## Review Article Effects of operating room detail nursing on postoperative infections and nursing satisfaction in patients undergoing radical hysterectomies

Juan Teng<sup>1</sup>, Yehua Zhang<sup>2</sup>, Cuiling Yu<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Operating Room, Departments of <sup>2</sup>Nursing, <sup>3</sup>Anesthesiology, Jiaozhou People's Hospital, Jiaozhou, Shandong Province, China

Received February 6, 2020; Accepted March 18, 2020; Epub May 15, 2020; Published May 30, 2020

**Abstract:** The present study aimed to explore the effects of operating room detail nursing (ORDN) on postoperative infections and nursing satisfaction in patients undergoing radical hysterectomies. Eighty-eight patients with cervical cancer were enrolled and divided into Groups A and B. Forty-eight cases in Group B were treated with conventional operating room nursing (ORN). The other 40 cases in Group A were treated with ORDN based on Group B. They were observed with respect to emotional changes, before and after nursing, as well as inflammatory cytokines, infection rates, satisfaction after nursing, postoperative clinical indices, and quality of life (QOL). Inflammatory cytokine levels and infection rates in Group A were lower than those in Group B (P<0.05). Emotions in Group A were better than those in Group B after nursing (P<0.05). Total satisfaction and QOL in Group A were higher than those in Group B (P<0.05). In conclusion, ORDN can reduce postoperative infections and improve nursing satisfaction in patients undergoing radical hysterectomies.

Keywords: ORDN, radical hysterectomy, postoperative infection, nursing satisfaction, individual nursing

#### Introduction

Cervical cancer is the fourth most common malignant epithelial tumor formed in the cervix, worldwide [1-3], with 52,000 new cases and 26,000 deaths reported every year [4]. A major cause of the disease is human papillomavirus (HPV) infection [5], which is related to almost all cervical cancers, including cervical squamous cell carcinoma (70%), cervical adenocarcinoma (25%), or mixed tumors, based on histology [6]. Although current nursing standards for cervical cancer include surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy, conventional chemotherapy not only cannot cause a therapeutic response but also may lead to serious systemic toxicity [7]. Thus, surgical treatment has been accepted by most patients [8]. Radical hysterectomy procedures are the standard recommendation for patients with early cervical cancer [9]. These procedures are helpful for patient survival, according to recent analysis [10]. This major operation causes serious pain. Inadequate treatment of moderateto-severe pain after surgery has been associated with the increased risk of progression to chronic pain [11]. Therefore, surgical management is essential. A patient-centered individual nursing plan, a frequently mentioned tool and a formal process in which clinicians and patients collaborate to formulate longitudinal therapeutic plans, can improve nursing quality with complex medical and high individual needs. According to a related report, patientcentered nursing is crucial for the management of chronic and multiple diseases [13]. In the present study, the effects of operating room detail nursing (ORDN), a component of individual nursing, on postoperative infections and nursing satisfaction in patients undergoing radical hysterectomies were explored.

#### Materials and methods

#### General information

Eighty-eight patients with cervical cancer were enrolled and divided into Groups A and B. A

