

NUTRITIONAL STATUS AND NUTRITIONAL BEHAVIOUR OF CANCER SURVIVORS

Varalakshmi. K* and Sarada.D**

*Varalakshmi. K, Ph.D scholar, Department of Home Science, Sri Padmavati Mahila Visvavidyalayam, Tirupati (AP) **Sarada.D, Professor, Department of Home Science, Sri Padmavati Mahila Visvavidyalayam, Tirupati (AP)

Abstract

Introduction: Cancer is a leading cause of death worldwide, accounting for nearly 10 million deaths in 2020, or nearly one in six deaths. One defining feature of cancer is the rapid creation of abnormal cells that grow beyond their usual boundaries, and which can then invade adjoining parts of the body and spread to other organs; the latter process is referred to as metastasis. Widespread metastases are the primary cause of death from cancer (WHO, 2022). The aim of the study is to assess the nutritional status and nutritional behaviour of cancer survivors attending medical, surgical and radiation oncology OPD's of a cancer hospital.

Materials and Methods: This is a cross sectional hospital based study carried out on 290 cancer survivors among which 118 men and 172 women suffering with various cancer diseases and attending medical, surgical and radiation oncology OPD's of a cancer hospital, after obtaining institutional ethical clearance from SPMVV, Tirupati (AP).Nutritional status was assessed using anthropometric, dietary assessment methods and nutritional behaviour was assessed by food habits, frequency of food intake, dietary diversity score (DDS), food likes and dislikes.

Results: Among 290 cancer survivors, majority (45.9%) were above 51 years of age, the mean dietary nutrient intake of the men (n=118) and women (n=172) were below normal when compared to their Recommended Dietary Allowance (RDA) for their age (ICMR, 2021). There was no significant association found between independent variables and DDS (Dietary Diversity scores) of cancer survivors.

Conclusion: The Cancer survivors need nutrition educational intervention to improve their nutritional behaviour and nutritional status.

Introduction:

The concept of survivorship related to cancer patients was introduced into the Western world, early on, between the sixth and seventh decades of the 20th century, when the development of effective treatments led to improved survival from a hitherto deadly disease (NCI, 2021). A cancer patient is a survivor, from the day of diagnosis of a potentially fatal illness, through the myriad of treatments, many of which are as toxic as the disease itself; and after treatment is complete, going on to live as normal life as possible. Nourishment is an imperative perspective of care within the administration of cancer at all stages, from determination to survivorship [Ravasco, 2019; Barrera and Wahnefried, 2009). An individual's move from a cancer understanding to a cancer survivor is challenging and frequently related with way of life and behavioral changes, counting those of a wholesome nature. Regularly side impacts of treatment can continue, such as weariness, taste, and scent changes. This may adversely affect the capacity or want to devour nourishment and share in physical action [Gegechkori etal., 2017). The part of sustenance as a basic portion of a solid way of life for cancer survivors is well acknowledged (Chapman et al., 2011). Cancer modifies metabolic and physiological perspectives of patients' dietary needs for carbohydrate, protein, fat, vitamins and minerals (Vanderbroek and Schrijvers, 2008). There is an increasing body of evidence that lifestyle interventions including a healthy diet, weight management and increased physical activity can influence the rate of cancer progression and improve overall survival (Davies et al. 2011, Pekmezi & Demark-Wahnefried 2011). The aim of the study is to assess the nutritional status and nutritional behaviour of cancer survivors attending medical, surgical and radiation oncology OPD's of a cancer hospital.

Materials and methods:

This is a cross sectional hospital based study carried out on 290 cancer survivors among which 118 men and 172 women suffering with various cancer diseases and attending medical, surgical and radiation oncology OPD's of a cancer hospital, after obtaining institutional ethical clearance from SPMVV, Tirupati (AP). The male and female cancer survivors aged between 25 to 65 years with any of the organ cancer were considered for inclusion in the study. The patients with third and fourth stage of cancer and those with comorbid complications were excluded from the study. A structured questionnaire developed for the purpose was used to collect demographic information, nutritional status was assessed using anthropometric, dietary assessment methods and nutritional behaviour was assessed by food habits, frequency of food intake, dietary diversity score (DDS), food likes and dislikes.

