

Changes in cancer prevention and management and patient needs during the COVID-19 pandemic: An umbrella review of systematic reviews

Taulant Muka (1,2), Joshua J X Li (3), Sahar J. Farahani (4), John P.A. Ioannidis (2, 5, 6)

¹ Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

² Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford (METRICS), Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA

³ Department of Anatomical and Cellular Pathology, Prince of Wales Hospital, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

⁴ Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Stony Brook University, Long Island, New York

⁵ Stanford Prevention Research Center, Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California, USA

⁶ Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California, USA

Correspondence to: John Ioannidis, 1265 Welch Rd, MSOB X306, Stanford, CA 94305, USA. E-mail: jioannid@stanford.edu

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The COVID-19 pandemic led to relocation and reconstruction of health care resources and systems, and to a decrease in healthcare utilization, and this may have affected the treatment, diagnosis, prognosis, and psychosocial well-being of cancer patients.

Objective: To summarize and quantify the evidence on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the full spectrum of cancer care.

Methods: We performed an umbrella review to summarize and quantify the findings from systematic reviews on impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer treatment modification, delays, and cancellations; delays or cancellations in screening and diagnosis; psychosocial well-being, financial distress, and use of telemedicine as well as on other aspects of cancer care. PubMed was searched for relevant systematic reviews with or without meta-analysis published before November 29th, 2022. Abstract, full text screening and data extraction were performed by two independent reviewers. AMSTAR-2 was used for critical appraisal of included systematic reviews.

Results. 45 systematic reviews evaluating different aspects of cancer care were included in our analysis. Most reviews were based on observational studies judged to be at medium and high risk of bias. Only 2 of the included reviews had high or moderate scores based on AMSTAR-2. Findings suggest treatment modifications in cancer care during the pandemic versus the pre-pandemic period were based on low level of evidence. Different degrees of delays and cancellations in cancer treatment, screening and diagnosis were observed, with low-and-middle income countries and countries that implemented lockdowns being disproportionately affected. A shift from in-person appointments to telemedicine use was observed, but utility of telemedicine, challenges in implementation and cost-effectiveness in different areas of cancer care were little explored. Evidence was consistent in suggesting psychosocial well-being (e.g., depression, anxiety, and social activities) of cancer patients deteriorated, and cancer patients experienced financial distress, albeit results were in general not compared to pre-pandemic levels. Impact of cancer care disruption during the pandemic on cancer prognosis was little explored.

Conclusion: Substantial but heterogenous impact of COVID-19 pandemic on cancer care has been observed. Evidence gaps exist on this topic, with mid- and long-term impact on cancer care being most uncertain.

INTRODUCTION

The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic and the mitigation measures that were undertaken posed major challenges to cancer care. The rapid spread of COVID-19 and early data showing patients with cancer were at increased risk of morbidity and mortality after Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection, prompted changes in healthcare delivery¹. These changes included reduction of medical activities, reallocation of healthcare workers, shifting in-person appointments to remote consultations, and limiting access of patients to care facilities².

Concerns have been raised that disruption of health care services might have had multidimensional impact in cancer care. Indeed, several studies have described delays and cancellation in treatment, screening, and diagnosis³⁻⁵. For example, two meta-analyses showed that during the pandemic there was a ~50% reduction in breast and cervical cancer screening, and that there was 18.7% reduction for all cancer treatments, with surgical treatment showing the highest reduction^{3,4}. In addition, several studies have highlighted deterioration of psychological well-being of cancer patients, and psychological, ethical, spiritual, and financial needs of cancer patients were also affected^{6,7}.

Several systematic reviews have examined the impact on cancer care, but they evaluated different outcomes and periods of the pandemic^{3,4,8-14}. Thus, it would be essential to put together these systematic reviews, particularly assessing the methodological rigor of the evidence and summarizing systematically the main findings in terms of the magnitude of the impact and the uncertainty thereof. To achieve these goals, we performed an umbrella review of systematic reviews.

METHODS

We performed an umbrella review following the recent published guideline¹⁵, and for reporting we adhered to the Preferred Reporting Items for Overviews of Reviews- PRIOR checklist¹⁶ (**Appendix 1**). The protocol has been registered with the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/qjgxy>)

Search Strategy

Literature search was performed in PubMed using the search strategy in **Appendix 2**. No language restriction was applied. We searched for studies published until November 3rd, 2022; an update of the search was performed until November 29th, 2022. References cited in the final included studies for analysis were further screened to identify other relevant publications.

Screening, Study selection and Eligibility criteria

Retrieved items were first screened based on the title and abstract and potentially eligible references were then screened in full text. Screening was performed by two reviewers and in case of discrepancies, a final decision to include or exclude was settled with discussion. We included studies if they fulfilled all the following criteria: (i) were systematic reviews with or without meta-analysis or individual participant meta-analysis; (ii) included individuals diagnosed with any type of cancer and at any cancer stages (early to advanced), or individuals targeted for cancer screening; (iii) assessed the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, and thus had data collected during the pandemic period (2020-2022) (the included studies may nevertheless have used also control pre-pandemic periods in order to assess the magnitude of change during the pandemic); and assessed any of the following outcomes: delay/cancellation of treatment (overall, and per specific treatment); modification of treatment (overall, and per specific treatment); delayed/cancelled screening (overall and per specific type of screening); reduced diagnoses (overall and per specific diagnosis); reduced uptake of HPV vaccination; psychological needs; ethical needs; social needs; financial burden and distress; social impact/ isolation; psychological distress; use of telehealth/virtual visits; tobacco use and cessation and other aspects of cancer care such as impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on prognosis.

Data extraction and Critical appraisal

The data extraction was performed by one of the authors and the extracted data were further checked by two other authors; differences were settled by discussion. In case an eligible article included data from several diseases, when feasible, we extracted information only on cancer-related outcomes of our interest. For each eligible systematic review we extracted the following information: authors, year of publication, type of studies considered (design), number of eligible studies, COVID-19 period covered (until when), whether it has considered studies with pre-pandemic controls (yes exclusively/yes for some/not at all), the location(s) that were eligible (countries/areas/global), the outcomes examined and for which cancers each outcome was examined, and methods of analysis and heterogeneity (if provided).

For each systematic review we extracted information on whether the authors used any previously validated tool or any other set of extracted items to assess the methodological rigor of the included studies. If yes, we recorded the tool used and the main conclusions of the assessment were grouped in the broad categories: most studies were weak in methodological rigor, most studies were strong in methodological rigor, or mixed/ intermediate pattern between the other two categories. Two reviewers assessed methodological rigor of the included systematic reviews using AMSTAR-2 tool¹⁷; any discrepancies were settled with the help of a third reviewer. AMSTAR-2 is based on a 16 item or domain checklist, with seven of these items considered critical the overall validity of a review. The domains considered critical are: (i) protocol registration before starting the review; (ii) adequate and

comprehensive search of the literature; (iii) providing justification for the exclusion of individual studies; (iv) risk of bias assessment of the studies included in the review; (v) use of appropriate statistical methods in performing a meta-analysis; (vi) accounting for risk of bias when interpreting the results; (vii) and evaluation of the presence and impact of publication bias.

Statistical analysis

Due to high heterogeneity in the designs, study questions, outcomes, and metrics, a descriptive analysis was performed. Separate tables were created for the methodological appraisal of the systematic reviews, the methodological appraisal of the studies in each systematic review, for the characteristics and subject matter information of each systematic review, and for the final conclusions of each systematic review. Limitations and areas of limited evidence were noted.

RESULTS

Our search strategy identified 649 citations. Based on title and abstract screening, we retrieved full texts of 74 articles for further screening. Of those, 29 articles did not meet our eligibility criteria, thus leaving 45 articles to be included in our final analysis. **Figure 1** summarizes our screening procedure. No additional study was found from screening of references of the included studies.