Categories	Group A (n=40)	Group B (n=48)	t/χ² value	P value
Age (Years)	42.58±4.29	43.23±4.26	0.710	0.479
Height (cm)	166.38±2.48	167.38±2.44	1.900	0.060
Body weight (kg)	55.27±4.24	56.41±4.13	1.274	0.206
Place of residence			0.058	0.808
Countryside	14 (36.00)	18 (37.50)		
City	26 (65.00)	30 (62.50)		
Educational history			0.349	0.554
Below senior high school	11 (27.50)	16 (33.33)		
Above senior high school	29 (72.50)	32 (66.67)		
Nationality			0.724	0.394
Han	33 (82.50)	36 (75.00)		
Ethnic minorities	7 (17.50)	12 (25.00)		
Economic level		,	0.313	0.855
Poor	7 (17.50)	10 (20.83)		
Well-off	24 (60.00)	26 (54.17)		
Rich	9 (22.50)	12 (25.00)		
Staying up	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,	0.258	0.611
Yes	23 (57.50)	25 (52.08)		
No	17 (42.50)	23 (47.92)		
Doing exercises			0.000	>0.999
Yes	25 (62.50)	30 (62.50)	0.000	0.000
No	15 (37.50)	18 (37.50)		
Obesity		(	0.125	0.722
Yes	16 (40.00)	21 (43.75)	0.220	0==
No	24 (60.00)	27 (56.25)		
Diabetes	21 (00.00)	21 (00120)	0.082	0.773
Yes	13 (32.50)	17 (35.42)	0.002	0.110
No	27 (67.50)	31 (64.58)		
Hypertension	21 (01.00)	01(04.00)	0.098	0.754
Yes	17 (42.50)	22 (45.83)	0.000	01101
No	23 (57.50)	26 (54.17)		
Smoking	20 (01.00)		0.195	0.658
Yes	14 (35.00)	19 (39.58)	0.100	0.000
No	26 (65.00)	29 (60.42)		
Drinking	20 (00.00)	20 (00.72)	0.074	0.784
Yes	18 (45.00)	23 (47.92)	0.014	0.704
No	18 (45.00) 22 (55.00)	25 (47.92) 25 (52.08)		
Disease types	22 (00.00)	20 (02.00)	0.286	0.592
Squamous carcinoma	19 (47.50)	24 (50.00)	0.200	0.002
Adenocarcinoma	9 (22.50)	13 (27.08)		
Adenosquamous carcinoma	9 (22.50) 12 (30.00)	13 (27.08) 11 (22.92)		
Tumor size (cm)	IZ (30.00)	11 (22.JZ)	0.163	0.686
<1	9 (22.50)	13 (27.08)	0.103	0.000
	9 (22.50) 11 (27.50)	15 (27.08) 15 (31.25)		
1~2		1.1.1.1.7.01		
1~2 2~3	15 (37.50)	12 (25.00)		

 Table 1. General information table [n (%)]

total of 48 cases in Group B were treated with conventional operating room nursing (ORN). The other 40 cases in Group A were treated with ORDN based on Group B.

# Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria: Patients with cervical cancer with tumor size <4 cm, internal OS integrity, and no extrauterine spread were included through CT imaging [14]. All patients and family members were informed of this study and provided informed consent. The present study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Jiaozhou People's Hospital.

Exclusion criteria: Patients with hepatic, renal, and cardiac insufficiencies; Patients with major hematological diseases; Patients with communication disorders, as well as those hiding something from medical personnel; Patients complicated with tumors.

### Nursing methods

ORDN for patients in Group A: Preoperative nursing: the nursing staff relieved patient stress and anxiety levels produced before and after the operation through attention diversion. The aim was to keep them happy physically and mentally, reducing their tightness. The staff adopted their opinions, understood nursing deficiencies, and rectified and supplemented



**Figure 1.** Comparison of inflammatory cytokines after nursing. IL-6 and TNF- $\alpha$  levels in Group A were lower than those in Group B after nursing (P<0.05). Note: \* indicates P<0.05 compared with that in Group B.

the deficiencies. Thus, preoperative high-quality and high-service nursing could be continuously provided for them. Health education was carried out. Patient demands were understood and their questions were answered. Health popularization was also carried out, ensuring the patients understood all relevant medical knowledge and first aid measures.

Intraoperative nursing: the nursing staff paid close attention, memorized every step of the operation by heart, and cooperated with the surgeons carefully. They further disinfected the operating room and surgical instruments carefully, aiming to maintain sterility and tidiness. In addition, the staff paid close attention to patient vital signs during the operation, immediately reporting any abnormalities to the doctor.

Postoperative nursing: the nursing staff formulated different eating plans based on the different stages of patient postoperative recoveries. They informed patients about diet taboos, avoiding stimulation of wound recurrence and infections by spicy food. The patients supplemented corresponding nutrition based on their own recovery over time to avoid physical weakness due to lack of nutrition. The nursing staff took the patients out for relaxation every day. This helps to avoid emotional depression. Moreover, they disinfected the wards frequently. The staff reasonably adjusted the temperature and humidity of the wards, observing the patients' various physical indicators every day. They asked whether they have discomfort. If there was any discomfort, they contacted the doctor as soon as possible to avoid delaying treatment. The staff guided the patients in maintaining health and paying attention to their own surgical wounds in time, to prevent bleeding or inflammation. The staff helped to relieve minor pain levels for the patients. However, they contacted and informed the doctor of all details in time if they had severe pain, providing appropriate treatment.

