Migration Letters

Volume: 20, No: S1 (2023), pp. 2037-2047

ISSN: 1741-8984 (Print) ISSN: 1741-8992 (Online)

www.migrationletters.com

Awareness Level And Associated Factors For Non-Communicable Disease Screening Among Adults In Makkah, Saudi Arabia

Sultan Ahmad Muafa¹, Saad Ibrahim Khamis Al-Thubaiti², Abdulrahman Muhammed Ali Alqurashi³, Rabha Bakur Salah⁴, Khadija Salem Albishi⁵, Abdullah Mazyad A. Alotaibi⁶, Hassan Suliman Bahloul⁷, Wafa Aedh Al Shehri⁸, Sadeq Anees Serdar⁹, Khloud Hassan Algamdi¹⁰, Afrah Atallah Bakhet Alanezy¹¹

Abstract:

Background: Non-communicable diseases have emerged as a health problem of global priority in recent times. Screening and early diagnosis is important to plan appropriate interventions. Objectives: The objectives of the study were as follows: (1) To study the awareness of screening for hypertension (HTN), diabetes, cancer cervix, and cancer breast, (2) to study the status of screening for HTN, diabetes, cancer cervix, and cancer breast, and (3) to study the factors associated with not aware of screening for above non-communicable diseases. Materials and Methods: A community-based cross-sectional study was conducted in service practice area of a health care centers in Makkah, Saudi Arabia. Adults aged more than 30 years were included by simple random sampling technique. The required sample size was 400. Face-to-face interview was done using semistructured questionnaire. Basic sociodemographic details, awareness, and status of screening were collected. Data were entered analyzed in SPSS 20.0. Results: Of 398 study participants, majority (43.2%) belongs to 30-45 age groups. The mean age of the study participants was 49 ± 13 years. The prevalence of self-reported HTN and ¹diabetes in the present study was 24% and 19.8%, respectively. Nearly three-fourth of the study population had awareness of screening for HTN and diabetes, Awareness of cancer cervix screening was very low (35%) when compared to cancer breast (45%). Unmarried and below primary level of education were independently associated with unawareness of screening for non-communicable disease. Conclusion: Around 15% and 30% of the study population were never screened for HTN and diabetes, respectively, though the awareness was high, whereas more than three-fourth of the female participants were never screened for cancer breast and cancer cervix though the awareness was <50%. Non-communicable disease screening needs to be targeted more toward young

¹Family medicine specialist, Preventive Medicine Department, Saudi Arabia.

²Medical laboratory specialist, MOH Makkah, Saudi Arabia.

³Public health epidemiology monitor, Mujahideen Health Center, Saudi Arabia.

⁴Nursing technician, Infection control department in the health cluster, Saudi Arabia.

⁵Nursing technician, Beneficiary experience management, Saudi Arabia.

⁶Public Health, Al-Shumaisi Medical Complex, Saudi Arabia.

⁷Nursing technician, Al-Kakiyya Health Center, Saudi Arabia.

⁸Nursing Technician, Al-Mansour Health Center, Saudi Arabia.

⁹Senior public and environmental health specialist, Infectious Diseases control department (national TB control program), Saudi Arabia.

¹⁰Technician-Nursing, Primary health care center alrasdiah, Saudi Arabia.

¹¹Nursing technician, Al Dhalfaa Health Center, Saudi Arabia.

females, those with below primary level of education with lowsocioeconomic background and elderly people.

Key words: Awareness; Screening; Non-Communicable Disease.

Introduction:

Non-communicable diseases (NCDs) are the major causes of mortality and morbidity globally. Non-communicable diseases (NCDs), mainly cardiovascular diseases (CVDs), were reported to be responsible for 64% of the global deaths during 201, more than 80% of deaths occurred in developing countries. In Eastern Mediterranean region every year 1.7 million people die from the four main NCDs (CVDs, cancer, chronic respiratory and diabetes), if no serious action is taken, the deaths due to NCDs is projected to reach 2.4 million in 2025. Moreover, Eastern Mediterranean region is recognized as the hot-spot of NCD particularly CVDs and diabetes. The trends of NCD showed variations between the countries of Eastern Mediterranean region of different income levels, and where the low income countries are still grappling with communicable diseases, while the tide of NCDs is increasing. Given that the rate of deaths from NCDs in 2014 was ranging from 19% in Somalia to 85% in Egypt and Lebanon. Likewise, Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries have witnessed a higher burden of NCD mortality which ranged from 65% to 78% of the total adult deaths (WHO., 2014; WHO-EMRO., 2016; Murray &Lopez., 1996).