Results and discussion: The data collected from 290 cancer survivors were tabulated and analyzed and presented as follows;

Body Mass Index (BMI): The data collected on height (cm)and weight (kg)of each respondent was used to calculate the Body Mass Index and the sample were categorized based on their BMI as shown table 1

BMI of the Respondents	Per cent	Frequency
BMI (3 Categories)		
Underweight (≤ 18.5)	14.8	43
Normal (18.5 – 24.9)	52.1	151
Obese (>25)	33.1	96
Total	100.0	290

The BMI of the sample reflects that a 14.8 percent were under weight, a 52.1 percent were normal and 33.1 percent were obese. Which indicates that majority of the sample had normal BMI, a notable percent were obese and a considerable percent were underweight. The BMI of cancer also depends on the diet, medication and other health issues. The impact of body composition on breast cancer chance and results for breast cancer survivors is well recorded (McDonald et al., 2011).

Dietary Nutrient Intake:

The researcher made an effort to assess the dietary intake of the respondents by collecting their previous day's menu and intake of all the food items using 24 hour recall method and set of standardized vessels (for volume) and translated into their raw equivalents and calculated the nutritive values of each respondent's diet for selected nutrients; Energy, Protein, Vitamin A, Vitamin C, Iron and Folic Acid using Nutritive Value of Indian Foods (ICMR,2021).The mean dietary nutrient intake of men and women were presented in Table 2

Selected Dietary Nutrient Intake Indicators	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Men (n = 118)				
Energ <mark>y (k</mark> cals)	1168	1927	1559	139.1
Protein (g)	15	65.5	52	6.4
Vitamin A(µg)	153	826	564.7	173.3
Vitamin C (mg)	3.7	27	18.3	4.1
Iron (mg)	11	20.5	15.7	1.8
Folic Acid ((µg))	36.8	178	132.5	29.3
Women (n = 172)				
Energy (kcals)	1011	1846	1402	165.9
Protein (g)	30.4	94	47.9	7.9
Vitamin A(µg)	59	1158	467.8	184.1
Vitamin C (mg)	5	31	17.7	4.6
Iron (mg)	7.3	22	15.1	2.4
Folic Acid ((µg))	13.8	197	120	33.3

T-LL 7.	D'-4		l l	- C-14- J D'-4	NT 4 4 T 4 - 1	T., .]! 4
Table 2:	DISTRIBUTION	of cancer	survivors ny	/ Selected Dietary	Nutrient Intak	e indicators
I UNIC 2.	Distribution	of cullect	bui troib by	Delected Dictuly	I there is a second second	te indicators

The mean dietary nutrient intakes of the men (n=118) and women (n=172) presented in table 2, indicates that they were below normal when compared to their recommended dietary Allowance (RDA) for their age (ICMR, 2021).

Nutritional behaviour:

The cancer survivors nutritional behaviour, food habits, frequency of meals consumed and water consumption per day in litres was recorded and presented in Table 3, which reflects that majority (62.1%) took more than two litres of water per day, around 55.5% were non vegetarians and 70% had meals less than or equal to three times a day.

Table 3: Distribution of the Respondents by Selected Indicators of

Nutritional Behaviour

Selected Indicators of Nutritional behaviour	Per cent	Frequency
1. Intake of Water (in Litres)		
≤ 1-2	37 <mark>.</mark> 9	110
>2	62.1	180
2. Food Habits		
Vegetarian / Ovo-Vegetarian	44.5	129
Non-Vegetarian	55.5	161
No. of Meals (Per Day)		
<u>≤3</u>	70.0	203
>4	30.0	87
Total	100.0	290

Likes and dislikes towards certain foods are frequently thought to play a colossal part in eating behaviors. The joy we infer from nourishment may be one of the foremost in the event that not the foremost critical variables contributing to nourishment admissions (Eertmans, et al., 2001; Rozin & Zellner, 1985; Rozin, 1990). It was found that among the men and women majority have expressed liking for cereals (men=99.2% and women =100%), pulses (men=78% and women =83.1%), vegetables (men=81.4% and =81.4% and =81women =80.2%), fruits (men=66.9% and women =75%), milk and milk products (men=73.7% and women =83.7%), eggs (men=88.1% and women =76.7%) and beverages (men=77.1% and women =75%). In contrast to these preferences less than 20 percent of sample liked millets, nuts and oil seeds. Moreover around 45 to 55 percent of men and women liked poultry, meat and sea foods, the women (72.7%) preferred junk foods than their male (54.2%) counter parts.