Patients in Group B were treated with conventional ORN. Before the operation, the nursing staff routinely prepared for the operation, including routinely disinfecting surgical instruments, preparing surgical items, and assisting the patients in positioning. During the operation, they assisted the physicians. After the operation, they provided patients with appropriate assistance and nursed their surgical sites.

#### Outcome measures

1) Self-Rating Anxiety Scale (SAS) [15] and Self-Rating Depression Scale (SDS) [16] scores were used to observe patient anxiety and depression levels. Scores were positively correlated with patient anxiety and depression. 2) Postoperative venous blood (5 mL) was collected from patients in the two groups. It was allowed to stand for 20 minutes, then centrifuged in a centrifuge (10× g at 4°C for 15 minutes, Beijing BMH Instruments Co., Ltd.) to separate the serum. The serum was quickly frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C for later use. Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) was used to detect interleukin-6 (IL-6) and tumor necrosis factor- $\alpha$  (TNF- $\alpha$ ). 3) Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) [17] scores were used to compare patient postoperative pain levels, with a total score of 10 points. Scores were positively correlated with pain severity. 4) 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36) [18] was used to score physical function, activity of daily living, psychological function, and quality of life (QOL) levels, with a total score of 100 points. Higher scores indicate better QOL.

#### Statistical methods

SPSS 20.0 (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) was used for statistical analysis. Measurement

(, )]				
Complications	Group A (n=40)	Group B (n=48)	X <sup>2</sup>	Ρ
Incision infection	1 (2.50)	3 (6.25)	-	-
Urinary infection	1 (2.50)	3 (6.25)	-	-
Urinary retention	0 (0.00)	2 (4.17)	-	-
Fever	1 (2.50)	2 (4.17)	-	-
Nausea	0 (0.00)	3 (6.25)	-	-
Vomiting	1 (2.50)	2 (4.17)	-	-
Total incidence	4 (10.00)	15 (31.25)	5.820	0.015

**Table 2.** Comparison of infection and complications [n(%)]

data are expressed by mean  $\pm$  standard deviation, with comparisons conducted by t-tests. Count data are expressed by percentages (%), with comparisons conducted by Chi-square tests. P<0.05 indicates that differences are statistically significant.

#### Results

#### Comparison of general information

There were no differences in general information between Groups A and B (P>0.05). See **Table 1** for details.

#### Comparison of inflammatory cytokines after nursing

After nursing, IL-6 levels in Groups A and B were ( $42.48\pm3.58$ ) ng/L and ( $51.53\pm4.24$ ) ng/L, respectively, while TNF- $\alpha$  levels were ( $25.18\pm3.91$ ) ng/L and ( $36.39\pm3.50$ ) ng/L, respectively. After nursing, IL-6 and TNF- $\alpha$  levels in Group A were lower than those in Group B (P<0.05). See **Figure 1** for details.

### Comparison of infection and complications

The total incidence of infections and complications in Group A (10%) was lower than that in Group B (31.25%) (P<0.05). See Table 2 for details.

### Comparison of clinical indices

The time of first getting out of bed in Groups A and B was  $(22.48\pm4.58)$  hours and  $(28.49\pm6.29)$  hours, respectively. The first exhaust time in the two groups was  $(31.59\pm4.52)$  hours and  $(40.28\pm4.69)$  hours, respectively. Catheter indwelling time in the two groups was  $(3.57\pm0.28)$  days and  $(4.79\pm0.54)$ 

days, respectively. Hospitalization time in the two groups was  $(7.24\pm0.78)$  days and  $(8.44\pm1.12)$  days, respectively. VAS scores in the two groups were  $(3.24\pm1.32)$ points and  $(4.68\pm1.45)$  points, respectively. Related clinical indices in Group A were better than those in Group B (P< 0.05). See **Figure 2** for details.