NCDs are considered the primary cause of death among adults, being implicated for most (78%) of the total deaths in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) during 2014, of which CVDs were responsible for about (46%) of these deaths. KSA was exposed to a vast epidemiological transition, rapid economic development and ageing population. Subsequently, major modifica tions have happened in lifestyle behaviours such as: increased caloric and high fat-diet consumption; reduced physical activity and dramatic increase in obesity prevalence among different age-groups. This has all lead to increased prevalence of NCDs, including diabetes mellitus and CVDs (WHO-NCD-Profile., 2014; Alhyas et al., 2011).

Conventional risk factors of NCD are classified into two groups: behavioural NCD risk factors as tobacco use, physical activity and dietary pattern, and clinical NCD risk factors as obesity, hypertension, diabetes mellitus and hyperlipidemia (Aaronson et al., 2013). These risk factors have exhibited clustering, and synergizing over time, and association with higher prevalence of NCD, including cardiovascular events and related mortality (Kaukua et al., 2001).

More than half of the people with diabetes remain undiagnosed in both developed and developing countries, and this individual often presents with diabetes complications. Undiagnosed diabetes and pre-diabetes need to be detected and treated early through community-based screening (Julka et al., 2014). Cervical cancer is the fourth most common cancer among thewomen worldwide and the seventh overall. Approximately 87% of the worldwide mortality for cervical cancer occursin underdeveloped countries (Julka et al., 2014).

Screening for precancerous lesions reduces the incidence and mortality from cancer cervix. Though the cytology based screening pap smear have been found to be effective in developed countries, an alternative screeningmethods using Visual Inspection Acetic acid (VIA) or Visual Inspection Lugals Iodine (VILLI) can be used more effectively in low resource settings (Siddharthar et al., 2014).

Community- based screening can improve the detection and treatment of NCDs. Studies from various parts of India have assessed theprevalence, awareness, treatment and control of NCDs and stressed upon the importance of early diagnosis by screeningtest, the present study have the novelty and aim to find out the proportion of population who have been aware and undergone screening for HTN, diabetes, cancer breast and cancer cervix and factors associated with unawareness of screening for non-communicable disease. Screening is an important aspect of the management of the disease, as it leads to early diagnosis and treatment and prevents risk of complications and future mortality.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A community-based cross-sectional study was conducted in service practice area of a health care center, Makkah, from June to November 2022. Institute Research Committeeand Ethics Committee approval were obtained beforeconducting the study. The health care center serves around 9000 population. Assuming 50% of adult population had undergone screening for non-communicable disease, 5% absolute precision with 95% confident interval, the estimated sample size was 384. Adults aged more than 30 years were randomly selected and included in the study until we achieved the sample size. Adults both men and women above 30 years were interviewed using the semi- structured questionnaire. Informed written consent was obtained. Basic sociodemographic details, prevalence of HTN and diabetes, factors associated with awareness, and status of screening were collected.

Statistical analysis:

Data analyzedin IBM SPSS 20. Categorical variables expressed inpercentages. Continuous variables expressed in mean± 2SD. Factors associated with not aware of screening were analyzed using bivariate and multivariate logistic regression.

RESULTS

Of 398 study participants, majority (43.2%) belongs to 30–45 age groups. The mean age of the study participants was 49 ± 13 years. More than half (55.8%) of the people hadbelow primary level of education, 56.5% were unemployed and unskilled workers, and 36.7% of persons belong to low socioeconomic class. Nearly three-fourth of the study population had awareness of screening for HTN and diabetes. Awareness of cancer cervix screening was very low (35%) when compared to cancer breast (45%). The prevalence of self-reported HTN and diabetes was 24% and 19.8%, respectively. Nearly one-fourth of the participants had familyhistory of HTN and diabetes. Almost 84.7% of the study participants had undergone screening for HTN and 70.6% had undergone diabetes screening irrespective of awareness. Among females, 15.3% had undergone screening test for cancer breast, whereas only 7.4% of females had undergone screening for cancer cervix.

