

Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.

Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic–related Colorectal Cancer Screening Delays Impact Unscreened Older Adults the Most, But Mitigation Strategies Exist

C olorectal cancer (CRC) screening between ages 50 and 75 years is a US Preventive Services Task Force Grade A recommendation.¹ The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic initially decreased CRC screening participation by as much as 82%,² and new variants continue to disrupt preventive care. Screening colonoscopy is more vulnerable to pandemic-related delays than the fecal immunochemical test (FIT).² We estimated the potential clinical impact of pandemic-related interruptions in CRC screening on the US population.

Using a validated CRC Markov model³ with a lifetime horizon, we evaluated 3 average-risk CRC cohorts: unscreened at age 50; unscreened at age 65, the age of Medicare eligibility; and screened at age 50 and due for screening colonoscopy at age 60. CRC risk was adjusted to birth cohort.³

We assessed the impact on CRC incidence and mortality in the United States of 1- and 2-year delays vs prompt screening colonoscopy every 10 years or an annual FIT through age 75, with surveillance colonoscopy through age 80. We then explored "rescue" strategies including FITbased CRC screening for a postulated 1 or 2 years as ac-cess to colonoscopy may be limited by the pandemic⁵; extended CRC screening past age 75 to ages 76 or 77 and CRC surveillance past age 80 to ages 81 or 82, both consistent with a US Preventive Services Task Force Grade C recommendation, to "make up" for the postulated 1 or 2 years of pandemic-related limited colonoscopy access; or a combination of the strategies above. Outcomes were CRC incidence and deaths per 100,000 individuals for each birth cohort.

Figure 1*A* and *B* demonstrates the effect of 1- or 2-year delays on colonoscopy-based CRC screening for 50- and 65-year-old average-risk cohorts previously unscreened for CRC. For unscreened 50-year-olds (Figure 1*A*), a 1- or 2-year delay in initiation of colonoscopy diminished the reduction in CRC incidence (70% to 69%) and CRC-related mortality (76% to 75%) by 1 absolute percentage point each. Rescue strategies were effective in mitigating or negating the impact of a 1- or 2-year CRC screening delay. From most to least effective were the combined strategy of FIT-based CRC screening when access to colonoscopy was limited, plus extension of the upper ages for screening/surveillance colonoscopy; extension of CRC screening in lieu of colonoscopy screening.

For unscreened 65-year-olds (Figure 1B), a 1- or 2year delay in initiation of colonoscopy resulted in a
diminished reduction by 12%-14% absolute percentage
points of CRC incidence (66% to 53%-54%) and CRCrelated mortality (74% to 60%). Starting at age 65

afforded individuals 2 lifetime colonoscopies, as opposed to 1 at age 66 or later, given that CRC screening ended at age 75. Rescue strategies decreased but did not negate the impact of pandemic-related CRC screening delays.

Figure 1*C* and *D* demonstrates the effect of 1- or 2-year delays on FIT-based CRC screening for 50- and 65-year-old average-risk cohorts previously unscreened for CRC. For unscreened 50-year-olds (Figure 1*C*), a 1- or 2-year delay in initiation of a FIT resulted in an absolute 1% per-year diminution in reduction of both CRC incidence (58% to 57% [1-year delay] to 56% [2-year delay]) and CRC-related mortality (71% to 70% [1-year delay] and 69% [2-year delay]). Extension of CRC screening/surveillance periods was effective in mitigating or negating the impact of these delays.

For unscreened 65-year-olds (Figure 1*D*), a 1- or 2-year delay in initiation of a FIT resulted in an absolute 3% peryear decrease in reduction in CRC incidence (44% to 41% [1-year delay] to 38% [2-year delay]) and CRC-related mortality (60% to 57% [1-year delay] to 54% [2-year delay]). Extending FIT-based CRC screening/surveillance reduced but did not negate the impact of CRC screening delays.

In a cohort of individuals who started colonoscopybased CRC screening at age 50 (Supplementary Figure 1), a 1- or 2-year delay in CRC screening at age 60 resulted in minimal decreases in reduction in CRC incidence and mortality. Rescue strategies mitigated or negated the impact from CRC screening delays and included FIT-based screening when colonoscopy was unavailable, with or without extended screening through ages 75 or 76.

In summary, COVID-19 pandemic–related 1- and 2-year delays in CRC screening were estimated to result in a minimal impact on the CRC incidence and mortality reductions achieved by screening in previously unscreened 50- and in 60-year-olds due for rescreening colonoscopy, but substantial blunting was found of the benefit of screening in previously unscreened 65-year-olds, especially if age 75 is strictly applied as the upper age limit for screening colonoscopy. The impact of delaying colonoscopy by a single year was pronounced in the 65-year-old unscreened cohort given the reduction of lifetime screening colonoscopies from 2 to 1. Rescue strategies for pandemic-related delays could

Abbreviations used in this paper: COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; CRC, colorectal cancer; FIT, fecal immunochemical test.