# Comparison of anxiety before and after nursing

Before and after nursing, SAS scores in Group A were  $(37.72\pm3.54)$  points and  $(17.28\pm2.58)$  points, respectively, while those in Group B were  $(38.57\pm3.49)$  points and  $(26.43\pm3.14)$  points, respectively. After nursing, SAS scores in the two groups reduced (P<0.05). Before nursing, there were no differences in scores between the two groups (P>0.05). After nursing, scores in Group A were lower than those in Group B (P<0.05). See Figure 3 for details.

# Comparison of depression before and after nursing

Before and after nursing, SDS scores in Group A were ( $40.48\pm4.28$ ) points and ( $22.35\pm$ 3.14) points, respectively, while those in Group B were ( $39.89\pm4.27$ ) points and ( $29.43\pm3.25$ ) points, respectively. After nursing, SDS scores in the two groups reduced (P<0.05). Before nursing, there were no differences in scores between the two groups (P>0.05). After nursing, scores in Group A were lower than those in Group B (P<0.05). See **Figure 4** for details.

### Comparison of nursing satisfaction

The total satisfaction in Group A (90%) was higher than that in Group B (70.83%) (P<0.05). See Table 3 for details.

### Comparison of QOL

Scores concerning physical function, activity of daily living, psychological function, and QOL in Group A were higher than those in Group B (P<0.05). See **Table 4** for details.

### Discussion

A pleiotropic cytokine that exerts a variety of functions *in vivo* [19], IL-6 can be used as a



**Figure 2.** Comparison of clinical indices after nursing. A. The time of first getting out of bed in Group A was significantly shorter than that in Group B (P<0.05). Note: \* indicates P<0.05 compared with that in Group B; B. The first exhaust time in Group A was significantly shorter than that in Group B (P<0.05). Note: \* indicates P<0.05). Note: \* indicates P<0.05 compared with that in Group B; C. Catheter indwelling time in Group A was significantly shorter than that in Group B; P<0.05). Note: \* indicates P<0.05 compared with that in Group B; D. Hospitalization time in Group A was significantly shorter than that in Group B; P<0.05). Note: \* indicates P<0.05 compared with that in Group B; D. Hospitalization time in Group A was significantly shorter than that in Group B; E. VAS scores in Group A were significantly lower than those in Group B (P<0.05). Note: \* indicates P<0.05 compared with that in Group B.



Figure 3. Comparison of anxiety before and after nursing. After nursing, SAS scores in the two groups reduced (P<0.05). Before nursing, there were no differences in SAS scores between the two groups (P>0.05). After nursing, SAS scores in Group A were lower than those in Group B (P<0.05). Note: \* indicates P<0.05 compared with that in the same group before nursing. # indicates P<0.05 compared with that in Group A.

multifunctional regulator of immune response and hematopoietic function [20]. It is a trophic



**Figure 4.** Comparison of depression before and after nursing. After nursing, SDS scores in the two groups reduced (P<0.05). Before nursing, there were no differences in SDS scores between the two groups (P>0.05). After nursing, SDS scores in Group A were lower than those in Group B (P<0.05). Note: \* indicates P<0.05 compared with that in the same group before nursing. # indicates P<0.05 compared with that in Group A.

cytokine that plays a central role in the comprehensive immune defense network against infections [21]. It widely affects cells of the immune and non-immune systems. It usually shows hormone-like characteristics that affect

Table 3. Comparison of nursing satisfaction [n (%)]

	0	,	-	
Satisfaction	Group A (n=40)	Group B (n=48)	X <sup>2</sup>	Р
Satisfied	16 (40.00)	8 (16.67)	-	-
Relatively satisfied	15 (37.50)	17 (35.42)	-	-
Generally satisfied	5 (12.50)	9 (18.75)	-	-
Dissatisfied	4 (10.00)	14 (29.17)	-	-
Total satisfaction	36 (90.00)	34 (70.83)	4.926	0.026

