

Colorectal cancer screening based on predicted risk: a pilot randomized controlled trial

Ekaterina Plys¹, Jean-Luc Bulliard¹, Aziz Chaouch¹, Marie-Anne Durand^{1,2}, Luuk A. van Duuren^{1,3}, Karen Braendle¹, Reto Auer^{1,4}, Florian Froehlich⁵, Iris Lansdorp Vogelaar³, Douglas A. Corley⁶, Kevin Selby¹

¹ University Center for Primary Care and Public Health (Unisanté), University of Lausanne, Route de Berne 113, 1010 Lausanne, Switzerland;

² The Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy & Clinical Practice, Dartmouth College, Lebanon, NH, USA;

³ Department of Public Health, Erasmus University Medical Centre, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, Dr. Molewaterplein 40, 3015 Rotterdam, the Netherlands

⁴ Institute of Primary Health Care (BIHAM), University of Bern, Mittelstrasse 43, 3012 Bern, Switzerland;

⁵ Department of Gastroenterology, University Hospital of Basel, Petersgraben 4, 4031 Basel, and Jura district Hospital, Route de Bure, 2900 Porrentruy;

⁶ Division of Research, Kaiser Permanente Northern California, 2000 Broadway, Oakland, CA 94612, California, the US.

Target journal: CGH, word count: 4,000 words (inclusive of main text; references; table/figure legends), Abstract: 260 words max.

Abbreviations:

FIT: fecal immunochemical test

CRC: Colorectal cancer

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Correspondence: Ekaterina Plys, email: catherine.plys@gmail.com , address:

Route de Berne 113, 1010 Lausanne, Switzerland. Telephone number:

+41787114215

Grant Support: This study was financed by a grant from the Swiss Cancer Research Foundation (KLS 5111-08-2020). The Kevin Selby's salary is in part paid by the Fondation Leenaards.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the 6 citizen partners who contributed throughout the study (Janine Chabloz, Simone de Rougemont, Ernest Frischknecht, Cruces Gaulis, Marie-Jo Magnin, et Jean-Marc Zaugg). We would like to thank Sarah Hediger and Angèle Bettens for their help preparing mailings. Finally, we would like to thank the participants for their trust and responses.

Disclosures: Marie-Anne Durand has contributed to the development of Option Grid patient decision aids. EBSCO Information Services sells subscription access to Option Grid patient decision aids. She receives consulting income from EBSCO Health, and royalties. No other competing interests declared from her or the other investigators.

Data Transparency Statement: The data set generated and analyzed during this study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Abstract (264 words, max 260 words)

Background & Aims: Colorectal cancer (CRC) screening relies primarily on colonoscopy and fecal immunochemical testing (FIT). Aligning utilization of these options with individual CRC risk (i.e. personalized screening) may maximize benefit with lower risks, individual burdens, and societal costs. We studied the effect of communicating personalized CRC risk and corresponding screening recommendations on appropriate screening uptake in an organized screening setting.

Methods: Pilot randomized controlled trial among residents aged 50-69 years old not yet invited for screening in Vaud, Switzerland. The intervention was a mailed brochure communicating individual 15-year CRC risk and corresponding screening recommendation. The control group received a brochure comparing FIT and colonoscopy. The primary outcome was self-reported risk-appropriate screening (FIT if <3% risk, FIT or colonoscopy if $\geq 3\%$ and <6%, colonoscopy if $\geq 6\%$), assessed by a mailed questionnaire at 6 months. A secondary outcome was overall screening uptake.

Results: Of 5396 invitations, 1059 people responded (19%), of whom 258 were randomized to intervention and 257 to control materials (average 15-year risk 1.4% (SD 0.5), age 52.2 years (SD 2.2), 51% women). Risk-appropriate screening completion was 37% in the intervention group and 23% in the control group (absolute difference 14%, 95%CI 6%-22%, $p < 0.001$). Overall screening uptake was 50% in the intervention and 49% in the control group (absolute difference 1%, 95CI -7%-10%, $p = 0.758$).

Conclusions: In a population not known to be at elevated CRC risk, brochures providing personalized CRC risk and screening recommendations improved risk-appropriate screening without impacting overall screening uptake. This approach could be helpful for aligning screening methods, risks, and benefits with cancer risk.

Trial registration: Clinicaltrials.gov NCT05357508.

Keywords

Colorectal cancer screening; personalized screening; risk communication; organized screening, White/Caucasian

What You Need to Know

Background

Colorectal cancer can be effectively prevented by screening using colonoscopy or fecal immunochemical test (FIT). Optimizing use of colonoscopy resources is crucial to reduce screening burden for patients and society.

Findings

After reading our intervention brochure, participants were 14% more likely to choose the screening test appropriate to their risk level. This result did not impact overall screening participation.

Implications for patient care

Risk-based screening recommendations for FIT or colonoscopy could be a means of better allocating colonoscopy resources in countries relying heavily on colonoscopy for screening, thus decreasing the burden of CRC screening for low-risk participants.