In Table 1, females are more aware of screening of HTN (73.3%) than the males (72.8%), but statistically there is no significant difference. Lower age group (30–45) is more aware (77.3%) of screening of HTN than other age groups without significant difference. Unmarried (aOR = 2.8 [1.3-6.1]) and below primary level of education (aOR=2.8 [1.6-4.8]) were independently associated with unawareness of screening for HTN.

Table 1: Factors affecting awareness of screening for hypertension among adults aged more than 30 years (n=398)

| Sociodemographic details | Awar e | Unaw are | n (%) | | Unadju sted OR | | Adjus ted OR | P value |
|--------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---|----------------------|---|--------------------|--------------|
| Age group (years) | | | | | | | | P= |
| 30–45 | 130 | 42 | 172 | 1 | | 1 | | 0.4 |
| | (75.6) | (24.4) | (43.2) | | | | | P= 0.6 |
| 46–60 | 109 | 39 | 148 | | 1.1 | | 0.8 | 0.0 |
| .0 00 | (71.6) | (28.3) | (37.2) | | (0.6– | | (0.4– | |
| | | | | | 1.8) | | 1.3) | |
| >60 | 52 | 26 | 78 | | 1.5 | | 0.8 | |
| | (66.6) | (33.3) | (19.6) | | (0.8- | | (0.4– | |
| Gender | | | | | 2.7) | | 1.6) | P=0.6 |
| Female | 148 | 55 | 203 | | 1.0 | | 0.6 | 1 -0.0 |
| 1 chiaic | (72.9) | (27.1) | (51) | | (0.6– | | (0.3– | |
| | | | , , | | 1.5) | | 1.0) | |
| Male | 143 | 52 | 195 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | (73.3) | (26.7) | (49) | | | | | D 0.0 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | P=0.0 08 |
| Married | 275 | 90 | 365 | 1 | | 1 | | 00 |
| Wallied | (75.3) | (24.6) | (91.7) | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Single | 16 | 17 | 33 | | 3.2 | | 2.8 | |
| | (48.4) | (51.5) | (8.3) | | (1.5- | | (1.3– | |
| | | | | | 6.6) | | 6.1) | |
| Educational status | | | | | | | | P=0.0 001 |
| Illiterate and primary | 143 | 79 | 222 | | 2.5 | | 2.8 | 001 |
| initerate and primary | (64.4) | (35.5) | (55.8) | | (1.5– | | (1.6– | |
| | (0 11 1) | (====) | (0010) | | 4.1) | | 4.8) | |
| Above primary | 148 | 28 | 176 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | (84) | (15.9) | (44.2) | | | | | |
| Occupational status | 155 | 7 0 | 225 | | 1.7 | | 1 ~ | P=0.1 |
| Unemployed and unskilled | 155 (68.8) | 70 (31.1) | 225 (56.5) | | 1.5 (0.9– | | 1.5 (0.9– | |
| uliskilieu | (00.0) | (31.1) | (30.3) | | 2.4) | | 2.6) | |
| Semiskilled and | 136 | 37 | 173 | 1 | / | 1 | / | |
| skilled | (78.6) | (21.3) | (43.5) | | | | | |
| Socioeconomic status | | | | | | | | P=0.1 |
| 1–3 | 183 | 69 | 252 | | 1.1 | | 1.4 | |
| | (72.6) | (27.3) | (63.3) | | (0.7– | | (0.8- | |
| | | | | | 1.8) | | 2.3) | |

| 4 and 5 | 108 | 38 | 146 | 1 | 1 | |
|---------|--------|------|--------|---|---|--|
| | (73.9) | (26) | (36.7) | | | |
| Total | 291 | 107 | 398 | | | |
| | (73) | (27) | | | | |

In Table 2, the difference in awareness for diabetes screening between married (75.3%) and unmarried (48.4%) is statistically significant. People with above primaryschool education are more aware of diabetes screening (84%) than illiterate and primary (64.4%). This difference is statistically significant. Lower age group (30–45) is more aware (75.6%) than other age groups without any significant difference. Unmarried (aOR = 2.8 [1.3-6.1]) and below primary level of education (aOR = 3.1 [1.8-5.4]) were independently associated with unawareness of screening for diabetes.

