.46±2.22	8.39±2.91
Stress	28 (13.0)	5.92±2.03	8.89±3.28
Going to the Toilet	9 (4.2)	4.66±1.50	10.00±2.69
Eating	18 (8.4)	5.77±2.53	8.22±3.07
N/A	92 (42.8)	3.11±2.61	10.17±3.02
p		<b>0.000<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>0.004<sup>a</sup></b>
<b>Medications Taken for Pain</b>			
Nonopioids	79 (36.7)	4.03±1.78	9.89±2.99
Weak Opioids	25 (11.6)	6.00±1.84	8.60±2.84
Strong Opioids	66 (30.7)	7.60±1.75	7.89±3.07
N/A	45 (20.9)	1.57±1.57	10.68±2.56
p		<b>0.000<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>0.000<sup>a</sup></b>

<sup>a</sup>: Kruskal-Wallis test , <sup>b</sup>: Independent sample t test

Of the patients, 90.7% had fatigue, 71.6% had loss of appetite, 60.5% were suffering from poor nutrition, 47.4% had nausea-vomiting, and 58.6% had sleeplessness. It was determined that the patients who had loss of appetite, nausea-vomiting, malnutrition, poor personal care and sleeplessness, had higher VAS mean scores and lower MNA mean scores. This difference was statistically significant in all situations except for fatigue ( $p < 0.05$ ). The geriatric cancer patients describing pain also experienced many other symptoms (Table 4).

**Table 4.** Comparison of some symptoms and pain and mini nutritional assessment mean scores of the patients

Problems	n(%)	VAS Mean±SD	MNA Mean±SD
<b>Fatigue</b>			
Available	195(90.7)	5.01±2.79	9.21±3.14
N/A	20(9.3)	3.20±2.60	10.10±2.46
p		0.008 <sup>a</sup>	0.216 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Loss of Appetite</b>			
Available	154(71.6)	5.46±2.54	8.63±2.95
N/A	61 (28.4)	3.29±2.90	10.96±2.82
p		<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>Nausea-Vomiting</b>			
Available	102(47.4)	5.75±2.83	8.26±3.05
N/A	113(52.6)	4.02±2.56	10.23±2.84
p		<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>Poor Nutrition</b>			
Available	130(60.5)	5.46±2.69	8.66±2.90
N/A	85 (39.5)	3.90±2.78	10.27±3.15
p		0.000 <sup>b</sup>	0.000 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Poor Personal Care</b>			
Available	65(30.2)	6.32±2.64	8.06±3.14
N/A	150(69.8)	4.20±2.66	9.83±2.92
p		<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>Negative Effect on Quality of Life</b>			
Yes	125(58.1)	5.43±2.63	8.69±3.08
No	90(41.9)	4.03±2.89	10.13±2.93
p		<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>Sleeplessness</b>			
Available	126(58.6)	5.98±2.48	8.76±3.23
N/A	89(41.4)	3.23±2.48	10.05±2.73
p		0.000 <sup>b</sup>	0.002 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Desire to Cry</b>			
Available	69(32.1)	6.23±2.49	8.18±3.16
N/A	146(67.9)	4.19±2.74	9.82±2.93
p		<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>Unwillingness to Talk</b>			
Available	69(32.1)	6.78±2.02	8.27±2.94
N/A	146 (67.9)	3.93±2.69	9.78±3.06
p		<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>0.001<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>Sense of Burnout</b>			
Available	73(34)	6.21±2.42	8.17±3.08
N/A	142(66)	4.14±2.76	9.87±2.95
p		<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>Decrease in Relations with Other People Around (Such as Coworkers. Social Friends)</b>			
Available	56(26)	6.50±2.13	8.03±3.34
N/A	159(74)	4.26±2.81	9.74±2.88
p		<b>0.000<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>0.001<sup>b</sup></b>

<sup>a</sup>: Mann Whitney U, <sup>b</sup>: Independent sample t test



The patients' VAS mean score was  $4.84 \pm 2.82$ , which was stated as "moderate" and MNA mean score was  $9.29 \pm 3.09$ , which was stated as "risk for malnutrition". It was determined that there was a negative correlation between VAS mean score and MNA mean score ( $p < 0.01$ ) (Table 5).