Characteristics of the included systematic reviews

Of the 45 included systematic reviews, 13 articles also included a quantitative analysis/meta-analysis with one being individual participant meta-analysis.^{2-14 18-49} Other key characteristics of the 45 systematic reviews are shown in **Table 1** (more extensive details appear in **Appendix 3 and Appendix 4**). The median number of bibliographic databases/data sources that were searched was 3.5; the most searched databases were PubMed (n=23), Medline (n=22), Embase (n=22), Scopus (n=17), Web of Science (n=13) and The Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature- CINAHL database (n=10). One review searched for mobile applications using the iOS App Store and Android Google Play²³. The median number of studies included in the systematic reviews was 31 (interquartile range, 15.5; 49). Most reviews provided data from different countries, while only two studies focused on data from India²⁹ and Italy³⁵ exclusively. The type of study designs included across reviews varied, but most reviews included data from observational study designs of cross-sectional and retrospective nature. Twenty reviews focused/reported exclusively on studies that include pre-pandemic controls. Seventeen reviews provided data only on site-specific cancers, while the rest for any cancer-site with or without data on site-specific cancers. Seventeen reviews assessed only one aspect of cancer care, while the rest examined two or more of our pre-defined outcomes. The date of last search varied from April 2020 to May 2022, with 15 reviews ending searches during 2020, 21 during 2021 and 5 during 2022; 4 reviews did not provide information on date of last search.

Risk of bias of primary studies included in the systematic reviews and GRADE assessments

Of the 45 reviews, 31 assessed risk of bias of the included studies (**Table 2** and details in **Appendix 5**). Thirteen different risks of bias checklists were used, and the most common checklists used to assess methodological rigor were Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) (n=10) and Joanna Briggs Institute tools (n=7). Of the systematic reviews that assess methodological rigor of the individual studies, 7 concluded strong evidence, 19 mixed evidence, 3 weak evidence and 2 did not provide any results. Excluding the NOS assessments (since NOS has been criticized to not provide accurate assessment of methodological rigor⁵⁰), the respective numbers were 2, 14, 3, and 2. Only two reviews used GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluations), concluding low to moderate certainty in the results.

Methodological rigor of included systematic reviews

Table 3 shows the AMSTAR-2 evaluations for the included systematic reviews. Only two reviews scored moderate to high quality, while the rest were evaluated as low or critically low quality due to not meeting one or more of the seven domains considered critical. Most of the studies did not provide the list of excluded studies during the full text screening, and did not account for methodological rigor of included studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the reviews.

Results and conclusions of systematic reviews and of meta-analyses

The main results and conclusions of the eligible systematic reviews are presented in **Appendices 6-12** for various aspects of cancer care. **Table 4** lists the effect sizes and confidence intervals for the systematic reviews that used formal meta-analysis as well as heterogeneity metrics. **Figure 2** provides a summary of main findings of this umbrella review. Here, we present some key findings for each type of outcome:

Modification of treatment

There were 11 reviews assessing modification of treatment^{5 9 10 18 19 21 26 31 34 37 40}. Main findings for each individual review are outlined in **Appendix 6 and Table 4**. All reviews were consistent reporting changes in treatment, with downscaling treatments plans in cancer patients being a significant intervention. Di Cosimo S et al. 2022 reported changes in treatment plans in 65% (95%CI, 53%-75%; I², 98%) of centers³⁴. Guidelines recommended use of non-surgical treatment over surgical treatments, as it was seen in head and neck cancer management. However, reviews suggested patients being assessed in a case-by-case basis and that individual factors should be considered for individualized treatment (**Appendix 6**). Garg PK et al. 2020 found that available guidelines were based on low level of evidence and had significant discordance for the role and timing of surgery, especially in early tumors²¹.

Delayed and/or cancelled treatment

Appendix 7 and **Table 4** summarize the main findings from the 13 reviews^{2 4 5 13 14 22 28 32 34 36 38 40 44} that assessed and reported on treatment delays and cancellations of cancer treatment. Seven reviews mentioned that cancellations of treatment were observed, although to what extent this happened was not consistently provided^{22 28 32 34 36 40 44}. However, reviews reported that these reductions were more pronounced during a lockdown. In the meta-analysis by Teglia F et al., 2022, it was found an overall reduction of -18.7% (95% CI, -13.3 to -24.1) in the total number of cancer treatments administered during January-October 2020 compared to the previous periods, with surgical treatment having a larger decrease compared to medical treatment (-33.9% versus -12.6%); among cancers, the largest decrease was observed for skin cancer (-34.7% [95% CI, -22.5 to -46.8])⁴. This difference would depend on the period, with the review reporting a U-shape for the period January–October 2020. Lignou S et al. 2022³⁸ reported that between 18th to 31st of January 2021, pediatric and noncancer surgical activities were occurring at less than a third of the rate of the previous year, while Di Cosimo SD et al. 2022³⁴ reported cancellation/delays of treatment in 58% (95%CI, 48%-67%; I², 98%) of centers. Majeed A et al., 2022¹⁴ showed that shortage of treatment and delays and interruptions to cancer therapies in general were more common in low- and middle-income countries.

Delayed and/or cancelled screening

The results of 11 reviews^{3 33 35-37 39 41 42 46 49 51} reporting on cancer screening are summarized in **Appendix 8** and **Table 4**. Of these, 5 included a meta-analysis. Overall, reviews showed a decline in screening rates across all cancer types, and that differences by demographic area and time periods were observed; for instance, countries that implemented lockdowns showed a higher decline in screening rates. Within colorectal and gastric cancers, most reviews reported a reduction of at least 50% in number of endoscopies and gastroscopies compared to previous years. In the meta-analysis by Teglia F et al³, while colorectal screening on average was reduced by 44.9% (95% CI, -53.8% to -36.1%) during January-October 2020, a U-shape association was observed. Within women-specific cancers, the meta-analyses showed a decrease in breast and cervical cancers screening rates of at least 40-50%.³ A meta-analysis focused on cytopathology practice showed that on average there was a sample volume reduction of 45.3% (range, 0.1%-98.0%), although the results would depend on the tissue sampled⁴⁹. Similar findings were reported by Alkatoul et al. 2021³³.

Reduced cancer diagnosis

Main findings of the ten reviews³⁶ providing data on reduction in cancer diagnosis are provided in **Appendix 9** and **Table 4**. Reviews were consistent in reporting decreased diagnosis of new cancer cases during the pandemic, although the reduction depended on the geographical area, the period being investigated and type of cancer. For example, there was a 73.4% decrease in cervical cancer diagnoses in Portugal during 2020, and in Italy, while there was up to 62% reduced diagnosis of colorectal cancer in 2020 compared to pre-pandemic years, the reduction was more pronounced in

Northern Italy where strict lockdowns were implemented. Indeed, reviews showed that countries that implemented lockdowns measures showed the highest reduction in number of new cancer cases being diagnosed. Breast cancer diagnosis rates dropped by an estimate between 18-29% between 2019 and 2021⁴².

Reduced uptake of HPV vaccination

There was only one review to summarize data on HPV vaccination, showing up to 96% reduction in number of vaccine doses administered in March-May 2020 among adolescents and young girls aged 9-26 years; the one- year period reduction reported was much smaller (13%)³⁶.

Psychological needs/distress

Twelve reviews covered topics related to psychological needs and distress that cancer patients experienced during the pandemic^{2 5-7 11 20 22 24 27 29 32 37}; the findings are summarized in **Appendix 10** and **Table 4**. Reviews reported that the pandemic negatively impacted the psychosocial and physical wellbeing of cancer survivors and cancer patients experienced different levels of anxiety, depression, and insomnia. In a meta-analysis, Ayubi E et al. 2021 reported an overall prevalence of depression and anxiety of 37% (95%CI, 27-47, I², 99.05) and 38% (95%CI, 31-46%, I², 99.08) in cancer patients, respectively²⁰. Similar findings were reported by Zhang et al. 2022⁶. Compared to controls, cancer patients had higher anxiety level [standard mean difference (SMD 0.25 (95% CI, 0.08, 0.42)]²⁰.