Table 4. Comparison of QOL

Groups	n	Physical function	Activity of daily living	Physiological function	QOL
Group A	40	85.35±14.17	91.37±9.72	88.92±7.18	92.32±9.36
Group B	48	77.73±13.28	83.17±11.37	81.18±9.27	80.59±10.48
t		2.600	3.595	4.311	5.486
р		0.011	0.000	<0.001	<0.001

steady-state process [22]. TNF-α, a pro-inflammatory cytokine, has a great effect on the pathogenesis of several diseases [23], possibly triggering death or tumor growth [24]. IL-6 and TNF-a have been considered as important mediators of inflammatory response. In this study, levels in Group A were lower, which may be due to the close monitoring of various indicators and all-round disinfection during ORDN. Inflammation is the host's protective response to infection and tissue damage, beneficial to the host under normal circumstances. However, inflammatory disorders lead to excessive or lasting tissue damage, resulting in the progression of acute or chronic inflammatory diseases. Therefore, the reason for less infections in Group A in this study may be that inflammatory cytokine levels in Group A were lower than those in Group B. According to some studies, patients with a nursing plan have better control over systolic blood pressure and low-density lipoprotein, compared to those without a nursing plan. Thus, the use of statins is more likely in the former [25]. These factors suggest that a designated nursing plan is more conducive to disease control. Most patients suffer from emotional disorders for treatment relatively late during disease progression. This is of great concern, because the delay of emotional relief reduces the success rate of subsequent treatment. Depressive episodes have a negative cumulative effect on the brain and body [26]. Moreover, negative emotions seriously affect self-perception, being closely related to disease prevention and treatment [27]. Therefore, in the current study, negative patient emotions were relieved by the medical staff throughout the process. This helped to reduce their resistance to surgery and treatment. The current study also compared SAS and SDS scores between the two groups, before and after nursing. Scores in Group A were better than those in Group B. This suggests that individual nursing can relieve patient psychological distress and negative effects [28]. According to a previous study, individual nursing can solve unresolved problems, including emotions, functional

status, happiness, mental process, and other variables. It seems to be more effective than conventional treatment [29]. This decision model improves patient knowledge, satisfaction, physical health, and mental health, as well as trust in providers [30]. In short, this patient-centered model is timely and sustainable, enabling patients to participate in treatment. This method helps to develop their health management capabilities, enabling them express concerns and preferences regarding treatment [31]. Compared with traditional nursing, this model improves or provides the same disease control, strengthens self-management strategies, and reduces the massive use of resources. Moreover, it is more cost-efficient [32].

In summary, ORDN can reduce postoperative infections and improve nursing satisfaction levels in patients undergoing radical hysterectomies.

### Disclosure of conflict of interest

#### None.

Address correspondence to: Cuiling Yu, Department of Anesthesiology, Jiaozhou People's Hospital, No. 180, Huzhou Road, Jiaozhou, Shandong Province, China. E-mail: yuou6062177@163.com

#### References

[1] Small W Jr, Bacon MA, Bajaj A, Chuang LT, Fisher BJ, Harkenrider MM, Jhingran A, Kitchener

HC, Mileshkin LR, Viswanathan AN and Gaffney DK. Cervical cancer: a global health crisis. Cancer 2017; 123: 2404-2412.