**Table 5.** Correlation between the pain and mini nutritional assessment mean scores of the patients

	r	MNA p
VAS	-.327	0.000 <sup>a</sup>

a: Spearman correlation Coefficient

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The population of elderly patients is growing with increasing prevalence of cancer diagnoses and cancer-related pain syndromes. Cancer pain occurs at any time in the disease's progression. It is a multidimensional and complex phenomenon that needs proper assessment, management and evaluation based on current nursing knowledge and practices (24). Playing a key role in this team, nurses are an important and supplementary element of cancer care (5).

Also, they have important duties and responsibilities in determining the risk for malnutrition and improving the nutritional status (25). Accordingly, this study aimed to assess the pain and nutritional status of geriatric cancer patients.

As geriatric patients had more complex health issues than young patients, serious difficulties are faced in evaluating and managing pain in geriatric cancer patients. Despite present treatments, geriatric patients are unable to receive adequate treatment for cancer pain (26) and at least 42% of patients complain about pain that cannot be treated as required (27). In a study comprising a nursing home for people over the age of 65 years, it was stated that as age advanced, the opportunity for patients not to receive adequate treatment increased and more than one quarter of these patients took no analgesic agents especially over the age of 85 years or in case of decreased cognitive functions (28). In the study conducted by Kutluturkan et al., with 106 geriatric cancer patients, the most frequent symptoms experienced by the patients were reported to be weakness (83%), dryness of the mouth (71.7%) and pain (62.3%) (29).

In a cohort study with 292 patients, the prevalence of pain in geriatric cancer patients was found to be 65% (30). In this study, it was determined that the patients' VAS mean score was  $4.84 \pm 2.82$  and the most frequent symptoms they experienced were fatigue (90.7%), loss of appetite (71.6%), and malnutrition (60.5%), respectively.

Malnutrition is a clinical condition that is not regarded much by most clinicians and does not receive attention for treatment when identified. However, it is common especially among the geriatric population and has a proven effect on the morbidity and mortality of patients (31). Uncontrollable malnutrition may worsen the tolerance of treatment, including a greater possibility for relapse or death during or

after the treatment and prevent the completion of treatment (32). Its prevalence might be 23-62% for the elderly in the hospital environment and rise up to 85% for the patients in nursing homes (31).

In a study conducted in Turkey it was determined that 28% of the patients applying to geriatric outpatient clinic had a poor nutritional status, 69% of hospitalized patients had a risk for malnutrition, and 12% had a malnutrition rate (33,34).

In a study conducted in a nursing home, it was found that according to the MNA, 63% of the elderly had a risk for malnutrition and 9.6% had malnutrition (35). In another study, it was determined that the risk for malnutrition was 31% and rate of malnutrition was 13% in patients applying to outpatient clinic; whereas, the risk for malnutrition was 39% and rate of malnutrition was 25% among hospitalized patients (36). In the Turkish Nursing Homes Nutritional Status Evaluation Project conducted by the Academic Geriatrics Society, it was found that the risk for malnutrition was 38.3% and the malnutrition rate was 11.9% (37). These results indicated that malnutrition was frequently encountered in cancer patients. The severity of malnutrition varies according to the type, area and stage of cancer (17,38).

In their study, Hamaker et al., found that the malnutrition prevalence in geriatric cancer patients was 46% (30). In a review examining multiple studies, it was reported that malnutrition or risk for malnutrition in geriatric cancer patients ranged from 27% to 83% (39). In this study, it was determined that the patients' MNA mean score was  $9.29 \pm 3.09$  and 46.9% had a risk for malnutrition and 28.1% had malnutrition. In addition, the patients had problems such as loss of appetite (71.6%), malnutrition (60.5%) and nausea-vomiting (47.4%). As is known, loss of appetite may lead to weight loss, malnutrition, morbidity and mortality in geriatric patients. In their study, Kutluturkan et al., determined that the severest symptom experienced by geriatric cancer patients was loss of appetite (29).

Pain frequency varies according to the stage of disease, might be around 25-50% in early-stage patients and patients receiving active cancer treatment and rises up to 70-80% in metastatic patients (40).