Telemedicine

Telehealth was investigated and reported in 10 of the included reviews^{2 10 12 19 23 25 30 32 34 38}; a summary of main findings is provided in **Appendix 11**. Salehi F et al. 2022³⁰ reported that telemedicine use in breast cancer patients was the most common investigated in studies exploring cancer-specific use of telemedicine. Telemedicine was used for various reasons, with provision of virtual visit services and consultation being the most common³⁰. One study explored various symptom tracking apps for cancer patients, available in the mobile health market, and found that only a limited number of apps exist for cancer-specific symptom tracking (27%)²³. In addition, of the 41 apps found, only one was tested in a clinical trial for usability among patients with cancer²³. While little research exists on how patients perceived telemedicine during the COVID-19 pandemic, early data showed that majority of patients found telemedicine service helpful and that obtaining a telemedicine service helped solve their health problem. Nevertheless, there were concerns that use of telehealth for people with cancer suggests a greater proportion of missed diagnoses³⁸, and that telemedicine cannot be a substitute for face-to-face appointments²⁵.

Financial distress and Social isolation

Four reviews reported the economic impact of COVID-19 and social isolation of cancer patients during the pandemic (**Appendix 12**)^{2 7 11 22}. While there is little research on this topic, overall, the reviews suggested financial distress with direct and indirect costs burden and social isolation being a common issue for cancer patients. Reviews also were consistent in reporting social isolation and loneliness among cancer patients. Several factors contributed to social isolation, including fear of infection, social distancing measures, not having visitors and lack of social interaction during treatment.

Tobacco use and cessation

There was only one systematic review and meta-analysis to explore tobacco use and cessation during the pandemic⁴⁵. Based on data from 31 studies, Sarich P et al. 2022 found that, compared to pre-pandemic period, the proportion of people smoking during the pandemic was lower (pooled prevalence ratio of 0.87 (95%CI:0.79-0.97)). In addition, there was similar proportions among smokers before pandemic who smoked more or smoked less during the pandemic, and on average 4% (95%CI: 1-9%) reported stopping smoking. 2% reported starting smoking during the pandemic. High heterogeneity was observed across the meta-analyses results.

Other aspects of cancer care

Sixteen reviews^{8-10 13 14 18 19 26 28 29 34 38 43 47 48} reported on mitigations strategies and cancer service restructuring, impact of measures on cancer prognosis, and on quality of recommendations provided during COVID-19 for cancer care; findings are summarized in **Appendix 13**. In the meta-analysis by Di Cosimo S et al., routine use of PPE by patient and healthcare personnel was reported by 81% and 80% of centers, respectively; systematic SARS-CoV-2 screening by nasopharyngeal swabs was reported by only 41% of centers³⁴. Four reviews also reported on potential impact of mitigation strategies on cancer outcomes/prognosis^{33 38 43 47}. It was estimated that 59,204–63,229 years of life lost might be attributable to delays in cancer diagnosis alone because of the first COVID-19 lockdown in the UK, albeit the findings were based on single study. Delayed cancer screening was estimated to cause globally the following additional numbers of cancer deaths secondary to breast, esophageal, lung, and colorectal cancer, respectively: 54,112–65,756, 31,556–32,644, 86,214–95,195, and 143,081–155,238³³. Tang et al. 2022⁴⁷ found no deterioration in the surgical outcomes of colorectal cancer surgery or reduction in the quality of cancer removal. Similar findings were also reported by Pararas N et al. 2022⁴³, despite the number of patients presenting with metastases during the pandemic was significantly increased. Thomson JD et al. 2020⁴⁸, by exploring recommendations for hypofractionated radiation therapy, found that in general the recommendations during the pandemic were based on lower quality of evidence than the highest quality routinely used dose fractionation schedules.

DISCUSSION

The current umbrella review appraises systematically the evidence on the extent to which several aspects of cancer care were disrupted during the COVID-19 pandemic. The summary message provided by 45 systematic reviews is that there have been modifications, delays and cancellation of treatment, delays and cancellation in cancer screening and diagnosis, and cancer patients may have experienced additional psychological, social, and financial distress. Nevertheless, appraisal of the impact of COVID-19 on cancer care is mainly based on limited and low-quality evidence, and that data mainly derive from high-income countries, with little understanding of consequences of COVID-19 on cancer care in low- and- middle income countries. In addition, limited evidence exists on whether disruptions in cancer care during the pandemic had adverse impact in prognosis of cancer patients and mortality.

Several guidelines were provided for cancer care during the pandemic, including recommendations on mitigation strategies to prevent SARS-CoV-2 infection and cancer treatment modalities. Nevertheless, most recommendations were based on expert opinions, and little quantitative evidence was provided to support them. This aspect was highlighted also in the systematic review by Thomson JD et al. 2020⁴⁸. The authors explored recommendations for hypofractionated radiation therapy before and during pandemic and found that during the pandemic there was a significant shift from established higher-quality evidence to lower-quality evidence and expert opinions for the recommended hypofractionated radiation schedules. Similar findings were reported also by Garg PK et al. 2020²¹, suggesting not only guidelines were based on low level of evidence, but also there was significant discordance for the role and timing of surgery, especially in early tumors.

Specific recommendations established from the guidelines such as prioritization of high-grade malignancy, as well as other aspects such as lockdowns, social restrictions, restructure of cancer care with prioritization of high-risk malignancies and use of telemedicine, fear of infection, financial distress and shortage in medications could explain the delays and cancellation in cancer treatment, screening and diagnosis reported in several studies. For example, Lignou S et al. 202³⁸ raised concerns that use of telehealth for people with cancer suggests a greater proportion of missed diagnoses. Most of examined systematic reviews reported a substantial reduction in treatment, screening, and diagnosis of several cancers during the pandemic, which was more pronounced for countries that implemented a lockdown. In addition, differences were observed by geographical area, suggesting that the impact on cancer treatment, screening and diagnosis could depend on mitigation strategies countries implemented as well as on country-specific health care organization and resources. For example, shortage of treatment and delays and interruptions to cancer therapies in general were more

pronounced in low- and middle-income countries¹⁴. The findings on disruption of cancer treatment, screening and diagnosis are in line with findings reported for other chronic diseases, such as cardiovascular disease⁵², suggesting the adverse impact might not be cancer specific. Future research should explore and compare how different chronic diseases were impacted.

Evidence is limited on evaluating how disruption of cancer care during COVID-19 affected prognosis of cancer patients. Limited evidence showed that the number of patients presenting with metastases during the pandemic was significantly increased, and emergency presentations and palliative surgeries were more frequent during the pandemic⁴³. No deterioration in the surgical outcomes of colorectal cancer surgery including mortality or reduction in the quality of cancer removal was observed^{43,47}. A study⁵³ in UK estimated that 59,204–63,229 years of life lost might be attributable to delays in cancer diagnosis alone because of the first COVID-19 lockdown, but estimates were based on modelling. Several studies^{54,55} have shown a decline in elective cancer such as colorectal cancer, despite findings showing that gastrointestinal cancer surgery during pandemic is safe with appropriate isolation measures and no delays should be implemented for both early and advanced cancer⁵⁶. A recent meta-analysis⁵⁷ showed that delaying colorectal cancer longer than 4 weeks could be associated with poorer outcomes.

Several studies and systematic reviews thereof have investigated the impact of the pandemic on psychological wellbeing, financial distress, and social isolation of cancer patients, as well as the role of telemedicine in cancer care. While studies suggested depression, anxiety, post traumatic disorder, insomnia and fear of cancer progression being highly reported by cancer patients with estimates reaching beyond 50%, high heterogeneity was observed, and in general systemic analysis comparing the findings with pre-pandemic period rates was lacking. The pandemic was reported to have financial burden on cancer patients with direct and indirect costs. Social isolation was commonly reported and mainly driven by fear of infection, social distancing measures and lack of social interaction during treatment. Nevertheless, there was limited effort to quantify social isolation and economic impact on cancer care. Telemedicine and remote consultations were sharply increased in use for different aspects of cancer care, including treatment, screening, and rehabilitation. However, evidence is limited in evaluating and quantifying the positive and negative impact, as well as cost-effectiveness of telemedicine. While limited evidence suggested telemedicine reduced costs of cancer care for both patients and health care provider, there were concerns especially from patients that telemedicine could not have similar benefits to on-site consultations.

