The Gap Between Medical Language and Understanding in Cancer Care

This article brings together published research and lived experiences to add to ongoing conversations about improving cancer care.

A cancer report can change the direction of a person's life in ways they never anticipated. One moment, you are moving through an ordinary day; the next, you are sitting across from a doctor, holding papers filled with unfamiliar words, numbers, and clinical terms that feel as though they belong to someone else's story. There is little time to take in what has happened or to make sense of it.

A cancer diagnosis is not only a medical event. It unsettles assumptions about the body, the future, and one's place in the world. It interrupts routines, conversations, and plans that once felt stable. Even before treatment begins, the emotional landscape shifts.

Cancer feels unfair in every direction. Children watch a parent grow weaker. Parents sit beside hospital beds, trying to understand how their child's life has changed so suddenly. Partners struggle to appear strong for each other. Families are asked to make life-altering decisions while they are still absorbing shock.

In those moments, difficult questions surface. Is it appropriate to share the complete truth immediately? How should serious information be spoken? How much detail is helpful, and when does it become overwhelming? Does knowing everything diminish hope, or can clarity itself become a source of strength?

Often, it is not only the word "cancer" that overwhelms people. It is everything that follows. Test reports. Imaging results. Treatment plans are outlined in phases. Side effects are explained in probabilities and percentages. Terms delivered with accuracy and speed. The language is precise. Clinical. Efficient.

But precision does not automatically create understanding.

When doctors present information without space for absorption, the gap between medical language and human comprehension quietly widens. When teams pace communication, reinforce it over time, and shape it with care, that gap begins to narrow.

In one hospital setting, an elderly couple sat outside an intensive care unit. Their only son, twenty-seven years old, had undergone surgery and was on a ventilator. Days passed. Each day on ventilatory support costs nearly a lakh of rupees. The financial strain grew alongside the emotional one.

The doctors explained that medically, removing ventilatory support would be appropriate. They spoke with clarity about prognosis and survival likelihood. The parents listened. They nodded. They asked a few questions. They continued to hope their son might wake up.

Perhaps it was hope. Perhaps it was love. Perhaps the medical explanation did not fully meet them at the level of lived understanding. They were not highly educated. No one translated percentages into something tangible. No one reframed probability into everyday language.

When they eventually agreed to withdraw support, grief and confusion accompanied the decision. This was not a failure of compassion by the medical team. It was a moment when the full weight of the situation settled only afterward, when the meaning of the earlier conversations finally caught up with the reality.

When Medical Language Moves Faster Than Understanding

This is where language matters most.

Cancer hospitals routinely use terms such as progression-free survival, treatment cycles, response rates, and neutropenia, a condition in which white blood cell counts drop significantly, increasing susceptibility to serious infection. Clinicians use these words to ensure accuracy, protect patient safety, and communicate clearly with one another. For patients and families, particularly in moments of shock, they can feel distant, technical, and difficult to absorb.

A large systematic review by *Ryman et al. (2024)* examined health literacy in cancer care across more than eight thousand patients in the United States, Europe, Asia, and Australia. The findings suggest that this communication gap is not accidental. It is structural. Cancer systems are built on medical fluency and compressed timelines.

At the same time, patients are asked to process complex, unfamiliar information while navigating fear, uncertainty, and emotional upheaval. Across the studies included in the review, between twelve and eighty-six percent of cancer patients demonstrated limited health literacy. Even in well-resourced healthcare systems, more than half of patients found it difficult to understand key information about their cancer. Researchers consistently linked limited health literacy to lower income, lower education, rural residence, multiple illnesses, and more advanced cancer at diagnosis.

These figures are not abstract statistics. They represent real conversations in real clinics. They shape who feels confident asking questions and who remains silent. They influence whether patients move through treatment with clarity or with quiet confusion.

Cancer enters at a moment when people are already overwhelmed. Yet this is precisely when the healthcare system delivers its most technical information. Research across countries shows this pattern repeatedly. The issue is not intelligence, motivation, or willingness to learn. It is shock, grief, and the limits of human processing under stress.

Ryman and colleagues (2024) found that patients find it hardest to process information at the time of diagnosis and in the first conversations about treatment. Work in psycho-oncology, including *McCarthy et al. (2012),* demonstrates that patients retain less than half of what clinicians discuss during initial consultations, even when communication is careful and empathetic. This does not reflect negligence or indifference. It reflects how the brain responds when confronted with a threat.

Jansen and colleagues (2018) reported that cancer systems in the Netherlands and Australia improved patient understanding and reduced decisional conflict by introducing structured follow-up explanation sessions within days of diagnosis. Oncology nurses and trained

counsellors guided these follow-up conversations, revisiting key information and allowing patients to engage at a steadier pace. Rather than expecting individuals to absorb everything immediately, these systems assumed responsibility for timing, repetition, and reinforcement.

What Happens When Questions Go Unasked

At the bedside, the consequences of misunderstanding often remain invisible.

Qualitative psycho-oncology research in Europe shows that many patients hesitate to ask questions. They worry about appearing uninformed, about taking up too much time, or about challenging authority. They may leave consultations uncertain whether treatment is curative or palliative. They may not fully understand potential side effects. Yet outwardly, they appear cooperative.

When a nurse explains that treatment is delayed because blood counts are low, some patients interpret this as treatment failure or cancer progression. Without clarification, anxiety deepens. Trust may weaken quietly.