Table 4: Distribution of the respondents by selected foods likes and dislikes across Gender

Selected Oral Supplements Intake	Men	Women	Total	χ2	df	p- value	χ2	df	p- value
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.			
1. Cereals									
Dislike	0.8	1	0.0	0	0.3	1			

© 2023 IJNRD | Volume 8, Issue 10 October 2023 | ISSN: 2456-4184 | IJNRD.ORG

<table-container>2. Pulsesjeak<thjeak< th="">jeakjeakjeak<</thjeak<></table-container>	Like	99.2	117	100.0	172	99.7	289	1.463	1	0.407
Dislike22.02616.92919.0551.21910.288Like78.09283.114381.02351.21910.2883. MillesDislike85.610186.614986.22500.06310.863Like14.41713.42313.8400.06310.863Like14.41713.42313.84040.0570.06310.863Jislike87.310380.213883.1241 <t< td=""><td>2. Pulses</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	2. Pulses									
Like78.09283.114381.02353. Millets86.614986.22500.06310.863Like14.41713.42313.880400.06310.8634. Nuts & Oil Seeds1519.82416.9490.0770.077Dislike87.310380.213883.1241240.0770.880Like12.71519.83419.3560.0570.880Like81.49680.213880.82340.867Like81.49680.213880.82340.880Like6.67975.012971.72080.887Selected72.041.72080.880Supplements75.012971.7208Supplements74.479.72310.05*Dislike26.33116.328.3594.31210.05*Supplements81.479.723110.05*Supplements81.479.723110.05*Supplements59.931.131<	Dislike	22.0	26	16.9	29	19.0	55	1.219	1	0.288
3. Millets5. Second9.6614986.22509.66319.663Like14.41713.42313.8400.66310.863Like13.710380.213883.124124<	Like	78.0	92	83.1	143	81.0	235			
Disilike85.610186.614986.22500.06310.863Like14.41713.42313.840010.8634. Nuts & OII seeds13.813.82313.8400000Jislike87.310380.213883.12412416.9490005.Vegetables519.82416.94900.05710.8800.800Like81.49680.213883.823400.05710.880Cike81.49680.213882323400.05710.880Dislike33.13925.04328.3822.23710.087Like66.97975.012971.72082.23710.087SelectedMenNomenTotal2217.72082.23710.057SupplementsMenNomenTotal22341<.1	3. Millets									
Like 14.4 17 13.4 23 13.8 40 () () 4. Nuts & Oil Seeds	Dislike	85.6	101	86.6	149	86.2	250	0.063	1	0.863
4. Nuts & Oil Seeds	Like	14.4	17	13.4	23	13.8	40			
Image: constraint of the sector of the sec	4. Nuts & Oil	Seeds								
Dislike 87.3 103 80.2 138 83.1 241 Like 12.7 15 19.8 24 16.9 49 5.Vegetables								2.487	1	0.077
Like12.71519.82416.9496.5.Vegetables18.62219.83419.3560.05710.880Like81.49680.213880.82342.23710.8806. Fruits33.13925.04328.3822.23710.087Like66.97975.012971.72082.23710.087SelectedNemNemNemTotal11	Dislike	87.3	103	80.2	138	83.1	241			
5.Vegetables5.Vegetables5.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables6.Vegetables7.Vegetables<	Like	12.7	15	19.8	24	16.9	49			
Dislike18.62219.83419.3560.05710.880Like81.49680.213880.823424.380.82346. Fruits33.13925.04328.3822.23710.087Like66.97975.012971.72082.23710.087Selected7975.012971.72082.237dfp-valueSupplementsMenMenRate74.120874.196.1	5.Vegetables									
Like81.49680.213880.82346. Fruits33.13925.04328.3822.3710.087Like66.97975.012971.720877710.087SelectedMen <t< td=""><td>Dislike</td><td>18.6</td><td>22</td><td>19.8</td><td>34</td><td>19.3</td><td>56</td><td>0.057</td><td>7 1</td><td>0.880</td></t<>	Dislike	18.6	22	19.8	34	19.3	56	0.057	7 1	0.880
6. Fruits	Like	81.4	96	80.2	138	80.8	234			
Dislike 33.1 39 25.0 43 28.3 82 2.237 1 0.087 Like 66.9 79 75.0 129 71.7 208 20.37 1 0.087 Selected Men Men Men Total χ df p- χ df p- value χ df p- value χ df p- χ χ df p- χ <t< td=""><td>6. Fruits</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	6. Fruits									
Like 66.9 79 75.0 129 71.7 208 Selected Oral supplements Intake Men Women X^2 df p- value 500 26.3 31 16.3 28 20.3 59 4.312 1 0.05^* Like 73.7 87 83.7 144 79.7 231 4.312 1.00^* Bislike 11.9 14 23.3 40 18.6 54 5.993 1.00^* 0.01^{**} Dislike 88.1 104 76.7 132 81.4 236 0.769 1.0^* 0.403 Like 50.0 59 52.9 91 49.3 143 2.188	Dislike	33.1	39	25.0	<mark>4</mark> 3	28.3	82	2.237	1	0.087