Our study has certain limitations. We searched only one bibliographic database, and therefore we cannot rule out missing some other relevant systematic reviews. Nevertheless, we screened references

of included studies to find other relevant studies we may have missed. Most systematic reviews included in this umbrella review were based on intermediate and high risk of bias studies, and the findings were mainly based on case-series, cross-sectional and retrospective observational study designs which are prone to residual confounding and poor in determining temporal associations. Prevalence and incidence estimates are also subject to selection biases. In some instances, data were derived from one study or from studies with small sample sizes and limited number of events, leading to large uncertainty. Many studies did not include any pre-pandemic controls. Furthermore, some of the evidence overlapped among the systematic reviews that were included in this umbrella review, but this allows comparing notes on results and conclusions for the overlapping efforts. Some systematic reviews were published early (in 2020), and thus they had even more limited evidence and the impact of the disruptions may have differed across different pandemic waves. Most findings were derived from high-income and/or western countries, limiting the generalizability of the findings to low- and middle-income countries. Lastly, concrete conclusions on intermediate, and long-term impact remain unclear. Finally, the suboptimal methodological rigor of many included reviews is notable.

In summary, evidence shows a diverse and substantial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer care, but large uncertainty and gaps exist in the literature on this topic. Future high-quality studies and properly performed, rigorous systematic reviews with careful meta-analyses will continue to have value in this field.

Availability of data and materials: All relevant data are included in the manuscript and supplemental material.

Competing interests: The authors have no disclosures to report.

Funding: No funding was provided for this project

Authors' Contributions: All authors listed have made a substantial, direct, and intellectual contribution to the work, as well as approved it for publication. T.M., and J.P.A.I., are the guarantors of the work.

Figure 1. Flowchart of Identification, Screening, Eligibility, Inclusion, and Exclusion of Retrieved Studies




Figure 2. Visual summary




Table 1. Characteristics of included systematic reviews

Author, year of publication	Meta-analysis	Number of included studies	Countries	Pre-pandemic controls	Cancer types	Aspects assessed	Last search
Adham, 2022 ¹⁸	No	5	Globally	No	H&N	MT, O	15-Jul-20
Alom, 2021 ¹⁹	No	72	Globally	No	All	MT, TL, O	1-Sep-20
Ayubi, 2021 ²⁰	Yes	34	Globally	No	All	PSND, O	3-Jan-21
Dhada, 2021 ²	No	19	IT, US, UK, NL	No	ALL	DCT, DCS, PSND, TL, FBD, SIA	1-Dec-20
Donkor, 2021 ⁸	No	11	CN, IR, BR, ZA	No	ALL	O	3-Aug-20
Garg, 2020 ²¹	No	212	Globally	No	ALL	MT	2-May-20
Gascon, 2020 ⁹	No	23	Globally	No	H&N	MT, O	1-May-20
Hojaij, 2020 ¹⁰	No	35	Globally	No	H&N,OT O	MT, TL, O	31-Dec-20
Jammu, 2021 ²²	No	19	Globally	No	ALL	DCT, PSND, FBD	27-Aug-20
Kirby, 2022 ⁷	No	56	Globally	No	ALL	PSND, FBD, SIA	31-Mar-21
Legge, 2022 ¹¹	No	18	Globally	No	ALL	PSND, FBD, SIA	25-May-22
Lu, 2021 ²³	No	41*	NA	No	ALL	TL	1-May-20
Moemenimovahed, 2021 ²⁴	No	55	Globally	No	ALL	PSND	30-Jun-21
Mostafaei, 2022 ²⁵	No	22	Globally	No	ALL	TL	1-Jun-21
Moujaess, 2020 ²⁶	No	88	Globally	No	ALL	DCT, O	15-Apr-

							20
Muls, 2022 ²⁷	No	51	Globally	No	ALL	PSND	1-Oct-21
Murphy A, 2022 ¹²	No	37	Globally	No	ALL	TL	31-Mar-21
Pacheco, 2021 ²⁸	No	9	US, IT, CN, SP, UK, IR	No	ALL	DCT, O	NP
Rohilla, 2021 ²⁹	No	6	IN	No	ALL	PSND, O	3-Feb-21
Salehi, 2022 ³⁰	No	16	Globally	No	ALL	TL	1-Apr-21
Sun P, 2021 ³¹	No	6	IT, AM, UK	No	BC	MT	1-Feb-21
Zapala, 2022 ³²	No	160	NP	No	ALL	DCT, PSND, TL	NP
Zhang, 2022 ⁶	Yes	40	Globally	No	ALL	PSND	31-Jan-22
Alkatoul, 2021 ³³	No	16	US, TW, BE, NL, JP, IT, UK, AS, CA	Yes	ALL	DCS, RD	28-Dec-20
Di Cosimo, 2022 ³⁴	Yes	56	Globally	Yes	ALL	MT, DCT, TL, O	11-Dec-20
Fancellu, 2022 ³⁵	No	7	IT	Yes	CRC	DCS, RD	31-Jan-22
Ferrar, 2022 ³⁶	No	33	Globally	Yes	CV	DCT, DCS, RD, RHPV	8-Feb-22
Gadsden, 2022 ¹³	No	17	IN, SL, BA	Yes	ALL	DCT, O	15-Dec-21
Hesary, 2022 ³⁷	No	22	IT, UK, PG, NL, CN, IN, JP, TU, IR, SN	Yes	GA	MT, DCS, RD, PSND	31-Dec-21
Lignou, 2022 ³⁸	No	32	Globally	Yes	PC	DCT, RD, TL	1-Aug-21
Majeed, 2021 ¹⁴	No	60	Globally	Yes, but NS	PC	DCT, RD, TL	3-Nov-21
Mayo, 2021 ³⁹	Yes	13	IT, AU, TW, US, FR, NL	Yes	ALL	DCT, DCS	10-Feb-21
Mazidimoradi, 2021 ⁴⁰	No	43	Globally	Yes	CRC	MT, DCT, RD	1-Jun-21

Mazidimoradi, 2022 ⁴¹	No	25	Globally	Yes	CRC	DCS	1-Jun-21
Ng, 2022 ⁴²	Yes	31	Globally	Yes	BC	DCS, RD	1-Oct-20
Nikolopoulos, 2022 ⁵	No	15	Globally	Yes, but NS	GC	MT, DCT, RD, PSND	10-Feb-21
Pararas, 2022 ⁴³	Yes	10	Globally	Yes	CRC	O	NP
Riera, 2021 ⁴⁴	No	62	Globally	Yes	ALL	DCT	NP
Sarich, 2021 ⁴⁵	Yes	44	Globally	Yes	NA	RF	5-Nov-20
Sasidharanpillai, 2022 ⁴⁶	Yes	7	SL, IT, CA, SC, BE, US	Yes	CV	DCT, RD	1-Sep-21
Tang, 2022 ⁴⁷	Yes	14	TU, CN, UK, IT, DN, AS, AU	Yes	CRC	O	12-Jan-22
Teglia, 2022 ³	Yes	39	Globally	Yes	BC, CRC, CV	DCT, RD	12-Dec-21
Teglia, 2022 ⁴	Yes	47	Globally	Yes	ALL	DCT	12-Dec-21
Thomson, 2020 ⁴⁸	Yes	54	NP	Yes	ALL	O	1-Jun-21
Vigliar, 2020 ⁴⁹	Yes	41**	Globally	Yes	ALL	DCS, RD	30-Apr-20

AM, America; BC; AS, Austria; AU, Australia; BA, Bangladesh; BC, breast cancer; BE, Belgium; BR, Brazil; CA, all cancers or Canada; CN, China; CRC, colorectal cancer; CV, cervical cancer; DN, Denmark; FR, France; GA, gastric cancer; GC, gynecological cancer; H&N, head and neck cancer; IN, India; IR, Iran; IT, Italy; JP, Japan; NA, not applicable; NL, Netherlands; NP, not provided; OTO, otorhinolaryngology cancer; PC, pediatric cancer; PG, Portugal; SC, Scotland; SL, Slovenia or Sri Lanka; SN, Singapore; SP, Spain; TU, Turkey; TW, Taiwan; UK, United Kingdom; United States; ZA, Zambia;