In this study, it was determined that advanced staged cancer patients, patients feeling constantly pain and metastatic patients had higher VAS mean scores and lower MNA mean scores.

Thus, it is thought that nurses giving care to advanced stage cancer patients should begin to evaluate patients' pain as from the early period, follow their nutrition and weight with a multidisciplinary team approach and support them before malnutrition develops. In the studies it has been reported that geriatric patients experience fatigue more often due to cancer and reasons not related to cancer (41,42). Especially untreated cancer may cause fatigue and reduce or cease physical, social, interpersonal and recreational activities, prevent household, family, work and educational

performance and affect all living spaces such as psychosocial and spiritual well-being.

It may cause significant declines in productivity, self-esteem, physical functionality and quality of life and also pose a distress in sticking to treatment regimes. In addition, it may delay the treatment and cause a dose limitation or cessation of the treatment (3,42,43). Thus, it is of prime importance to define fatigue in the geriatric patient group very well and apply necessary nursing interventions. Also in this study, it was determined that the most frequent symptom experienced by geriatric cancer patients was fatigue and this symptom was accompanied by many other problems. Accordingly, it is of particular importance to evaluate fatigue and other related problems in geriatric patients regularly. As is known, cancer patients, no matter how old they are, typically experience multiple symptoms at the same time. Cancer itself, direct or indirect outcomes of cancer, early or late side effects of the treatment or comorbidities may cause these symptoms (44). In a study, it was reported that nearly one third of the elderly (31.2%) had pain, fatigue, sleeplessness and mood disorders at the same time (45).

In the cancer report published by the World Health Organization in 2020, it was reported that 20-50% of patients could show symptoms such as pain, fatigue and nutritional problems, have a difficulty in expressing their pain depending on fatigue, and geriatric patients could face a risk for malnutrition under the effect of symptoms such as nutritional difficulty and loss of appetite (32). In this study, it was determined that the patients most frequently experienced symptoms such as fatigue, loss of appetite, malnutrition and sleeplessness in addition to pain.

In the study, it was found that the patients taking strong opioids for analgesics, had the highest levels of pain and the lowest malnutrition mean scores. This showed that the patients still had pain and their nutritional problems continued despite taking strong opioids. In cancer patients malnutrition is a frequently encountered situation due to nausea-vomiting and loss of appetite, depending on the burdens caused by the disease and treatment.

In case of loss of appetite, symptoms such as changes in sense of taste, presence of nausea-vomiting, pain and depression should be questioned.

It is recommended that changes related to sense of taste can be controlled by adding a little salt and spice to the food. Removing any odor or view, increasing nausea-vomiting from the environment, before nutrition in order for nausea and vomiting not to affect nutrition is among possible interventions (46).

## 5. CONCLUSION

It was determined that geriatric cancer patients experienced "moderate" pain, had a risk for malnutrition and as their pain levels increased, the risk for malnutrition increased. The patients who had fatigue, loss of appetite, nausea-vomiting,

malnutrition, poor personal care and sleeplessness, had higher VAS mean scores and lower MNA mean scores.

In addition, the pain experienced by the patients was accompanied by fatigue, loss of appetite, nausea-vomiting, malnutrition, poor personal care, sleeplessness, desire of crying and sense of burnout. In accordance with these results, it is recommended to evaluate geriatric cancer patients in terms of pain and malnutrition in the treatment process, take necessary precautions before their symptoms advance, follow other problems that may accompany pain and support patients.

The most important limitation of the study was that pain and nutritional status were evaluated only via a questionnaire and results are limited to the research group only.

Procurement of pain management and nutritional support is crucial for intended clinical outcomes in geriatric cancer patients. It is suggested to follow up pain and malnutrition of patients using appropriate assessment tools. Nurses at this point play a key role.

Thus pain, malnutrition and accompanying problems of patients should be managed with a multidisciplinary team approach.