Selected Oral Supplements IntakeMenWomenTotalχ2dfp- valueχ2dfp- χ2dfp- χ2dfp- value7.Milk Products5.033116.32820.3594.31210.05*Like73.78783.714479.723110.05*S. Eggs5.931423.34018.6545.99310.01**Dislike11.91423.34018.6545.99310.01**Like88.110476.713281.42360.76910.403Dislike50.05955.29553.11540.76910.403Like50.05944.89746.91360.4030.403Dislike55.96647.18150.714710.087Like51.76155.89654.11570.47810.549Dislike51.76155.89654.11570.47810.549Like51.79175.012975.92200.7210.780Dislike45.85427.34734.81010.48110.001Like54.26472.712565.2189114.81100Dislike <t< td=""><td>Like</td><td>66.9</td><td>79</td><td>75.0</td><td>129</td><td>71.7</td><td>208</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Like	66.9	79	75.0	129	71.7	208			
Oral Supplements IntakeMenWomenTotalNoValuevaluevaluevalue7.Milk Products50.0050.331.016.328.059.04.31211Dislike26.331.016.328.020.359.04.31210.05*Like73.787.083.714479.723110.05*S. Fegs50.059.0132.081.423.340.018.654.05.9931Dislike11.914.076.7132.081.423.60.01**0.01**Dislike50.059.055.295.053.1154.00.691Dislike50.059.052.295.053.1154.00.691Dislike50.059.052.295.053.1154.00.691Dislike50.059.052.295.053.1154.00.691Dislike50.059.066.047.181.050.7147.00.08Dislike51.761.055.896.054.1157.00.47811Dislike51.761.055.896.054.1157.00.47811Dislike51.761.055.896.054.1157.00.47810.59Dislike51.761.055.896.054.1157.00.47810.6	Selected				χ2	df	p-	χ2	df	p-
Supplements Men Women Iotal Iotal <thiotal< th=""> Iotal Iotal</thiotal<>	Oral	Mon	Waman	Total			value			value
IntakeImageImageImageImageImageImageImage7.Milk Products26.33116.32820.3594.31210.05*Dislike73.78783.714479.723110.05*8. Eggs10476.713281.42365.99310.01**Dislike11.91423.340018.6545.99310.01**Dislike11.91423.340018.6545.99310.01**Dislike10.91423.340018.6545.99310.01**Dislike50.05955.29553.11545.99310.403Like50.05944.89746.91360.76910.403Dislike44.15252.99149.31432.18810.087Like55.96647.18150.71470.47810.678Dislike51.76155.89654.11570.47810.549Like51.76155.89654.11570.47810.678Dislike51.76155.89654.11570.47810.780Like51.76155.89654.11570.4780.78010.678Like70	Supplements	Men	women	Iotai					-	
7.Milk ProductsVVVA.3121MM	Intake 💦									
Dislike26.33116.32820.3594.31210.05*Like73.78783.714479.723177777B. EggsJislike11.91423.34018.6545.99310.01**Dislike11.91423.34018.6545.99310.01**Jislike88.110476.713281.42367910.01**Outree50.05955.29553.11540.76910.403Like50.05944.89746.91360.76910.403Dislike44.15252.99149.31432.18810.087Dislike44.15252.99149.31432.18810.87Dislike51.76155.89654.11570.47810.87Dislike51.76155.89654.11570.47810.549Like52.92725.04324.1700.17210.549Dislike51.76155.89654.11570.47810.549Like51.76155.89654.11570.478110.549Dislike51.76155.89654.1157 </td <td>7.Milk Produ</td> <td>cts</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	7.Milk Produ	cts								
Like73.78783.714479.7231 \cdot \cdot 8. Eggs \cdot Dislike11.91423.34018.654 \cdot	Dislike	26.3	31	16.3	28	20.3	59	4.312	1 0.0	0.05*
8. EggsImage: segme seg	Like	73.7	87	83.7	144	79.7	231			
Dislike11.91423.34018.6545.99310.01**Like88.110476.713281.4236111 <td>8. Eggs</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	8. Eggs	-								
Like88.110476.713281.42369. Poultry </td <td>Dislike</td> <td>11.9</td> <td>14</td> <td>23.3</td> <td>40</td> <td>18.6</td> <td>54</td> <td>5.993</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.01**</td>	Dislike	11.9	14	23.3	40	18.6	54	5.993	1	0.01**