*apps; **respondents

Table 2: Methodological rigor of included reviews

Author	Checklist use	Methodological rigor conclusion category	GRADE
Adham M et al. 2022	CEBM	Not provided	Not provided
Alom S et al. 2021	NHLBI, NIH	Not provided	Not provided
Ayubi E et al. 2021	Not applied	Not provided	Not provided
Dhada S et al. 2021	CASP, NHLBI, NIH	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Donkor et al.	JBI	Weak	Not provided
Garg PK et al. 2020	Not applied	Not provided	Not provided
Gascon L et al. 2020	Agree II	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Hojaij FC et al.2020	Not applied	Not provided	Not provided
Jammu As et al	Not applied	Not provided	Not provided
Kirby A et al. 2022	JBI, CHEC	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Legge H et al. 2022	MMAT	Strong evidence	Not provided
Lu DJ et al. 2021	MARS	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Moemenimovahed Z et al. 2021	Not applied	Not provided	Not provided
Mostafaei A et al. 2022	JBI	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Moujaess E et al. 2020	Not applied	Not provided	Not provided
Muls A et al. 2022	MMAT	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Murphy A et al. 2022	JBI, CHEC	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Pacheco RF et al. 2021	JBI, ROBINS-I	Weak	Not provided
Rohilla KK et al. 2021	Not applied	Not provided	Not provided
Salehi F et al. 2022	Not applied	Not provided	Not provided
Sun P et al. 2021	Not applied	Not provided	Not provided
Zapala J et al. 2022	Not applied	Not provided	Not provided
Zhang L et al. 2022	JBI	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Alkatoul et al. 2021	NOS	Strong evidence	Not provided
Cosimo SD et al. 2022	CLARITY	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided

Fancellu A et al	Not applied	Not provided	Not provided
Ferrar P et al. 2022	NOS	Strong evidence	Not provided
Gadsden T et al. 2022	JBI, ROBINS-I	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Hesary FB et al. 2022	NOS	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Lignou S et al. 2022	Not applied	Not provided	Not provided
Majeed A et al. 2021	Not applied	Not provided	Low to moderate certainty
Mayo M et al. 2021	NOS	Mixed/Intermediate	Moderate to high
Mazidimoradi A et al.2021	NOS	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Mazidimoradi A et al.2022	NOS	Strong evidence	Not provided
Ng JS et al. 2022	NOS	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Nikolopoulos M et al. 2022	NOS	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Pararas N et al. 2022	NOS	Strong evidence	Not provided
Riera R et al. 2021	ROBINS-I	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Sarich P et al. 2021	ROBINS-I	Weak evidence	Not provided
Sasidharanpillai S et al. 2022	NHLBI, NIH	Strong evidence	Not provided
Tang G et al. 2022	NOS	Strong evidence	Not provided
Teglia F et al. 2022	CASP	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Teglia F et al. 2022	CASP	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Thomson JD et al. 2020	ASTRO	Mixed/Intermediate	Not provided
Vigliar E et al. 2020	Not applicable	Not provided	Not provided

CEBM, Critical appraisal tool of qualitative studies from Centre of Evidence-based Medicine (CEBM), University of Oxford; ASTRO, The American Society of Radiation Oncology; CASP, <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/>; CHEC, Consensus on Health Economic Criteria; CLARITY, “Risk of bias instrument for cross-sectional surveys of attitudes and practices” from the CLARITY Group at McMaster University”; JBI, Joanna Briggs Institute; MARS, Mobile Apps Rating Scale; MMAT, Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool; NHLBI, NHI, National Institute of Health Checklist; NOS, Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment; RBC, Risk of Bias Checklist for Prevalence Studies by Hoy Damian et al. 2012

Table 3. Methodological assessment of the included reviews- AMSTAR 2 evaluation (16 questions)*

Authors, year of publication	q1	q2	q3	q4	q5	q6	q7	q8	q9**	q10	q11	q12	q13	q14	q15	q16	Overall Assessment
Adham M et al. 2022	n	n	n	py	n	n	n	n	y	n	na	na	na	n	na	n	Critical low
Alom S et al., 2021	n	n	n	py	n	y	n	py	y	n	na	na	y	n	na	y	Critical Low
Ayubi E et al. 2021	y	n	n	py	n	n	n	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	y	y	Critical low
Dhada S et al. 2021	n	py	n	py	n	n	n	y	y	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical Low
Donkor et al. 2021	n	n	n	py	y	y	n	y	y	n	na	na	na	n	na	y	Critical low
Garg PK et al. 2020	n	n	n	py	y	y	n	n	n	n	na	na	n	y	na	y	Critical low
Gascon L et al. 2020	y	y	n	y	y	y	n	na	y	y	na	na	na	n	na	y	Low
Hojaij FC et al. 2020	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	na	na	na	n	na	y	Critical low
Jammu AS et al. 2021	n	n	n	py	y	y	n	n	n	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical low
Kirby A et al. 2022	y	py	n	y	n	y	n	py	y	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical Low
Legge H et al. 2022	y	py	y	py	y	y	n	y	y	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical Low
Lu DJ et al. 2021	y	n	na	py	n	n	n	y	na	n	na	na	na	n	na	y	Critical Low
Momenimovahed Z et al. 2021	n	n	n	py	n	n	n	n	n	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical low
Mostafaei A et al. 2022	n	py	n	n	n	n	y	py	y	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical low
Muls A et al. 2022	y	py	y	py	n	y	n	y	y	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical Low
Murphy A et al. 2022	n	n	n	y	n	n	n	y	y	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical low
Pacheco RF et al. 2021	y	y	y	py	y	y	y	py	y	y	na	na	y	n	na	y	High quality
Rohilla KK et al. 2021	n	n	n	py	n	y	n	n	n	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical low

Salehi F et al. 2022	n	n	n	py	y	n	n	n	n	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical low
Sun P et al. 2021	n	n	n	py	n	n	n	n	n	n	na	na	na	n	na	n	Critical low
Zapala J et al. 2022	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical low
Zhang L et al. 2022	y	y	y	py	n	y	n	py	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	Low
AlkatouI et al. 2021	n	py	y	py	n	n	n	py	y	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical Low
Di Cosimo et al. 2022	n	n	n	py	y	n	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	Critical low
Fancellu A et al. 2022	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	na	na	n	n	n	n	Critical low
Ferrara P et al. 2022	n	py	n	py	y	y	n	n	y	n	na	na	y	n	na	y	Low
Gadsden T et al. 2022	y	py	n	py	y	n	n	y	y	n	na	na	y	n	na	y	Low
Hesary FB et al. 2022	n	py	n	py	n	n	n	n	y	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical Low
Lignou S et al. 2022	y	n	n	n	y	y	n	y	n	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical low
Majeed A et al. 2022	n	y	n	py	n	y	n	n	py	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical Low
Mayo M et al. 2021	n	y	n	py	y	y	n	n	py	n	n	y	y	n	n	y	Critical low
Mazidimoradi A et al.2021	n	py	n	py	n	n	n	y	y	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical Low
Mazidimoradi A et al. 2022	n	py	n	py	n	n	n	py	y	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical Low
Ng JS et al. 2022	n	py	n	py	n	n	n	py	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	Low
Nikolopoulos M et al. 2022	n	py	n	py	n	n	n	n	y	n	na	na	n	n	na	y	Critical Low
Pararas N et al. 2022	n	y	n	y	y	n	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	Critical low
Riera R et al. 2021	n	py	y	py	y	y	y	y	y	y	na	na	n	y	na	y	Moderate quality
Sarich P et al. 2022	y	y	y	py	y	y	n	y	y	n	y	y	n	y	n	y	Critical low

Sasidharanpillai et al. 2022	n	py	n	py	n	n	n	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	Low
Tang G et al. 2022	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	py	n	n	n	y	n	y	Critical low
Teglia F et al. 2022	y	py	y	py	y	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	Critical low
Teglia F et al. 2022	y	py	y	py	y	y	n	py	y	n	n	n	n	y	n	y	Critical low
Thomson JD et al. 2020	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	n	y	n	n	n	na	y	Critical low
Vigliar E et al., 2020**	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	NA

n, no; NA, not applicable; py, partially yes; y, yes

*The review scored yes if study used a checklist to evaluate methodological rigor, and partial yes if only GRADE assessment was provided without applying a checklist for assessing methodological rigor. *Individual participant meta-analysis and thus not applicable the AMSTAR evaluation