**Acknowledgments:** The researchers would like to thank the patients who participated in the study.

**Funding:** The author(s) received no financial support for the research.

**Conflicts of interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

**Ethics Committee Approval:** This study was approved by Clinical Trials Ethics Committee of Gaziantep University (2017/163)

**Peer-review:** Externally peer-reviewed.

**Author Contributions:**

Research idea: SA, ÖO, SS, NO

Design of the study: SA, ÖO, SS, NO

Acquisition of data for the study: SA, SS

Analysis of data for the study: SA, ÖO, SS, NO

Interpretation of data for the study: SA, ÖO, SS, NO

Drafting the manuscript: SA, ÖO, NO

Revising it critically for important intellectual content: SA, ÖO, SS, NO

Final approval of the version to be published: SA, ÖO, SS, NO

## REFERENCES

- [1] Tekin ÇS, Kara F. Dünyada ve Türkiye'de yaşlılık. Uluslararası Bilimsel Araştırmalar Dergisi 2018;3(1):219-229 (Turkish)
- [2] Çetin A, Arslan İ, Tekin O, Sarı O. Yaşlıların yaşadığı yerin ve sosyodemografik özelliklerinin yaşam kalitesi üzerine etkisi. Journal of Medicine and Palliative Care. 2020;1(2):34-40 (Turkish)
- [3] Karadağ E. Yaşlı kanser hastalarında yorgunluk. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi 2018;11(4): 328 – 333 (Turkish)
- [4] Barutcu CD. Kronik hastalığı olan yaşlı bireylerin ağrı kesici tercihleri. Geleneksel ve Tamamlayıcı Tıp Dergisi 2020;3(1):69-76 (Turkish)
- [5] Mutluay E. Yaşlı kanser hastalarında ağrı. Türk Onkoloji Dergisi 2015;30(2):90-95 (Turkish)