9. Poultry 50.0 59.0 55.2 95.0 53.1 154.0 0.769 1.100 0.403 Like 50.0 59.0 44.8 97.0 46.9 136.0 0.769 1.1000 0.403 10. Meat $1.000000000000000000000000000000000000$	Like	88.1	104	76.7	132	81.4	236			
Dislike 50.0 59 55.2 95 53.1 154 0.769 1 0.403 Like 50.0 59 44.8 97 46.9 136 166 1 0.403 10. Meat 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0.403 Dislike 44.1 52 52.9 91 49.3 143 2.188 1 0.087 Dislike 44.1 52 52.9 91 49.3 143 2.188 1 0.087 Dislike 55.9 66 47.1 81 50.7 147 2.188 1 0.087 Dislike 51.7 61 55.8 96 54.1 157 0.478 1 1 0.549 Like 48.3 57 44.2 78 45.9 133 0.478 1 0.549 Dislike 22.9 27.7 25.0 43.2 24.1 70 0.172 1 0.780 Dislike 22.9 27.7 25.0 43.2 24.1 70 0.172 1 0.780 I.ike 77.1 91 75.0 129 75.9 220 10.481 1 1 0.001 Dislike 45.8 54 27.3 47 34.8 101 10.481 1 1 1.43 Dislike 45.8 54 27.3 47 54.2 180 100 290	9. Poultry									
Like 50.0 59 44.8 97 46.9 136 166 166 166 $10. Meat$ 166 <th< td=""><td>Dislike</td><td>50.0</td><td>59</td><td><u>55.2</u></td><td>95</td><td>53.1</td><td>154</td><td>0.769</td><td>1</td><td>0.403</td></th<>	Dislike	50.0	59	<u>55.2</u>	95	53.1	154	0.769	1	0.403
10. MeatImage: space of the system of the syst	Like	50.0	59	44.8	97	46.9	136		911	
Dislike44.15252.99149.31432.18810.087Like55.96647.18150.7147111<	10. Mea <mark>t</mark>									
Like55.96647.18150.7147147 11.Sea FoodsVVVVVVVV Dislike51.76155.89654.11570.478110.549Like48.35744.27845.91330.47810.549 12. BeveragesVV 44.27845.91330.47810.549Dislike22.92725.04324.1700.17210.780Like77.19175.012975.922010.48110.001Dislike45.85427.34734.810110.48110.001Like54.26472.712565.218910.48114Total100118100172100290111	Dislike	44.1	52	52.9	91	49.3	143	2 .188	1	0.087
11.Sea Foods Dislike 51.7 61 55.8 96 54.1 157 0.478 1 0.549 Like 48.3 57 44.2 78 45.9 133 0.478 1 0.549 Like 48.3 57 44.2 78 45.9 133 0.478 1 0.549 Dislike 22.9 27 25.0 43 24.1 70 0.172 1 0.780 Like 77.1 91 75.0 129 75.9 220 10.481 1 0.01 Dislike 45.8 54 27.3 47 34.8 101 10.481 1 0.001 Like 54.2 64 72.7 125 65.2 189 101 *** Total 100 118 100 172 100 290 290 50 50 50	Like	55.9	<mark>66</mark>	47.1	81	50.7	147			
Dislike 51.7 61 55.8 96 54.1 157 0.478 1 0.549 Like 48.3 57 44.2 78 45.9 133 0.478 1 0.549 12. Beverages 22.9 27 25.0 43 24.1 70 0.172 1 0.780 Dislike 22.9 27 25.0 43 24.1 70 0.172 1 0.780 Like 77.1 91 75.0 129 75.9 220 10.481 1 0.001 Jislike 45.8 54 27.3 47 34.8 101 10.481 1 0.001 Like 54.2 64 72.7 125 65.2 189 1 0.001 Total 100 118 100 172 100 290 290 1 1 0.549	11.Sea F <mark>ood</mark> s									
Like48.35744.27845.9133Image: constraint of the state of	Dislike	<mark>51.</mark> 7	61	55.8	96	54.1	157	0.478	1	0.549
12. Beverages Dislike 22.9 27 25.0 43 24.1 70 0.172 1 0.780 Like 77.1 91 75.0 129 75.9 220 10.481 1 0.001 Junk Foods 0.172 1 0.780 Dislike 45.8 54 27.3 47 34.8 101 10.481 1 0.001 *** Like 54.2 64 72.7 125 65.2 189 290 1 4 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1 <th1< th=""></th1<></th1<>	Like	48.3	57	44.2	78	45.9	133			
Dislike 22.9 27 25.0 43 24.1 70 0.172 1 0.780 Like 77.1 91 75.0 129 75.9 220 10.481 1 0.001 Jank Foods 27.3 47 34.8 101 *** Dislike 45.8 54 27.7 125 65.2 189 -	12. Beverages	2000	-			a h	lee	awa I	in	
Like 77.1 91 75.0 129 75.9 220 Image: Constraint of the state of	Dislike	22.9	27	25.0	43	24.1	70	0.172	1	0.780
13. Junk Foods Dislike 45.8 54 27.3 47 34.8 101 1 0.001 Like 54.2 64 72.7 125 65.2 189 1 0.001 Total 100 118 100 172 100 290	Like	77.1	91	75.0	129	75.9	220			
Dislike 45.8 54 27.3 47 34.8 101 *** Like 54.2 64 72.7 125 65.2 189 *** Total 100 118 100 172 100 290	13. Junk Food	ls						10.481	1	0.001
Like 54.2 64 72.7 125 65.2 189 Total 100 118 100 172 100 290	Dislike	45.8	54	27.3	47	34.8	101	1		***
Total 100 118 100 172 100 290	Like	54.2	64	72.7	125	65.2	189	1		
	Total	100	118	100	172	100	290			