AMSTAR-2 overall assessment rating: high—the review provides an accurate and comprehensive summary of the results of the available studies that addresses the question of interest; moderate—the review has more than one weakness, but no critical flaws. It may provide an accurate summary of the results of the available studies; low—the review has a critical flaw and may not provide an accurate and comprehensive summary of the available studies that address the question of interest; or critically low—the review has more than one critical flaw and should not be relied on to provide an accurate and comprehensive summary of the available studies

Table 4: Summary estimates of the meta-analysis included

Author	No. of studies	Outcome	Estimate	LCI	UCI	I ²	P-heterogeneity	Metric
Ayubi et al. 2021	15	Depression	0.37	0.27	0.47	99	<0.001	Prev*
	17	Anxiety	0.38	0.31	0.46	99	<0.001	Prev*
	4	Anxiety	0.25	0.08	0.42	68	0.02	SMD *
Zhang et al.2022	28	Depression	0.325	0.263	0.392	99	<0.001	Prev*
	34	Anxiety	0.313	0.254	0.375	99	<0.001	Prev*
	8	PTSD	0.288	0.207	0.368	99	<0.001	Prev*
	5	Distress	0.539	0.469	0.609	67	0.016	Prev*
	5	Insomnia	0.232	0.171	0.293	91	<0.001	Prev*
	3	Fear of cancer progression	0.674	0.437	0.91	93	<0.001	Prev*
Cosimo et al. 2022	28	Cancellation/delay of treatment	0.58	0.48	0.67	98	<0.01	Prop* ^a
	14	Modification of treatment	0.65	0.53	0.75	98	<0.01	Prop* ^a
	10	Delay of clinic visits	0.75	0.49	0.95	99	<0.01	Prop* ^a
	14	Reduction in activity	0.58	0.47	0.68	93	<0.01	Prop* ^a
	25	Use of remote consultation	0.72	0.59	0.84	99	<0.01	Prop* ^a
	7	Routine use of PPE (patients)	0.81	0.75	0.95	96	<0.01	Prop* ^a
	16	Routine use of PPE (workers)	0.8	0.61	0.94	99	<0.01	Prop* ^a
	18	Routine screening SARA-CoV-2 swab	0.41	0.3	0.53	96	<0.01	Prop* ^a
Mayo et al. 2021	6	Screening breast cancer	0.63	0.53	0.77	100	<0.001	IRR**
	5	Screening conlonc cancer	0.11	0.05	0.24	100	<0.001	IRR**

	3	Screening cervical cancer	0.1	0.04	0.24	10 0	<0.001	IRR**
Ng et al. 2022	3	Screening breast cancer registry-based study	0.59	0.46	0.7	10 0	<0.001	RR**
	10	Screening breast cancer non registry-based study	0.47	0.38	0.58	10 0	<0.001	RR**
	4	Diagnosis breast cancer registry-based study	0.82	0.63	1.06	99	<0.001	RR**
	18	Diagnosis breast cancer non-registry-based study	0.71	0.63	0.8	92	<0.001	RR**
Praras et al. 2022	5	Tis-T1 stage	1.14	0.87	1.48	41	0.15	OR**
	5	T2 stage	0.91	0.78	1.06	0	0.6	OR**
	5	T3 stage	1.18	0.82	1.7	88	<0.001	OR**
	6	T4 stage	1.19	0.79	1.8	80	<0.001	OR**
	6	N+ stage	1	0.89	1.11	0	0.54	OR**
	6	M+ stage	1.65	1.02	2.67	91	<0.001	OR**
	7	Right-sided tumors	0.88	0.51	1.52	99	<0.001	OR**
	7	Left-sided tumors	0.91	0.56	1.5	96	<0.001	OR**
	8	Rectal tumors	0.93	0.63	1.37	95	<0.001	OR**
	3	Emergency presentations	1.74	1.07	2.84	95	<0.001	OR**
	3	Complicated tumor	1.72	0.78	3.78	82	0.004	OR**
	3	Neoadjuvant therapy	1.22	1.09	1.37	0	0.4	OR**
	4	Palliative internt surgery	1.95	1.13	3.36	54	0.09	OR**
	6	Minimally invasive surgery	0.68	0.37	1.24	98	<0.001	OR**
	5	Stoma formation	0.91	0.51	1.62	94	<0.001	OR**
	2	Morbidity	0.92	0.55	1.55	25	0.25	OR**
	3	Leng of hospital stay	0.51	-0.93	1.94	79	0.008	WMD**
	3	Lymph node harvest	1.57	-1.99	5.13	64	0.06	WMD**

Sarich et al. 2022	12	Smoking prevalence	0.87	0.79	0.97	99	<0.001	PR**
	17	Among smokers, smoking less prevalence	0.21	0.14	0.3	99	<0.001	Prev*
	22	Among smokers, smoking more	0.27	0.22	0.32	98	<0.001	Prev*
	17	Among smokers, smoking unchanged	0.5	0.41	0.58	99	<0.001	Prev*
	6	Among smokers, quit smoking	0.04	0.01	0.09	95	<0.001	Prev*
	4	Among non-smokers, started smoking	0.02	0.01	0.03	92	<0.001	Prev*
Sasidharanpillai et al. 2022	7	Women screened before the COVID-19 pandemic	0.0979	0.06	0.135	10	<0.001	Prop
	7	Women screened during the COVID-19 pandemic	0.0424	0.027	0.057	10	<0.001	Prop
Tang et al. 2022	10	Postoperative morbidity	0.9	0.8	1.01	26	0.22	OR**
	8	Postoperative mortality	1.27	0.92	1.75	0	0.57	OR**
	4	Conversion rate	1.07	0.75	1.52	31	0.23	OR**
	5	Incidence of anastomotic leakage	0.71	0.07	19.22	0	0.74	OR**
	2	Intensive care unit demand rate	0.73	0.29	1.85	0	0.5	OR**
	4	R1 resections rate	0.46	0.11	1.9	0	0.48	OR**
	5	Mean lymph node yield	0.16	-2.26	2.59	54	0.07	MD**
	7	Length of hospital stay	-0.05	-2.28	2.19	98	<0.001	MD**
Teglia et al. 2022	21	Breast cancer screening January-October 2020	0.467	0.378	0.378	NP	NP	PRED**
	21	Breast cancer screening April 2020	0.74	0.567	0.918	NP	NP	PRED**
	21	Breast cancer screening June-October 2020	0.13	-0.07	0.33	NP	NP	PRED**
	22	Colorectal cancer screening January-October 2020	0.449	0.361	0.538	NP	NP	PRED**
	21	Colonoscopy screening January-October 2020	0.525	0.388	0.663	NP	NP	PRED

								**
	21	Fecal occult blood test or fecal immunochemical test January-October 2020	0.378	0.258	0.499	NP	NP	PRED **
	21	Colorectal cancer screening April 2020	0.693	0.369	1	NP	NP	PRED **
	21	Colorectal cancer screening June-October 2020	0.234	0.024	0.444	NP	NP	PRED **
	11	Cervical cancer screening January-October 2020	0.518	0.389	0.647	NP	NP	PRED **
	21	Cervical cancer screening March 2020	0.788	0.583	0.993	NP	NP	PRED **
								PRED **
Teglia et al. 2022	NP	Overall treatment January-October 2020	0.187	0.133	0.241	NP	NP	PRED **
	NP	Overall treatment January-February 2020	0.027	0.045	0.1	NP	NP	PRED **
	NP	Overall treatment March 2020	0.156	0.076	0.237	NP	NP	PRED **
	NP	Overall treatment April 2020	0.283	0.194	0.372	NP	NP	PRED **
	NP	Overall treatment May 2020	0.262	0.176	0.041	NP	NP	PRED **
	NP	Overall treatment June-October 2020	0.16	0.041	0.279	NP	NP	PRED **
	NP	Overall surgical treatment January-October 2020	0.339	0.279	0.399	NP	NP	PRED **
	NP	Overall surgical treatment January-February 2020	0.072	0.093	0.238	NP	NP	PRED **
	NP	Overall surgical treatment March 2020	0.307	0.219	0.396	NP	NP	PRED **
	NP	Overall surgical treatment April 2020	0.342	0.239	0.445	NP	NP	PRED **
	NP	Overall surgical treatment May 2020	0.416	0.318	0.514	NP	NP	PRED