- [2] Koh WJ, Abu-Rustum NR, Bean S, Bradley K, Campos SM, Cho KR, Chon HS, Chu C, Clark R, Cohn D, Crispens MA, Damast S, Dorigo O, Eifel PJ, Fisher CM, Frederick P, Gaffney DK, Han E, Huh WK, Lurain JR, Mariani A, Mutch D, Nagel C, Nekhlyudov L, Fader AN, Remmenga SW, Reynolds RK, Tillmanns T, Ueda S, Wyse E, Yashar CM, McMillian NR and Scavone JL. Cervical cancer, version 3.2019, NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology. J Natl Compr Canc Netw 2019; 17: 64-84.
- [3] Huang R and Rofstad EK. Cancer stem cells (CSCs), cervical CSCs and targeted therapies. Oncotarget 2017; 8: 35351-35367.
- [4] Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network; Albert Einstein College of Medicine; Analytical Biological Services; Barretos Cancer Hospital; Baylor College of Medicine; Beckman Research Institute of City of Hope: Buck Institute for Research on Aging; Canada's Michael Smith Genome Sciences Centre; Harvard Medical School; Helen F. Graham Cancer Center & Research Institute at Christiana Care Health Services; HudsonAlpha Institute for Biotechnology; ILSbio, LLC; Indiana University School of Medicine; Institute of Human Virology; Institute for Systems Biology; International Genomics Consortium; Leidos Biomedical; Massachusetts General Hospital; McDonnell Genome Institute at Washington University; Medical College of Wisconsin; Medical University of South Carolina; Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center; Montefiore Medical Center; NantOmics; National Cancer Institute; National Hospital, Abuja, Nigeria; National Human Genome Research Institute; National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences; National Institute on Deafness & Other Communication Disorders; Ontario Tumour Bank, London Health Sciences Centre; Ontario Tumour Bank, Ontario Institute for Cancer Research; Ontario Tumour Bank, The Ottawa Hospital; Oregon Health & Science University; Samuel Oschin Comprehensive Cancer Institute, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center; SRA International; St Joseph's Candler Health System; Eli & Edythe L. Broad Institute of Massachusetts Institute of Technology & Harvard University; Research Institute at Nationwide Children's Hospital; Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center at Johns Hopkins University; University of Bergen; University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center; University of Abuja Teaching Hospital; University of Alabama at Birmingham; University of California, Irvine: University of California Santa Cruz; University of Kansas Medical Cen-

ter; University of Lausanne; University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center; University of Pittsburgh; University of São Paulo, Ribeir ão Preto Medical School; University of Southern California; University of Washington; University of Wisconsin School of Medicine & Public Health; Van Andel Research Institute; Washington University in St Louis. Integrated genomic and molecular characterization of cervical cancer. Nature 2017; 543: 378-384.

- [5] Marth C, Landoni F, Mahner S, McCormack M, Gonzalez-Martin A and Colombo N; ESMO Guidelines Committee. Cervical cancer: ESMO clinical practice guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. Ann Oncol 2017; 28 Suppl 4: iv72-iv83.
- [6] Berman TA and Schiller JT. Human papillomavirus in cervical cancer and oropharyngeal cancer: one cause, two diseases. Cancer 2017; 123: 2219-2229.
- [7] Zaman MS, Chauhan N, Yallapu MM, Gara RK, Maher DM, Kumari S, Sikander M, Khan S, Zafar N, Jaggi M and Chauhan SC. Curcumin nanoformulation for cervical cancer treatment. Sci Rep 2016; 6: 20051.
- [8] Melamed A, Margul DJ, Chen L, Keating NL, Del Carmen MG, Yang J, Seagle BL, Alexander A, Barber EL, Rice LW, Wright JD, Kocherginsky M, Shahabi S and Rauh-Hain JA. Survival after minimally invasive radical hysterectomy for early-stage cervical cancer. N Engl J Med 2018; 379: 1905-1914.
- [9] Ramirez PT, Frumovitz M, Pareja R, Lopez A, Vieira M, Ribeiro R, Buda A, Yan X, Shuzhong Y, Chetty N, Isla D, Tamura M, Zhu T, Robledo KP, Gebski V, Asher R, Behan V, Nicklin JL, Coleman RL and Obermair A. Minimally invasive versus abdominal radical hysterectomy for cervical cancer. N Engl J Med 2018; 379: 1895-1904.
- [10] Shah CA, Beck T, Liao JB, Giannakopoulos NV, Veljovich D and Paley P. Surgical and oncologic outcomes after robotic radical hysterectomy as compared to open radical hysterectomy in the treatment of early cervical cancer. J Gynecol Oncol 2017; 28: e82.
- [11] Liu X, Wang X, Zhao W, Wei L, Zhang P and Han F. A prospective, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of acute postoperative pain treatment using opioid analgesics with intravenous ibuprofen after radical cervical cancer surgery. Sci Rep 2018; 8: 10161.
- [12] Edwards ST, Dorr DA and Landon BE. Can personalized care planning improve primary care? JAMA 2017; 318: 25-26.
- [13] Bolton RE, Bokhour BG, Hogan TP, Luger TM, Ruben M and Fix GM. Integrating personalized

care planning into primary care: a multiplecase study of early adopting patient-centered medical homes. J Gen Intern Med 2020; 35: 428-436.

