




Who should be targeted first: background risk of non-participants

Hilliene J. van de Schootbrugge-Vandermeer, Esther Toes-Zoutendijk
on behalf of the Dutch National Colorectal Cancer Screening Working Group





Aim

What is the risk of CRC in different socio-demographic groups targeted for CRC screening?

Aim

What is the risk of CRC in
different socio-demographic
targeted for CRC screening?

CRC risk per subgroup

CRC risk by participation status

Yield of screening per subgroup

Stage distribution

	Screen-detected cancers	FIT interval cancers	Post-colonoscopy cancers	Non-participant cancers
I	47.4 %	21.5 %	33.1 %	15.0 %
II	18.6 %	23.5 %	20.3 %	23.2 %
III	26.5 %	31.3 %	29.7 %	33.9 %
IV	6.4 %	22.5 %	15.3 %	26.8 %
?	1.0 %	1.1 %	1.7 %	1.1 %
	<i>n = 6757</i>	<i>n = 2278</i>	<i>n = 119</i>	<i>n = 4148</i>



Stage distribution

	Screen-detected cancers	FIT interval cancers	Post-colonoscopy cancers	Non-participant cancers
I	47.4 %	21.5 %	33.1 %	15.0 %
II	18.6 %	23.5 %	20.3 %	23.2 %
III	26.5 %	31.3 %	29.7 %	33.9 %
IV	6.4 %	22.5 %	15.3 %	26.8 %
?	1.0 %	1.1 %	1.7 %	1.1 %
	<i>n = 6757</i>	<i>n = 2278</i>	<i>n = 119</i>	<i>n = 4148</i>



Stage distribution

	Screen-detected cancers	FIT interval cancers	Post-colonoscopy cancers	Non-participant cancers
I	47.4 %	21.5 %	33.1 %	15.0 %
II	18.6 %	23.5 %	20.3 %	23.2 %
III	26.5 %	31.3 %	29.7 %	33.9 %
IV	6.4 %	22.5 %	15.3 %	26.8 %
?	1.0 %	1.1 %	1.7 %	1.1 %
	<i>n = 6757</i>	<i>n = 2278</i>	<i>n = 119</i>	<i>n = 4148</i>




Stage distribution

	Screen-detected cancers	FIT interval cancers	Post-colonoscopy cancers	Non-participant cancers
I	66.0 %	45.0 %	53.4 %	38.2 %
II				
III	26.5 %	31.3 %	29.7 %	33.9 %
IV	6.4 %	22.5 %	15.3 %	26.8 %
?	1.0 %	1.1 %	1.7 %	1.1 %
	<i>n = 6757</i>	<i>n = 2278</i>	<i>n = 119</i>	<i>n = 4148</i>



Multivariate logistic regression

- Participation
- Sex
- Age
- Migration background
- Income
- Household type
- Education
- Employment status



LOGISTIC
REGRESSION




CRC
incidence




Risk by sex

- Sex
- Age
- Migration background
- Income
- Household type
- Education
- Employment status




Risk by age

- Sex ✓
- Age
- Migration background
- Income
- Household type
- Education
- Employment status




Risk by migration background

- Sex ✓
- Age ✓
- Migration background
- Income
- Household type
- Education
- Employment status




Risk by income

- Sex ✓
- Age ✓
- Migration background ✓
- Income
- Household type
- Education
- Employment status




Risk by household type

- Sex ✓
- Age ✓
- Migration background ✓
- Income ✓
- Household type**
- Education
- Employment status




Risk by level of education

- Sex ✓
- Age ✓
- Migration background ✓
- Income ✗
- Household type ✓
- Education
- Employment status



Risk by employment status

- Sex ✓
- Age ✓
- Migration background ✓
- Income ✗
- Household type ✓
- Education ✓
- Employment status



Other findings

1

Stage shift through screening is similar for groups with low and high CRC incidence

2

Relative risk of CRC of non-participants compared to participants is 1.16

3

Yield of screening higher for males and those with low income

Conclusion



Males

Higher CRC risk, lower participation



Turkish / Moroccan migration background

Lower CRC risk, lower participation



Income

Only significant effect on CRC risk for participants





WEO

World Endoscopy
Organization

Erasmus MC

Universitair Medisch Centrum Rotterdam



Thank you!

h.vandermeer@erasmusmc.nl