Table 2: Factors affecting awareness of screening for diabetes among adults aged more than 30 (n=398)

| Sociodemographic details | Aware | Una ware | n | | Unadj ust ed OR | | Adju ste d O R | P valu e |
|--------------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|---|--------------------------|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Age group (years) | | | | | | | | P= |
| 30–45 | 133 (77.3) | 39 (22.6) | 1 7 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 0.2 P= 0.0 7 |
| 46–60 | 106 (71.6) | 42 (28.3) | 1 4 8 | | 1.3 (0.8– 2.2) | | 0.9 (0.5– 1.7) | |
| >60 | 52 (66.6) | 26 (33.3) | 7 8 | | 1.7 (0.9– 3.0) | | 0.9 (0.4– 1.7) | |
| Gender | | | | | | | | P=0. 8 |
| Female | 149 (73.3) | 54 (26.6) | 2 0 3 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Male | 142 (72.8) | 53 (27.1) | 1 9 5 | | 1.0 (0.6– 1.6) | | 1.8 (1.0– 3.1) | |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | P=0. 001 |
| Married | 275 (75.3) | 90 (24.6) | 3 6 5 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Single | 16 (48.4) | 17 (51.5) | 3 | | 3.2 (1.5– | | 2.8 (1.3– | |

2042 Awareness Level And Associated Factors For Non-Communicable Disease Screening Among Adults In Makkah, Saudi Arabia

| | | | | | 6.6) | | 6.1) | |
|--------------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|---|----------------------|---|----------------------|--------------|
| Educational status | | | | | | | | P=0. 0001 |
| Illiterate and primary | 143 (64.4) | 79 (35.5) | 2 2 2 | | 2.9 (1.7– 4.7) | | 3.1 (1.8– 5.4) | |
| Above primary | 148 (84) | 28 (15.9) | 1 7 6 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Occupational status | | | | | | | | P=0. 06 |
| Unemployed and unskilled | 155 (68.8) | 70 (31.1) | 2 2 5 | | 1.6 (1.0– 2.6) | | 1.6 (0.9– 2.8) | |
| Semiskilled and skilled | 136 (78.6) | 37 (21.3) | 1 7 3 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Socioeconomic statu | S | | | | | | | P=0. 2 |
| 1–3 | 183 (72.6) | 69 (27.3) | 2 5 2 | | 1.0 (0.6– 1.7) | | 1.3 (0.8– 2.2) | |
| 4 and 5 | 108 (73.9) | 38 (26) | 1 4 6 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Total | 291 (73) | 107 (27) | 3 9 8 | | | | | |

In Table 3, women with above primary school education aremore aware (56%) of screening for cancer cervix than illiterateand primary (24.8%). This difference is statistically significant. Middle age group women (46–60) are more aware (40.5%) than other age groups, but this difference is not statistically significant. Married women (36.5%) are more aware than unmarried person (25%) without any significant difference. Women in higher socioeconomic status (SES) (Classes 1–3)are more aware (39.4%) than lower SES (28.5%) without any significant difference. Below primary level of education is independently associated with aOR = 3.5 (1.8-6.9)unawareness of cervical cancer screening.

Table 3: Sociodemographic details and its association with unawareness of screening for cervical cancer (n=203)

| Sociodemographic details | Aware | Unawar e | n (%) | Unadjust edOR | Adjuste dOR | P value |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Age group (years) | | | | | | |
| 30–45 | 28 (34.5) | 53 (65.4) | 81 (39.9) | 1 | | |
| 46–60 | 32 (40.5) | 47 (59.4) | 79 (38.9) | 0.7 (0.4– 1.4) | | |
| >60 | 11 (25.5) | 32 (74.4) | 43 (21.1) | 1.5 (0.6– 3.5) | | |
| Marital status | , | , | , | , | | P=0.6 |
| Married | 64 (36.5) | 111 (63.4) | 175 (86.2) | 1 | 1 | |
| Single | 7 (25) | 21 (75) | 28 (13.8) | 1.7 (0.6– 4.2) | 1.2 (0.4– 3.1) | |
| Educational status | | | | | | P=0.00 01 |
| Illiterate and primary | 34 (24.8) | 103 (75) | 137 (67.5) | 3.8 (2.0– 7.1) | 3.5 (1.8– 6.9) | |
| Above primary | 37 (56) | 29 (43.9) | 66 (32.0) | 1 | 1 | |
| Occupational status | | | | | | P=0.3 |
| Unemployed and unskilled | 58 (36.7) | 100 (63.2) | 158 (77.8) | 1 | 1 | |
| Semiskilled and skilled | 13 (28.8) | 32 (71.1) | 45 (22.2) | 1.4 (0.6– 2.9) | 0.6 (0.3– 1.4) | |
| Socioeconomic status | | | | | | P=0.5 |
| 1–3 | 47 (39.4) | 72 (60.5) | 119 (58.6) | 1 | 1 | |
| 4 and 5 | 24 (28.5) | 60 (71.4) | 84 (41.4) | 1.6 (0.8– 2.9) | 1.2 (0.6– 2.3) | |
| Total | 71 (35) | 132 (65) | 203 | | | |