ARTICLE IN PRESS

2 Sharaf et al

Gastroenterology Vol. ■, No. ■



Figure 1. Impact of postulated 1- and 2-year pandemic-related delays in CRC screening on CRC-related incidence and mortality for unscreened 50- and 65-year-olds. Delays of 1–2 years in CRC screening initiation had significantly lower impact on the 50-year-old cohort (*A* and *C*) compared with the 65-year-old cohort (*B* and *D*). Rescue strategies in the 65-year-old cohort, unlike for the 50-year-old cohort, decreased but could not negate the impact of pandemic-related CRC screening delays. COLO *x*-*y*, screening colonoscopy initiation at age *x* years and termination at *y* years; FIT *x*-*y*, FIT screening initiation at age *x* years continuing with colonoscopy at age *y* years (screening stops at age 75).

negate reductions in CRC incidence and mortality for previously unscreened 50- and in 60-year-olds due for rescreening colonoscopy but not for previously unscreened 65year-olds.

Our study has limitations. Costs or incremental cost-effectiveness ratios were not calculated; as such, eco-nomic implications could not be assessed. We modeled specific scenarios, although results can be extrapolated. We did not model a cohort of those with early signs and symptoms of CRC, but this would empirically be a priority group for colonoscopy during a period of limited re-sources. Other studies have modeled the pandemic's ef-fects on CRC screening, primarily in non-US populations,

using only a FIT or colonoscopy^{5–9} but showed that similar rescue strategies can mitigate pandemic-related effects on CRC screening.

Our work suggests that among the 20% of the US population aged 50–75 years who are unscreened for CRC,¹⁰ older adults would experience the most clinical benefit from CRC screening if resources were limited during the COVID-19 pandemic; younger unscreened individuals and those awaiting CRC rescreening colonos-copy would be less affected. Pandemic-related delays could be mitigated or nullified by strategies including use of the FIT or an extended age window for CRC screening.

ARTICLE IN PRES

Clinical Impact of Pandemic-related Interruptions in CRC Screening

Supplementary Material

Note: To access the supplementary material accompanying this article, visit the online version of Gastroenterology at www.gastrojournal.org and at https://doi.org/10.1053/ j.gastro.2022.08.035.

Q5 RAVI N. SHARAF*

- Division of Gastroenterology
- Department of Medicine
- Division of Epidemiology
- Department of Population Health Sciences
- Weill Cornell Medical Cancer
- Jay Monahan Center for Gastrointestinal Health
- New York, New York

SOHAM SINHA

257	Division of Epidemiology
258	Department of Population Health Sciences
259	Weill Cornell Medicine
260	New York, New York
261	

ZIXUAN LI

263	ZIXUAN LI
264	Division of Epidemiology
265	Department of Population Health Sciences
265	Weill Cornell Medicine
200	Now Vork Now Vork
267	NEW IOIK, NEW IOIK

ARI BAR-MASHIAH

270	Department of Medicine
271	
2/1	Weill Cornell Medicine

- Weill Cornell Medicine
- New York, New York

URI LADABAUM

275	URI LADABAUM
276	Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatolog
277	Stanford University School of Medicine
278	Redwood City, California

	,	
	References	Q2 301
1.	https://uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/uspstf/draft-	302
	recommendation/colorectal-cancer-screening3.	303
2.	National Cancer Institute's PROSPR Consortium, et al.	. 304
	Gastroenterology 2020.	Q3 305
3.	Ladabaum U, et al. Gastroenterology 2019;157: 137–148.	: 306 307
4.	Dekker E, et al. Gastroenterology 2020;159: 1998–2003.	: 308 309
5.	de Jonge L. et al. Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol 2021.	310
6.	Ricciardiello L. et al. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2020.	311
7.	Loveday C. et al. Gut 2020.	312
8.	Kreating LM. et al. Br J Cancer 2021:124:1516–1523.	313
9.	Issaka RB. et al. JAMA Netw Open 2021:4:e21654.	314
10.	https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/colorectal/statistics/use-	315
	screening-tests-BRFSS.htm.	316
		317
		- 318
Rec	eived April 22, 2021. Accepted August 16, 2022.	319
Corr	respondence	320
Add	ress correspondence to: Ravi N. Sharaf, MD, MS, Division of troenterology Department of Medicine Division of Epidemiology	f 321
Depa	artment of Population Health Sciences, Weill Cornell Medical Cancer	, 324 , 202
Jay	Monahan Center for Gastrointestinal Health, 1315 York Avenue Ground r New York NY 10021 e-mail: ras9030@med.cornell.edu	1 323
1100		324
CRe	diT Authorship Contributions Sharaf, MD, MS (Concentualization: Lead: Formal analysis: Lead: Project	52. + 274
adm	inistration: Lead; Software: Lead; Visualization: Lead; Writing – origina	l 320
draft	: Lead; Writing – review & editing: Lead).	327
origi	nal draft: Supporting; Writing – review & editing: Supporting).	320
Zi	xuan Li, MS (Formal analysis: Equal; Software: Equal; Visualization: Equal)	. 330
Ur	i Ladabaum, MD, MS (Conceptualization: Equal; Formal analysis: Equal	; 331
Meth	nodology: Equal; Supervision: Equal; Writing – review & editing: Equal).	332
Con	flicts of Interest	333
This	author discloses the following: Uri Ladabaum is advisor to Universal Dx	334
and Heal	th, and Freenome. The remaining authors disclose no conflicts.	335
_	· ·	336
Fund This	study was supported by grant K07CA216326 from the National Cance	r Q 4 337
Instit	tute to Ravi Sharaf.	338
		339
		340

ARTICLE IN PRESS

3.e1 Sharaf et al

Gastroenterology Vol. ■, No. ■