Medical language exists for good reason. It protects accuracy and safety. Research does not call for abandoning it. Instead, evidence supports layering explanation and reinforcement into routine care.

The 2019 National Academies report on health literacy in oncology found that patients understand their care more clearly when clinicians reinforce conversations with plain-language summaries, simple visual aids, and brief written materials aligned with what was discussed. In *breast and colorectal cancer clinics*, even a one-page summary of treatment intent and potential side effects measurably improved understanding. These tools do not replace conversation. They give patients something steady to revisit later. They reduce pressure on doctors to translate everything perfectly in a single sitting.

At times, doctors slow down without announcing it. They reach for a pen, turn a sheet of paper toward the patient, and draw a simple outline of the body. They mark where the cancer sits and talk through why pain occurs or why certain side effects happen. The sketches are rough and unpolished. But in that moment, something complicated becomes easier to grasp. What felt abstract begins to take shape, and fear feels a little less undefined.

In emergencies, that same clarity matters even more. Senior doctors speak plainly about what is happening and how serious it is. The fear does not vanish, but it no longer feels tangled in uncertainty.

Honest communication changes how decisions feel. When doctors explain clearly and include patients in discussions, trust grows. Being informed is not about controlling outcomes. It is about preserving dignity.

These efforts do not remove grief. They prevent misunderstanding from adding to it.

When Misunderstanding Affects Care

Misunderstanding also influences outcomes.

Osborne et al. (2013) and Mora-Pinzon et al. (2019) demonstrate that patients with limited health literacy are more likely to present with advanced-stage disease, experience challenges with symptom management, and face difficulty adhering to treatment plans. In breast and colorectal cancer populations, lower health literacy correlates with poorer care coordination and higher decisional regret.

What may appear as non-compliance often reflects communication that did not fully land at the right moment.

Street and colleagues, writing in the Journal of Clinical Oncology (2020), found that patients frequently avoid asking questions because they assume confusion reflects their own inadequacy. When doctors explicitly normalize uncertainty and invite clarification, patient engagement improves without extending consultation time.

Simply acknowledging that medical information can feel overwhelming alters the emotional climate of care.

When Informed Consent Is Not Fully Understood

Busch et al. (2015) showed that clinicians obtain signatures on consent forms and document treatment plans appropriately. Yet newly diagnosed patients often receive complex information in a single conversation and struggle to absorb it fully. Informed consent may meet ethical and legal standards on paper. In lived experience, understanding may remain partial.

Reviews published in 2024 in *JMIR Cancer* indicate that well-designed decision aids improve knowledge and reduce decisional regret. These tools translate complex options into structured comparisons that patients can review with family members. They support, rather than replace, clinical dialogue.

Consent becomes meaningful when doctors revisit it after emotional shock has softened and patients have had time to reflect.

Sanjeevani… Life Beyond Cancer: Creating Space for Understanding

Sanjeevani… Life Beyond Cancer supports people through cancer with a clear recognition of how overwhelming medical information can feel once patients leave the hospital environment. A consultation may last twenty or thirty minutes. Its emotional impact extends far beyond that.

After hospital visits, patients and families return home carrying details, fear, uncertainty, and questions they did not manage to ask.

Sanjeevani offers space without urgency. People pause. They speak openly. They revisit what they heard. Understanding often unfolds later, in quieter settings rather than clinical rooms.

Counsellors spend time listening as patients and families talk through concerns and confusion. These conversations frequently return to medical explanations shared earlier because strong emotions can interrupt comprehension. Counsellors revisit treatment plans, side effects, and

next steps in familiar language, connecting medical terminology to everyday experience so information settles more gradually.

At times, support involves helping people find their voice. Counsellors assist families in shaping questions for doctors. They help patients articulate what remains unclear. This guidance reduces the silence that can form around complex language and difficult decisions.

This work does not replace clinical care. It strengthens it. When patients receive time, continuity, and compassionate listening, they engage more confidently with treatment decisions.

Conclusion

Cancer care asks people to make decisions while their inner world feels unstable.

Research across countries consistently shows that systems can function with technical excellence and still leave patients uncertain. The issue is not a lack of expertise. It is a mismatch between how medicine communicates and how humans process information under emotional strain.

When language moves faster than understanding, people rarely object. They comply quietly. Later, confusion may surface as regret, distress, or mistrust.

This is not about softening hard truths. It is about recognizing that understanding unfolds gradually through repetition, reflection, and emotional steadiness.

Cancer will always bring uncertainty. Confusion does not need to intensify suffering. When systems deliberately meet people where they are, care becomes not only more effective but also more humane and more deserving of trust.

For families sitting outside intensive care units or at dining tables late at night, trying to interpret medical words, that difference matters deeply.

- **References:**

- JMIR Cancer (2024). Reviews on decision aids and decisional regret in oncology.
- Ryman et al. (2024). Health literacy in cancer care.
- McCarthy et al. (2012). Patient recall during early cancer consultations.
- Jansen et al. (2018). Follow-up explanations after cancer diagnosis.
- National Academies (2019). Improving health literacy in healthcare systems.
- Osborne et al. (2013). Health literacy and cancer outcomes.
- Mora-Pinzon et al. (2019). Health literacy and decision-making in breast cancer.
- Street et al. (2020). Communication and outcomes in oncology care.
- Busch et al. (2015). Informed consent in cancer treatment.
- Krieger et al. (2012). Improving understanding in patients with low health literacy.