In Table 4, women with above primary school education aremore aware (65%) than illiterate and primary (35%) about screening for cancer breast with significant statistically difference. Married women (48%) are more aware than unmarried person (25%) with significant statistically difference. Lower age group women (30–45) are more aware (49.3%) than other age groups without statistically significant difference. Lower SES (Classes 4 and 5) is more aware (49%) than higher SES (42%) without any statistical difference. Being single (OR=2.7[1.1-6.8]) is associated with unawareness about breast cancer screening. Below primary level of education (aOR=4.0[2.0-7.8]) is independently associated with unawareness about breast cancer screening.

Table 4: Sociodemographic details and its association with unawareness of screening for cancer breast (n=203)

| cancer breast (n=20 | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|
| Sociodemographic | Awa | Una | n | Unadjuste | Adjuste | P |
| details | re | ware | (%) | d OR | d OR | value |
| Age group (years) | 40 | 4.1 | 04/2 | 4 | | |
| 30–45 | 40 | 41 | 81(3 | 1 | | |
| | (49.3 8) | (50.6 | 9.9) | | | |
| 46–60 | 34 |) 45 | 79 | 1.2 (0.6– | | |
| 40-00 | (43.0 | (56.9 | (38.9 | 2.4) | | |
| | 3) | 6) |) | 2, | | |
| >60 | 17 | 26 | 43 | 1.4 (0.7– | | |
| | (39.5 | (60.4 | (21.1 | 3.1) | | |
| | 3) | 6) |) | | | |
| Marital status | | | | | | 0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 1 |
| Married | 84 | 91 | 175 | 1 | 1 | |
| | (48) | (52) | (86.2 | | | |
| Single | 7 | 21 | 28 | 2.7 (1.1– | 1.8 (0.7– | |
| Single | (25) | (75) | (13.8 | 6.8) | 4.8) | |
| | (20) | (,0) |) | 0.0) | | |
| Educational status | | | | | | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 01 |
| Illiterate and primary | 48 | 89 | 137 | 3.4 (1.8– | 4.0 (2.0- | |
| | (35) | (65) | (67.5 | 6.4) | 7.8) | |
| | | |) | | | |
| Above primary | 43 | 23 | 66 (22.5 | 1 | 1 | |
| | (65) | (35) | (32.5 | | | |
| Occupational status | | |) | | | 0 |
| Occupational status | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 4 |
| Unemployed and | 69 | 89 | 158 | 1.2 (0.6– | 1.2 (0.6– | |
| unskilled | (44) | (56) | (77.8 | 2.3) | 2.6) | |
| | | |) | | | |
| Semiskilled and | 22 | 23 | 45 | 1 | 1 | |
| skilled | (49) | (51) | (22.2 | | | |
| Cociocacanomia etatua | | |) | | | 0.02 |
| Socioeconomic status | 50 | 60 | 110 | 1 2 (0 7 | 20/10 | 0.03 |
| 1–3 | 50 (42) | 69 (58) | 119 (58.6 | 1.3 (0.7– 2.3) | 2.0 (1.0– 3.7) | |
| | (44) | (30) | (36.0 | 2.3) | 3.1) | |
| 4 and 5 | 41 | 43 | 84 | 1 | 1 | |
| | (49) | (51) | (41.4 | - | - | |
| | ` ' | ` / | * | | | |

| | | |) |
|-------|------|------|-----|
| Total | 91 | 112 | 203 |
| | (45) | (55) | |

DISCUSSION

The prevalence of self-reported HTN and diabetes in the present study was 24% and 19.8%, respectively. Nearly three-fourth of the study population had awareness of screening for HTN and diabetes. Awareness of cancer cervix screening was very low (35%) when compared to cancer breast (45%). Unmarried and below primary level of education were independently associated with unawareness of screening for non-communicable disease.