								**
	NP	Overall surgical treatment June-October 2020	0.351	0.186	0.516	NP	NP	PRED**
	NP	Overall medical treatment January-October 2020	0.126	0.048	0.204	NP	NP	PRED**
	NP	Overall medical treatment January-February 2020	0.015	0.055	0.084	NP	NP	PRED**
	NP	Overall medical treatment March 2020	0.116	0.012	0.233	NP	NP	PRED**
	NP	Overall medical treatment April 2020	0.248	0.09	0.407	NP	NP	PRED**
	NP	Overall medical treatment May 2020	0.196	0.085	0.306	NP	NP	PRED**
	NP	Overall medical treatment June-October 2020	0.079	0.078	0.236	NP	NP	PRED**
								PRED**
Vigliar et al. 2020	41	Cytological samples over 4 weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic	0.453	0.001	0.98	NP	NP	PRED**
	41	Ratio of exfoliative to fine needle aspiration samples	0.89	0.74	1.08	95	<0.01	OR**
	27	Malignant diagnosis	0.0556	0.0377	0.0735	81	>>0.01	RD**

LCI, lower confidence interval; IRR, incidence rate ratio; MD, mean difference; OR, odds ratio; PRED, percent reduction; PR, prevalence ratio; Prev, prevalence; Prop, proportion; RD, risk difference; RR, rate ratio; PPE, personal protective equipment; NP, not provided; UCI, upper confidence interval; SMD, standardized mean difference; WMD, weighted mean difference

^a, surveyed centers/operators; *, estimates are during pandemic; **, estimates are pandemic vs. pre-pandemic

REFERENCES

1. Venkatesulu BP, Chandrasekar VT, Girdhar P, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of cancer patients affected by a novel coronavirus. *medRxiv* 2020 doi: 10.1101/2020.05.27.20115303 [published Online First: 20200529]
2. Dhada S, Stewart D, Cheema E, et al. Cancer Services During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Systematic Review of Patient's and Caregiver's Experiences. *Cancer Manag Res* 2021;13:5875-87. doi: 10.2147/cmar.S318115 [published Online First: 20210729]
3. Teglia F, Angelini M, Astolfi L, et al. Global Association of COVID-19 Pandemic Measures With Cancer Screening: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Oncol* 2022;8(9):1287-93. doi: 10.1001/jamaoncol.2022.2617
4. Teglia F, Angelini M, Casolari G, et al. Global Association of COVID-19 Pandemic Measures with Cancer Treatment: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Cancers (Basel)* 2022;14(22) doi: 10.3390/cancers14225490 [published Online First: 20221108]
5. Nikolopoulos M, Maheshwari MK, Doumouchtsis SK. Impact of COVID-19 in gynaecological oncology care: a systematic rapid review. *Arch Gynecol Obstet* 2022;305(3):555-65. doi: 10.1007/s00404-021-06295-1 [published Online First: 20211103]
6. Zhang L, Liu X, Tong F, et al. The prevalence of psychological disorders among cancer patients during the COVID-19 pandemic: A meta-analysis. *Psychooncology* 2022 doi: 10.1002/pon.6012 [published Online First: 20220811]
7. Kirby A, Drummond FJ, Lawlor A, et al. Counting the social, psychological, and economic costs of COVID-19 for cancer patients. *Support Care Cancer* 2022:1-27. doi: 10.1007/s00520-022-07178-0 [published Online First: 20220611]
8. Donkor A, Atuwu-Ampoh VD, Opie C, et al. Novel coronavirus mitigation measures implemented by radiotherapy centres in low and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Rep Pract Oncol Radiother* 2021;26(2):303-15. doi: 10.5603/RPOR.a2021.0032 [published Online First: 20210414]
9. Gascon L, Fournier I, Chiesa-Estomba C, et al. Systematic review of international guidelines for head and neck oncology management in COVID-19 patients. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol* 2022;279(2):907-43. doi: 10.1007/s00405-021-06823-4 [published Online First: 20210423]
10. Hojaj FC, Chinelatto LA, Boog GHP, et al. Head and Neck Practice in the COVID-19 Pandemics Today: A Rapid Systematic Review. *Int Arch Otorhinolaryngol* 2020;24(4):e518-e26. doi: 10.1055/s-0040-1715506 [published Online First: 20200930]
11. Legge H, Toohey K, Kavanagh PS, et al. The unmet supportive care needs of people affected by cancer during the COVID-19 pandemic: an integrative review. *J Cancer Surviv* 2022:1-21. doi: 10.1007/s11764-022-01275-z [published Online First: 20221029]
12. Murphy A, Kirby A, Lawlor A, et al. Mitigating the Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Adult Cancer Patients through Telehealth Adoption: A Systematic Review. *Sensors (Basel)* 2022;22(9) doi: 10.3390/s22093598 [published Online First: 20220509]
13. Gadsden T, Downey LE, Vilas VDR, et al. The impact of COVID-19 on essential health service provision for noncommunicable diseases in the South-East Asia region: A systematic review. *Lancet Reg Health Southeast Asia* 2022;1:100010. doi: 10.1016/j.lansea.2022.04.006 [published Online First: 20220505]
14. Majeed A, Wright T, Guo B, et al. The Global Impact of COVID-19 on Childhood Cancer Outcomes and Care Delivery - A Systematic Review. *Front Oncol* 2022;12:869752. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2022.869752 [published Online First: 20220407]
15. Belbasis L, Bellou V, Ioannidis JPA. Conducting umbrella reviews. *BMJ Medicine* 2022;1(1):e000071. doi: 10.1136/bmjmed-2021-000071
16. Gates M, Gates A, Pieper D, et al. Reporting guideline for overviews of reviews of healthcare interventions: development of the PRIOR statement. *BMJ* 2022;378:e070849. doi: 10.1136/bmj-2022-070849 [published Online First: 20220809]

17. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. *BMJ* 2017;358:j4008. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j4008 [published Online First: 20170921]
18. Adham M, Anam K, Reksodiputro L. Treatment prioritization and risk stratification of head and neck cancer during COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Med J Malaysia* 2022;77(1):53-59.
19. Alom S, Chiu CM, Jha A, et al. The Effects of COVID-19 on Cancer Care Provision: A Systematic Review. *Cancer Control* 2021;28:1073274821997425. doi: 10.1177/1073274821997425
20. Ayubi E, Bashirian S, Khazaei S. Depression and Anxiety Among Patients with Cancer During COVID-19 Pandemic: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Gastrointest Cancer* 2021;52(2):499-507. doi: 10.1007/s12029-021-00643-9 [published Online First: 20210505]
21. Garg PK, Kaul P, Choudhary D, et al. Discordance of COVID-19 guidelines for patients with cancer: A systematic review. *J Surg Oncol* 2020;122(4):579-93. doi: 10.1002/jso.26110 [published Online First: 20200715]
22. Jammu AS, Chasen MR, Lofters AK, et al. Systematic rapid living review of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer survivors: update to August 27, 2020. *Support Care Cancer* 2021;29(6):2841-50. doi: 10.1007/s00520-020-05908-w [published Online First: 20201126]
23. Lu DJ, Girgis M, David JM, et al. Evaluation of Mobile Health Applications to Track Patient-Reported Outcomes for Oncology Patients: A Systematic Review. *Adv Radiat Oncol* 2021;6(1):100576. doi: 10.1016/j.adro.2020.09.016 [published Online First: 20201010]
24. Momenimovahed Z, Salehiniya H, Hadavandsiri F, et al. Psychological Distress Among Cancer Patients During COVID-19 Pandemic in the World: A Systematic Review. *Front Psychol* 2021;12:682154. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.682154 [published Online First: 20210928]
25. Mostafaei A, Sadeghi-Ghyassi F, Kabiri N, et al. Experiences of patients and providers while using telemedicine in cancer care during COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-synthesis of qualitative literature. *Support Care Cancer* 2022 doi: 10.1007/s00520-022-07415-6 [published Online First: 20221102]
26. Moujaess E, Kourie HR, Ghosn M. Cancer patients and research during COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review of current evidence. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol* 2020;150:102972. doi: 10.1016/j.critrevonc.2020.102972 [published Online First: 20200422]
27. Muls A, Georgopoulou S, Hainsworth E, et al. The psychosocial and emotional experiences of cancer patients during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Semin Oncol* 2022 doi: 10.1053/j.seminoncol.2022.08.001 [published Online First: 20220822]
28. Pacheco RL, Martimbianco ALC, Roitberg F, et al. Impact of Strategies for Mitigating Delays and Disruptions in Cancer Care Due to COVID-19: Systematic Review. *JCO Glob Oncol* 2021;7:342-52. doi: 10.1200/go.20.00632
29. Rohilla KK, Kalyani CV, Gupta S, et al. Quality of Life of People with Cancer in the Era of the COVID-19 Pandemic in India: A Systematic Review. *Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health* 2021;17(1):280-86. doi: 10.2174/1745017902117010280 [published Online First: 20211231]
30. Salehi F, Mashhadi L, Khazeni K, et al. Management of Cancer Patients in the COVID-19 Crisis Using Telemedicine: A Systematic Review. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2022;299:118-25. doi: 10.3233/shti220969
31. Sun P, Luan F, Xu D, et al. Breast reconstruction during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2021;100(33):e26978. doi: 10.1097/md.00000000000026978
32. Zapala J, Matecka M, Zok A, et al. The needs of cancer patients during the COVID-19 pandemic- psychosocial, ethical and spiritual aspects-systematic review. *PeerJ* 2022;10:e13480. doi: 10.7717/peerj.13480 [published Online First: 20220629]
33. Alkatout I, Biebl M, Momenimovahed Z, et al. Has COVID-19 Affected Cancer Screening Programs? A Systematic Review. *Front Oncol* 2021;11:675038. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2021.675038 [published Online First: 20210517]

34. Di Cosimo S, Susca N, Apolone G, et al. The worldwide impact of COVID-19 on cancer care: A meta-analysis of surveys published after the first wave of the pandemic. *Front Oncol* 2022;12:961380. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2022.961380 [published Online First: 20220929]
35. Fancellu A, Veneroni S, Santoru A, et al. How the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the colorectal cancer screening in Italy: A minireview. *World J Gastrointest Oncol* 2022;14(8):1490-98. doi: 10.4251/wjgo.v14.i8.1490
36. Ferrara P, Dallagiacomma G, Alberti F, et al. Prevention, diagnosis and treatment of cervical cancer: A systematic review of the impact of COVID-19 on patient care. *Prev Med* 2022;164:107264. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2022.107264 [published Online First: 20220920]
37. Hesary FB, Salehiniya H. The Impact of the COVID-19 Epidemic on Diagnosis, Treatment, Concerns, Problems, and Mental Health in Patients with Gastric Cancer. *J Gastrointest Cancer* 2022;53(3):797-804. doi: 10.1007/s12029-021-00692-0 [published Online First: 20210914]
38. Lignou S, Greenwood J, Sheehan M, et al. Changes in Healthcare Provision During Covid-19 and Their Impact on Children With Chronic Illness: A Scoping Review. *Inquiry* 2022;59:469580221081445. doi: 10.1177/00469580221081445
39. Mayo M, Potugari B, Bzeih R, et al. Cancer Screening During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Mayo Clin Proc Innov Qual Outcomes* 2021;5(6):1109-17. doi: 10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2021.10.003 [published Online First: 20211018]
40. Mazidimoradi A, Hadavandsiri F, Momenimovahed Z, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Colorectal Cancer Diagnosis and Treatment: a Systematic Review. *J Gastrointest Cancer* 2021;1-17. doi: 10.1007/s12029-021-00752-5 [published Online First: 20211129]
41. Mazidimoradi A, Tiznobaik A, Salehiniya H. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Colorectal Cancer Screening: a Systematic Review. *J Gastrointest Cancer* 2022;53(3):730-44. doi: 10.1007/s12029-021-00679-x [published Online First: 20210818]
42. Ng JS, Hamilton DG. Assessing the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on breast cancer screening and diagnosis rates: A rapid review and meta-analysis. *J Med Screen* 2022;29(4):209-18. doi: 10.1177/09691413221101807 [published Online First: 20220520]
43. Pararas N, Pikouli A, Papaconstantinou D, et al. Colorectal Surgery in the COVID-19 Era: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Cancers (Basel)* 2022;14(5) doi: 10.3390/cancers14051229 [published Online First: 20220227]
44. Riera R, Bagattini Â M, Pacheco RL, et al. Delays and Disruptions in Cancer Health Care Due to COVID-19 Pandemic: Systematic Review. *JCO Glob Oncol* 2021;7:311-23. doi: 10.1200/go.20.00639
45. Sarich P, Cabasag CJ, Liebermann E, et al. Tobacco smoking changes during the first pre-vaccination phases of the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine* 2022;47:101375. doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2022.101375 [published Online First: 20220412]
46. Sasidharanpillai S, Ravishankar N. The Short-Term Impact Of COVID-19 Pandemic on Cervical Cancer Screening: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2022;23(5):1497-504. doi: 10.31557/apjcp.2022.23.5.1497 [published Online First: 20220501]
47. Tang G, Pi F, Tao J, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on surgical outcomes in patients undergoing colorectal cancer surgery: A retrospective study and meta-analysis of data from 11,082 participants. *Front Public Health* 2022;10:907571. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.907571 [published Online First: 20220929]
48. Thomson DJ, Yom SS, Saeed H, et al. Radiation Fractionation Schedules Published During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Systematic Review of the Quality of Evidence and Recommendations for Future Development. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2020;108(2):379-89. doi: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2020.06.054 [published Online First: 20200811]

49. Vigliar E, Cepurnaite R, Alcaraz-Mateos E, et al. Global impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cytopathology practice: Results from an international survey of laboratories in 23 countries. *Cancer Cytopathol* 2020;128(12):885-94. doi: 10.1002/cncy.22373 [published Online First: 20201027]
50. Stang A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2010;25(9):603-5. doi: 10.1007/s10654-010-9491-z [published Online First: 20100722]
51. Bougioukas KI, Liakos A, Tsapas A, et al. Preferred reporting items for overviews of systematic reviews including harms checklist: a pilot tool to be used for balanced reporting of benefits and harms. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2018;93:9-24. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.10.002 [published Online First: 20171014]
52. Williams MC, Shaw L, Hirschfeld CB, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on the imaging diagnosis of cardiac disease in Europe. *Open Heart* 2021;8(2) doi: 10.1136/openhrt-2021-001681
53. Maringe C, Spicer J, Morris M, et al. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer deaths due to delays in diagnosis in England, UK: a national, population-based, modelling study. *Lancet Oncol* 2020;21(8):1023-34. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30388-0 [published Online First: 20200720]
54. Cui J, Li Z, An Q, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Elective Surgery for Colorectal Cancer. *J Gastrointest Cancer* 2022;53(2):403-09. doi: 10.1007/s12029-021-00621-1 [published Online First: 20210317]
55. Smith HG, Jensen KK, Jorgensen LN, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the management of colorectal cancer in Denmark. *BJS Open* 2021;5(6) doi: 10.1093/bjsopen/zrab108
56. Sozutek A, Seker A, Kuvvetli A, et al. Evaluating the feasibility of performing elective gastrointestinal cancer surgery during the COVID-19 pandemic: An observational study with 60 days follow-up results of a tertiary referral pandemic hospital. *J Surg Oncol* 2021;123(4):834-41. doi: 10.1002/jso.26396 [published Online First: 20210209]
57. Whittaker TM, Abdelrazek MEG, Fitzpatrick AJ, et al. Delay to elective colorectal cancer surgery and implications for survival: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Colorectal Dis* 2021;23(7):1699-711. doi: 10.1111/codi.15625 [published Online First: 20210325]