The results of chi square test reveals that there was no significant association found between the food likes and dislikes of men and women for; cereals, pulses, millets, nuts and oil seeds, vegetables, fruits, poultry, meat, sea foods and beverages as p value is greater than 0.05. In contrast, there was significant association

IJNRD2310310	International Journal of Novel Research and Development (<u>www.ijnrd.org</u>)	d78

found between gender and food likes and dislikes for milk and milk products ($p=0.05^*$), eggs ($p=0.01^{**}$) and junk foods ($p=0.001^{***}$). In the event that eating behaviour isn't seen as engaging in terms of appearance, scent, taste, and surface it likely will not be eaten (Hetherington & Rolls, 1996). Although interest in eating inclinations do not imply that it has impact on eating behaviour, likes and dislikes, provided they have a knowledge on healthy food choices.

Dietary Diversity Score (DDS):

DDS provides a simple score which reflects a number of different food groups consumed over a given period (Hoddinott et al., 2002). There are various DDSs developed and used for different purposes. In the present study the Dietary Diversity Score card was prepared by Sarada (2014) as part of UGC funded major research project on Family nutritional behavioural risk factors surveillance was used to examine the frequency of food intake of cancer survivors and to identify the quality of food consumed. The DDS card consisted of 21 food items with their quantity of consumption per day and score assigned to per portion, the total positive score was 28 and negative score was -4 per day. Thus, the total score for each respondent per week was calculated and the negative score was deducted (196-28=168), thus the ideal score was 168 for a person consuming a diet drawn from all the 17 groups and excluding foods from four groups. The maximum score as 168 per week, 28 per day and the minimum score as 104 per week and 16 per day. The mean DDS per week was 113.5 and per day was 16.5. The standard deviation was larger indicating that the sample were varied in their DDS

Total DDS	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Total DDS/ Week	104	168	113.5	5 <mark>2.24</mark>	nc
Total DDS/ Day	16	28	16.5	7.46	

 Table 5: Distribution of the Respondents by their DDS per Week and Per Day (N=290)

It was found that there was no significant association between seven independent variables and cancer survivors' DDS per week and per day. There was significant association found between the predictor variables namely: education ($p=0.05^*$), marital Status ($p=0.01^{**}$), monthly income (0.01^{**}) and relationship of caretaker ($p=0.01^{**}$) at 0.05 and 0.01 level respectively.