The prevalence of self-reported HTN in this study shows 24% which is similar to the study from Puducherry and systematicreview and meta-analysis from India 2014 (Anchala et al., 2014; Datta et al., 2019). In the present study, about 27% of the study participants werenot aware of screening for both HTN and diabetes. Overall, 85% of the study populations were screened for their HTN status. More females (99%) were screened for HTN as compared to males (92%). A study from Puducherry reported that 60.8% of the study population was screened for their HTN and more females 68.4% were screened for HTN as compared to males (52%)which is low compared to the present study. The difference may be due to the difference in urban and rural setting (Datta et al., 2019). However, a study on screening for HTN among women of reproductive age group, in the U.S. in 2011, reported that 89.6% of the women had received screening for HTN (Robbins et al., 2011).

Young age group (44.2%), illiterate and primary (56.3%), employed (55.3%), and lower socioeconomic class (52.6%) were more screened for HTN which is contrast to the study done in Puducherry (2014)The prevalence of self-reported diabetes in the present studywas 19.8%. There are other studies from various parts of India show the prevalence from 6% to 18.8% (Gupta et al., 2010; Anjana et al., 2017; Gupta et al., 2014). cervical cancer is the leading female genital cancer in developing countries. This high prevalence rate might be a reflection of the lack of an organized cervical cancer screening program and unhealthy life style. The majority of women were in the fourth, fifth, and sixth decades of life. Nearly 15% were young having age <40 years.

In the present study, 34% of women were aware of screening for cancer screening, another study from tertiary care hospital, Puducherry, shows 18% awareness, [4] whereas the study from Kerala shows three-fourth of the study population aware of screening for cervical cancer. [7] This difference could be explained in the difference in educational status in the study settings. Various studies show the awareness level of cancer cervix screening from 2% to 27% (Gupta et al., 2014; Alhyas et al., 2011) In the present study, 4% of women had undergone screening for carcinoma cervix, this study finding is consistent withthe study from tertiary care center, Puducherry (2014), whereas the study from Kerala shows 6.9%. [7] The screening coverage of Indian women in the age group of 18–69 years was 2.6% (4.9% among urban and 2.3% among rural) and was found to vary between 4% and 6% in poor and rich women in India. [22]

In the present study, 45% were aware of screening (BSE), among them 15% had undergone screening for carcinoma breast. In this study, we found that lack of awareness is a predominant barrier for undergoing screening for cancer cervix and breast followed by ignorance and

no complaints, most ofthe studies revealed that lack of knowledge and awareness, fear of pelvic examination and disease, embarrassment and shy, lack of time, and family support were the important barriers (Aaronson et al., 2013; Kaukua et al., 2001).

Moreover, the KSA economic transition seemed to have changed traditional lifestyle and occupational patterns to the detriment of physical activity in KSA as well as in GCC region (Al-Hazzaa., 2014). In this study the majority of the participants (more than two thirds) reported to be physically inactive. Saudis and women were more likely to be physically inactive, which analogous to recent GCC reports (Al-Zalabani, et al., 2015 Al-Nooh et al., 2014)

CONCLUSION

Around 15% and 30% of the study population were never screened for HTN and diabetes, respectively, whereas more than three-fourth of the female participants were never screened for cancer breast and cancer cervix. Diabetes and HTN screening needs to be targeted more toward those with below primary level of education and elderly people. Cancer breast and cervix screening need to be targeted more toward women with extremes of age group, unmarried, low socioeconomic class, and below primarylevel of education.

Reference:

- Al-Nooh AA, Abdulabbas Abdulla AA, Wood D. The Prevalence of Cardiovascular Disease Risk Factors among Employees in the Kingdom of Bahrain between October 2010 and March 2011: A Cross-Sectional Study from a Workplace Health Campaign. CardiolResPract. 2014; 2014:832421.
- Al-Zalabani AH, Al-hamdan NA, Saeed AA. The prevalence of physical activity and its socioeconomic correlates in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: A cross-sectional population-based national survey. Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences. 2015 10(2):208–15. doi: 0.1016/j.jtumed.2014.11.001.
- Al-Hazzaa HM, Alahmadi MA, Al-Sobayel HI, Abahussain NA, Qahwaji DM, Musaiger AO. Patterns and determinants of physical activity among saudi adolescents. J Phys Act Health. 2014; 11(6):1202– 11. doi: 10.1123/jpah.2012-0427 PMID: 23963597
- Alhyas L, McKay A, Balasanthiran A, Majeed A. Prevalences of overweight, obesity, hyperglycaemia, hypertension and dyslipidaemia in the Gulf: systematic review. JRSMShort Rep. 2011; 2(7):55
- Aaronson PI, Ward JP, Connoly MJ. Capter; Risk factors for cardiovascular disease. The Cardiovascu-lar at a Glance. 4. Chichester: John Wiley and sons Ltd; 2013. p. 76–9.
- Julka S, Goyal R, Sharma R. Screening for diabetes in high risk a passé. Indian J Endocrinol Metab 2014;18:872. Available from: https://www.who.int/cancer/prevention/ diagnosis-screening/cervical-cancer/en. [Last accessed on 2019 May 28].
- WHO-NCD-Profile. Noncommunicable diseases country profiles 2014 http://www.who.int/nmh/publications/ncd-profiles-2014/en. Date of access Nov 12, 2014. 2014
- Murray CJ, Lopez AD. Evidence-based health policy—lessons from the Global Burden of Disease Study. Science. 1996; 274(5288):740–3. PMID: 8966556
- Siddharthar J, Rajkumar B, Deivasigamani K. Knowledge, awareness and prevention of cervical cancer among women attending a tertiary care hospital in Puducherry, India. J Clin Diagn Res 2014;8:OC01-3.
- Kaukua J, Turpeinen A, Uusitupa M, Niskanen L. Clustering of cardiovascular risk factors in type 2 dia-betes mellitus: prognostic significance and tracking. Diabetes ObesMetab. 2001; 3(1):17–23
- WHO-NCD-status. Global status report on noncommunicable diseases 2014. http://www.who.int/nmh/publications/ncd-status-report-2014/en/. Date of access 9 April 2015 2014
- WHO-EMRO. Non-communicable disease in EMROhttp://www.emro.who.int/noncommunicable-diseases/diseases/diseases.html. Date of access May 2016. 2014
- Gakidou E, Nordhagen S, Obermeyer Z. Coverage of cervical cancer screening in 57 countries: Low average levels and large inequalities. PloS Med 2008;5:e132.

- Gupta SK, Singh Z, Purty AJ, Kar M, Vedapriya D, Mahajan P, et al. Diabetes prevalence and its risk factors in rural area of Tamil Nadu Indian J Community Med 2010;35:396-9.
- Anjana RM, Deepa M, Pradeepa R, Mahanta J, Narain K,Das HK, et al. Prevalence of diabetes and prediabetes in 15 states of India: Results from the ICMR-INDIAB population-based crosssectional study. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol 2017;5:585-96.
- Gupta A, Gupta R, Sharma KK, Lodha S, Achari V, Asirvatham AJ, et al. Prevalence of diabetes and cardiovascularrisk factors in middle-class urban participants in India. BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care 2014;2:e000048.
- Siddharthar J, Rajkumar B, Deivasigamani K. Knowledge, awareness and prevention of cervical cancer among women attending a tertiary care hospital in Puducherry, India. J Clin Diagn Res 2014;8:OC01-3.
- Aaronson PI, Ward JP, Connoly MJ. Capter; Risk factors for cardiovascular disease. The Cardiovascular at a Glance. 4. Chichester: John Wiley and sons Ltd; 2013. p. 76–9.
- Kaukua J, Turpeinen A, Uusitupa M, Niskanen L. Clustering of cardiovascular risk factors in type 2 dia- betes mellitus: prognostic significance and tracking. Diabetes ObesMetab. 2001; 3(1):17–23.
- Anchala R, Kannuri NK, Pant H, Khan H, Franco OH, Di Angelantonio E, et al. Hypertension in India: A systematic review and meta-analysis of prevalence, awareness, and control of hypertension. J Hypertens 2014;32:1170-7.
- Datta S, Sahu SK, Niranjjan R, Roy G. A community-based cross-sectional study on hypertension screening in Puducherry, India. Indian J Med Res 2019;150:199-202
- Robbins CL, Dietz PM, Bombard JM, Gibbs F, Ko JY, Valderrama AL. Blood pressure and cholesterol screening prevalence among U.S. women of reproductive age opportunities to improve screening. Am J Prev Med 2011;41:588-95.