- [6] Durmuş E, Uğur Ö. Kanser ağrısının yönetiminde bakım verenlerin ağrı kesicileri kullanım engelleri ve etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesi. *Hemşirelikte Araştırma Geliştirme Dergisi* 2018;20(2/3):22-33 (Turkish)
- [7] Eti Aslan F. Ağrı doğası ve kontrolü. 1. baskı, İstanbul: Avrupa Tıp Kitapevi; 2006. (Turkish).
- [8] Alan Ö, Gürsel Ö, Ünsal M, Altın S, Kılıksız S. Geriatrik hastalarda onkolojik yaklaşım. *Okmeydanı Tıp Dergisi* 2013;29(Ek sayı 2):94-98 (Turkish)
- [9] Özel V, Alphan E. Yetişkin hematolojik kanserli hastaların malnütrisyon düzeylerinin farklı tarama araçları ile değerlendirilmesi. *Sağlık ve Yaşam Bilimleri Dergisi* 2019;1(1):21-29 (Turkish)
- [10] Hébuterne X, Lemarié E, Michallet M, de Montreuil CB, Schneider SM, Goldwasser F. Prevalence of malnutrition and current use of nutrition support in patients with cancer. *J Parenter Enteral Nutr.* 2014;38(2):196-204.
- [11] Planas M, Álvarez-Hernández J, León-Sanz M, Celaya-Pérez S, Araujo K, De Lorenzo A.G. Prevalence of hospital malnutrition in cancer patients: a sub-analysis of the PREDyCES® study. *Support Care Cancer.* 2016;24(1):429-435.
- [12] Pressoir M, Desné S, Berchery D, Rossignol G, Poiree B, Meslier M, Meuric J. Prevalence, risk factors and clinical implications of malnutrition in French Comprehensive Cancer Centres. *Br J Cancer.* 2010;102(6):966-971.
- [13] De Melo Silva FR, de Oliveira MGOA, Souza ASR, Figueroa JN, Santos CS. Factors associated with malnutrition in hospitalized cancer patients: a cross-sectional study. *Nutrition Journal* 2015;14(1):123.
- [14] Caillet P, Liuu E, Simon AR, Bonnefoy M, Guerin O, Berrut G, Paillaud E. Association between cachexia, chemotherapy and outcomes in older cancer patients: a systematic review. *Clin Nutr.* 2017;36(6):1473-1482.
- [15] Ovayolu Ö, Ovayolu N. Onkolojide semptom yönetiminde kullanılan kanıt temelli tamamlayıcı yöntemler ve etkileri. *ERÜ Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi.* 2013;1(1):83-98 (Turkish)
- [16] Kutlu R, Çivi S, Börüban M, Demir A. Kanserli hastalarda depresyon ve yaşam kalitesini etkileyen faktörler. *Selçuk Üniv Tıp Derg.* 2011;27(3):149-153 (Turkish).
- [17] Kocatürk C, Kalafat, S. Akciğer kanserli hastalarda malnütrisyon ve perioperatif nütrisyon desteği. *Toraks Cerrahisi Bülteni* 2015;9(4):297-302 (Turkish)
- [18] Silva PB, Trindade LC, Gallucci MC, Schirr RA. Prevalence of malnutrition and pain in patients admitted by the screening service of an oncologic hospital. *Rev Dor.* 2013;14(4):263-266
- [19] Güzeldemir ME. Ağrı değerlendirme yöntemleri. *Sendrom.* 1995;6(7):11-21 (Turkish)
- [20] Guigoz Y. The mini nutritional assessment (mna) review of the literature—what does it tell us? *J Nutr Health Aging.* 2006;10(6):466-485.
- [21] Van Nes MC, Herrmann FR, Gold G, Michel JP, Rizzoli R. Does the mini nutritional assessment predict hospitalization outcomes in older people? *Age Ageing.* 2001;30(3):221-226.
- [22] Sarıkaya D. Geriatrik Hastalarda Mini Nütrisyonel Değerlendirme (MNA) Testinin uzun ve kısa (MNA-sf) Formunun Geçerlilik çalışması, *Tıpta Uzmanlık Tezi* 2013, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara (Turkish)
- [23] T.C Sağlık Bakanlığı. Türkiye Halk Sağlığı Kurumu Kronik Hastalıklar, Yaşlı Sağlığı ve Engelliler Daire Başkanlığı, Türkiye Bulaşıcı olmayan hastalıklar çok Paydaşlı eylem planı, 2017-2025. Accessed [01September 2020] [https://www.euro.who.int/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0006/346695/BOH\\_TR.pdf](https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/346695/BOH_TR.pdf)
- [24] Khalil AZ, Meawad EB, Abd Elhameed SH. Nurses' attitude, practices and barriers towards pain management of elderly patients with cancer. *Mansoura Nursing Journal* 2022;9(1):23-30.
- [25] Baz S, Ardahan M. Yaşlılarda malnütrisyon ve hemşirelik yaklaşımları. *Balıkesir Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi* 2016;(5):147-153 (Turkish)
- [26] Caltagirone C, Spoletini I, Gianni W, Spalletta G. Inadequate pain relief and consequences in oncological elderly patients. *Surg Oncol.* 2010;19(3):178-83.
- [27] Uyar M, Eyigör C. Geriatrik kanser ağrısına yaklaşım. *Ege Tıp Dergisi* 2014;53(Ek sayı):38-45 (Turkish)
- [28] Barford KL, D'Olimpio JT. Symptom management in geriatric oncology: Practical treatment considerations and current challenges. *Curr Treat Options Oncol.* 2008;9(2-3):204-214.
- [29] Kutlutürkan S, Sözeri Öztürk E, Böke Erdoğan S, İyimaya Ö, Bay F, Gül F. Yaşlı kanser hastalarında yaşam kalitesinin ve semptomların değerlendirilmesi. *Van Tıp Dergisi* 2018;26(4):418-426 (Turkish)
- [30] Hamaker ME, Buurman BM, van Munster BC, Kuper IM, Smorenburg CH, de Rooij SE. The value of a comprehensive geriatric assessment for patient care in acutely hospitalized older patients with cancer. *The oncologist.* 2011;16(10):1403
- [31] Akademik Geriatri Derneği, Yaşlılarda Malnütrisyon Kılavuzu, Grup 1 Malnütrisyonun önemi tarama ve tanı. Published [January 2013]. Accessed [01January 2020] <https://www.akademikgeriatri.org/files/thn-kitap.pdf> (Turkish)
- [32] World Health Organization. WHO report on cancer: setting priorities, investing wisely and providing care for all. Accessed [01 January 2020]. <https://repository.gheli.harvard.edu/repository/13173/>
- [33] Ülger Z, Halil M, Kalan I, Yavuz BB, Cankurtaran M, Güngör E, Arioğul S. Comprehensive assessment of malnutrition risk and related factors in a large group of community-dwelling older adults. *Clin Nutr.* 2010;29(4):507-511.
- [34] Kuyumcu ME, Yeşil Y, Oztürk ZA, Halil M, Ülger Z, Yavuz BB, Arioğul S. Challenges in nutritional evaluation of hospitalized elderly; always with mini-nutritional assessment? *Eur Geriatr Med.* 2013;4(4):231-236
- [35] Ekici E, Yetim Çolak M, Kozan EH. Huzurevinde yaşayan yaşlıların beslenme durumları ve günlük yaşam aktivitelerinin belirlenmesi. *Online Türk Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi.* 2019;4(4):506-518 (Turkish)
- [36] Saka B, Kaya O, Ozturk GB, Erten N, Karan MA. Malnutrition in the elderly and its relationship with other geriatric syndromes. *Clin Nutr.* 2010;29(6):745-748.
- [37] Cankurtaran M, Saka B, Sevnaz S, Varlı M, Döventaş A, Yavuz BB, Halil M, Çurgunlu A, Ülger Z, Öztürk GB, Tufan F, Tekin N, Akçiçek F, Karan MA, Atlı T, Beğler T, Erdinçler DS, Arioğul S. 2012. Türkiye huzurevleri ve bakımevleri nütrisyonel değerlendirme projesi. Accessed [01 January 2020]. <https://www.akademikgeriatri.org/files/thn-kitap.pdf> (Turkish).
- [38] Thomas PA, Berbis J, Falcoz PE, Le Pimpec-Barthes F, Bernard A, Jougon J, Alauzen M. National peroperative outcomes of pulmonary lobectomy for cancer: the influence of nutritional status. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2014;45(4):652-659
- [39] Caillet P, Laurent M, Bastuji-Garin S, Liuu E, Culine S, Lagrange JL, Paillaud E. Optimal management of elderly cancer patients:

- usefulness of the comprehensive geriatric assessment. *Clin Interv Aging*. 2014;9:1645
- [40] Yekedüz E, Utkan G, Ürün Y. Ağrili kemik metastazlarında onkolojik yaklaşımlar. *Nükleer Tıp Seminerleri* 2020;6:11-16 (Turkish)
- [41] Berger AM, Gerber LH, Mayer DK. Cancer-related fatigue: implications for breast cancer survivors. *Cancer* 2012;118(S8):2261-2269
- [42] Eyigor S, Eyigor C, Uslu R. Assessment of pain, fatigue, sleep and quality of life (QoL) in elderly hospitalized cancer patients. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics* 2010;51(3):57-61
- [43] Luctkar-Flude MF, Groll DL, Tranmer JE, Woodend K. Fatigue and physical activity in older adults with cancer: a systematic review of the literature. *Cancer Nurs*. 2007;30(5):35-45.
- [44] Henson LA, Maddocks M, Evans C, Davidson M, Hicks S, Higginson IJ. Palliative care and the management of common distressing symptoms in advanced cancer: Pain, breathlessness, nausea and vomiting, and fatigue. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2020;38(9):905-914
- [45] Cheng KK, Lee DT. Effects of pain, fatigue, insomnia, and mood disturbance on functional status and quality of life of elderly patients with cancer. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol*. 2011;78(2):127-137.
- [46] Yurtsever S, Çavuşoğlu E, Onkoloji hastalarının palyatif bakımında semptom yönetimi, 2. Uluslararası Multidisipliner Çalışmalar Kongre Kitabı; Adana,Türkiye; 2018. Pp.1-12 (Turkish)

**How to cite this article:** Aytaç S, Ovayolu O, Serçe S, Ovayolu N. Pain and Malnutrition in Elderly Cancer Patients: Examples of Southern Turkey. *Clin Exp Health Sci* 2023; 13: 1-8. DOI: 10.33808/clinexphealthsci.927643.