S.No	Independent	DDS per We	ek	DDS per Day		
	variables	χ2 -Value	p-value	χ2 -Value	p-value	
1	Age	1.817	0.164	1.775	0.171	
2	Gender	16.803	0.001	18.913	0.001	
3	Domicile	1.719	0.087	1.740	0.083	
4	Religion	0.199	0.820	0.176	0.839	
5	Marital Status	5.008	0.01**	5.041	0.01**	

6	Education	2.937	0.05*	2.971	0.05*
7	Occupation	1.824	0.163	1.762	0.176
8	Monthly Income	4.582	0.01**	4.695	0.01**
9	Type of Family	0.387	0.699	0.401	0.689
10	Family Size	0.046	0.955	0.050	0.095
11	Relationship of Caretaker	5.216	0.01**	5.003	0.01**

*Significant @ 0.05 level and ** very significant @0.01 level

Conclusion:

From this study we have drawn the conclusion that among the sample majority were under the age of ≥ 50 years, The mean dietary nutrient intakes of the men (n=118) and women (n=172) were below normal. There was no significant association found between seven independent variables and cancer survivors' DDS per week and per day, there was significant association found between the four predictor variables; marital status, monthly income, relationship of care taker and education at 0.001 and 0.05 level of significance. These findings indicate that these four variables may influence the nutritional status and nutritional behaviour of the cancer survivors to improve their nutritional status and nutritional behaviour

References:

- Barrera, S.; Demark-Wahnefried, W. Nutrition during and after cancer therapy. Oncology 2009, 23 (Suppl. S2), 15–21.
- 2. Chapman K, Stacey F, Groves E, et al (2011). After the storm: nutrition after cancer treatment. Cancer Forum, 35, 97-101.
- Davies.N.J., Batehup.L., and Thomas.R. (2011). The role of diet and physical activity in breast, colorectal, and prostate cancer survivorship: a review of the literature. Briti Pekmezi DW & Demark-Wahnefried W (2011) Updated evidence in support of diet and exercise interventions in cancer survivors. Acta Oncologica 50,167–178.
- D'Souza, Rebecca Brian; Ghose, Joy Debasis; Nag, Shona Milon*, Breast cancer survivorship in India. Indian Journal of Medical Research: August 2021 - Volume 154 - Issue 2 - p 177-179 doi: 10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_2679_20
- 5. Eertmans etal (2001). Study on food likes and their relative importance in human eating behaviour; review and preliminary suggestions for health promotion. Health education Research 16(4):443-56
- Gegechkori, N.; Haines, L.; Lin, J.J. Long-Term and Latent Side Effects of Specific Cancer Types. Med. Clin. 2017, 101, 1053–1073. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 7. Hetherington, M.M and Rolls, B.J (1996). Sensory Specific Satiety. Theoritical frameworks and central characteristics. Why we eat what we eat: American Psychology Association, 267-290

- Hoddinott etal (2002). Dietary Diversity as a food Security Indicator FCND discussion papers 136, International Food Policy Research Institute,
- 9. ICMR(2021). Burden of Cancer in India. <u>https://www.livemint.com/science/health/indias-cancer-burden-to-rise-to-29-8-million-in-2025-icmr-report-11652382169284.html</u>
- National Cancer Institute The NCI Dictionary of Cancer Terms: Survivorship Available from:<u>https://www.cancer.gov/publications/dictionaries/cancer-terms/def/survivor</u> accessed on June 4, 2021
- 11. Ravasco, P. Nutrition in Cancer Patients. J. Clin. Med. 2019, 8, 1211. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 12. WHO (2022). https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cancer
- 13. Vandebroek A, Schrijvers D (2008). Nutritional status in anticancer treatment. Ann Oncol, 19,