- [14] Bourgioti C, Chatoupis K and Moulopoulos LA. Current imaging strategies for the evaluation of uterine cervical cancer. World J Radiol 2016; 8: 342-354.
- [15] Svanborg P and Asberg M. A new self-rating scale for depression and anxiety states based on the comprehensive psychopathological rating scale. Acta Psychiatr Scand 1994; 89: 21-28.
- [16] Zung WW. A self-rating depression scale. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1965; 12: 63-70.
- [17] Pointer JS. A novel visual analogue scale (VAS) device: an instrument based on the VAS designed to quantify the subjective visual experience. Ophthalmic Physiol Opt 2004; 24: 181-185.
- [18] Zare R, Jafari P and Ghanizadeh A. Do adult attention deficit hyperactivity disorder qualityof-life (AAQoL) scale and the SF-36 scale measure the same construct of health-related quality of life? Atten Defic Hyperact Disord 2017; 9: 39-45.
- [19] Schmidt-Arras D and Rose-John S. IL-6 pathway in the liver: from physiopathology to therapy. J Hepatol 2016; 64: 1403-1415.
- [20] Jones SA and Jenkins BJ. Recent insights into targeting the IL-6 cytokine family in inflammatory diseases and cancer. Nat Rev Immunol 2018; 18: 773-789.
- [21] Rose-John S, Winthrop K and Calabrese L. The role of IL-6 in host defence against infections: immunobiology and clinical implications. Nat Rev Rheumatol 2017; 13: 399-409.
- [22] Hunter CA and Jones SA. IL-6 as a keystone cytokine in health and disease. Nat Immunol 2015; 16: 448-457.
- [23] El-Tahan RR, Ghoneim AM and El-Mashad N. TNF-alpha gene polymorphisms and expression. Springerplus 2016; 5: 1508.
- [24] Berguetti T, Quintaes LSP, Hancio T, Robaina MC, Cruz ALS, Maia RC and de Souza PS. TNFalpha modulates P-glycoprotein expression and contributes to cellular proliferation via extracellular vesicles. Cells 2019; 8.

- [25] Mikkola I, Hagnas M, Hartsenko J, Kaila M and Winell K. A personalized care plan is positively associated with better clinical outcomes in the care of patients with type 2 diabetes: a crosssectional real-life study. Can J Diabetes 2020; 44: 133-138.
- [26] Prendes-Alvarez S and Nemeroff CB. Personalized medicine: prediction of disease vulnerability in mood disorders. Neurosci Lett 2018; 669: 10-13.
- [27] Bekker MH, van de Meerendonk C and Mollerus J. Effects of negative mood induction and impulsivity on self-perceived emotional eating. Int J Eat Disord 2004; 36: 461-469.
- [28] Raz DJ, Sun V, Kim JY, Williams AC, Koczywas M, Cristea M, Reckamp K, Hayter J, Tiep B and Ferrell B. Long-term effect of an interdisciplinary supportive care intervention for lung cancer survivors after surgical procedures. Ann Thorac Surg 2016; 101: 495-502.
- [29] Barley EA, Walters P, Haddad M, Phillips R, Achilla E, McCrone P, Van Marwijk H, Mann A and Tylee A. The UPBEAT nurse-delivered personalized care intervention for people with coronary heart disease who report current chest pain and depression: a randomised controlled pilot study. PLoS One 2014; 9: e98704.
- [30] Berman AT, Rosenthal SA, Moghanaki D, Woodhouse KD, Movsas B and Vapiwala N. Focusing on the "person" in personalized medicine: the future of patient-centered care in radiation oncology. J Am Coll Radiol 2016; 13: 1571-1578.
- [31] Chen J, Mullins CD, Novak P and Thomas SB. Personalized strategies to activate and empower patients in health care and reduce health disparities. Health Educ Behav 2016; 43: 25-34.
- [32] Lopez-Martinez N, Segu JL, Vazquez-Castro J, Brosa M, Bohigas L, Comellas MJ and Kalfhaus L. Analysis of the implementation of a personalized care model in diabetes mellitus as an example of chronic disease with information and communication technology support. Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res 2017; 17: 141-148.