Introduction

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the third most common cancer in men and second most common in women, causing approximately 700 000 deaths worldwide every year [1]. The long pre-clinical development of the disease allows for screening to reduce CRC incidence and mortality [2, 3]. In Switzerland 48% of the population aged above 50 was up to date with screening in 2017, and 43% had had a screening or diagnostic colonoscopy within the last 10 years [4]. Although colonoscopy is preferred because of its high sensitivity for CRC and advanced adenomas [5], there is no direct evidence for its superiority compared to the Fecal immunochemical test (FIT) in an organized screening setting to detect cancers [6] and prevent CRC mortality [7], especially among individuals at low or average risk of cancer. Moreover, colonoscopy exposes individuals to potential complications [2]. When overused as a screening method, it occupies gastroenterologist resources, resulting in longer waiting time for the individuals with symptoms and higher health-related costs for society [8].

Personalized CRC screening could decrease overuse of colonoscopy by reserving this method for individuals at high risk and orienting others to FIT. Personalized screening includes estimating individual risk for CRC and providing screening recommendations appropriate to that risk level. This could diminish potential harm related to screening, namely the burden of colonoscopy preparation, risk of side-effects, and inappropriate expenditure [9]. However, it could also cause anxiety and a sense of inevitability when participants are communicated their personal risk by mail, without a healthcare provider.

The impact of personalized screening recommendations on appropriate screening is not clearly understood. Most studies have tested its influence on overall screening uptake, with multiple studies and a meta-analysis concluding that personalized risk

information results in little to no effect [10-14]. Only two studies focused on appropriate screening, meaning use of colonoscopy by those at high risk and non-invasive tests by those at low risk [15, 16]. It appears that communicating risk alone without personalized screening recommendations is insufficient to influence individuals' decision about screening test [16]. Emery et al [15] showed an increase of 21% in risk-appropriate screening after communicating risk-based recommendations. However, risk and screening recommendations were communicated to participants by health providers in primary care, which is a challenging strategy in an organized screening setting.

The primary aim of this trial was to study whether communicating individual CRC risk and screening recommendations with written materials has an effect on appropriate screening uptake at six months. We hypothesized that participants at low risk would be more likely to undergo a FIT and participants at high risk a colonoscopy.

Methods

This study followed the CONSORT Guidelines for reporting outcomes in trial reports [17]. The trial was registered prior to inclusion of the first participant and later published [18].

Trial design

This was a monocentric, two-arm randomized controlled superiority trial with participants randomized 1:1 in the intervention and the control arms. The trial was nested in the CRC screening program of the canton of Vaud, Switzerland.

Participants

Recruitment took place between June and September 2022 in the canton of Vaud.

We included people aged between 50 and 69 years old who had not yet been invited to the cantonal organized CRC screening program. Individuals were excluded if they had symptoms suggestive of CRC, personal history of CRC, advanced adenoma or inflammatory bowel disease, genetic syndromes representing high risk for CRC (i.e., Lynch syndrome), if they were up-to-date with screening (colonoscopy within 9 years or FIT within 1.5 years) or expected to leave Switzerland during the 6-months follow-up. These exclusion criteria were verified using our self-administered recruitment questionnaire. See Figure 1 and Supplementary Figure 1 for details.

Intervention and comparator

The intervention consisted of mailing participants a brochure containing their 15-year CRC risk and corresponding screening recommendations. The individuals at low risk (<3%) were recommended the FIT, those at high risk ($\geq 6\%$) were recommended colonoscopy, and those at moderate risk (3-6%) were offered a choice between the FIT and colonoscopy.

The intervention was based on the health belief model [19]. This model posits that people are more likely to adopt a health-protecting behavior if they believe they are susceptible, the illness is severe, the recommended behavior is efficient, and when they feel higher self-efficacy [19]. It was expected that, after the intervention, people at high risk would feel more susceptible and would therefore complete colonoscopy, whereas people at low risk would feel less susceptible and prefer the non-invasive FIT. Screening recommendations were expected to increase self-efficacy. Brochures for those at low risk informed them that zero risk didn't exist and strongly

recommended a screening test. As there are no strong recommendations for the individuals at moderate risk, the brochure presented FIT and colonoscopy as equally reasonable. The control brochure was the standard brochure used by the Vaud screening program, which presented the advantages and disadvantages of both FIT and colonoscopy. It did not include personalized risk or risk-based screening recommendations. For more information, see [Supplemental materials](#) and our study protocol [18].

An individual's personal 15-year CRC risk score was calculated using the QCancer-colorectal risk calculator [20]. This open-source tool developed and validated in the United Kingdom assigns individuals aged 40 to 69 years old to the correct risk group 66-70% of the time [21, 22]. For this study, the QCancer algorithm was modified slightly by excluding postal code, ethnicity, ulcerative colitis, and colonic polyps as risk factors (see [18] for details). Based on the obtained risk score, individuals were divided in three risk levels: low risk (<3%), moderate risk (3% - 6%), and high risk ($\geq 6\%$), based in part on the 3% threshold of the BMJ Rapid Recommendation [23].

Recruitment and data collection procedures

The study included three phases. At T0, 6200 invitations with consent and the recruitment questionnaires were mailed, which allowed us to verify eligibility for the study and calculate CRC risk. At T1, right after receiving consent, the participants received intervention or control materials, questionnaire 2 and an information sheet to facilitate discussion about screening with their general practitioner or pharmacist. At T2, 6 months after the intervention, screening behavior was measured using the follow-up questionnaire. Because mailings and return can take several weeks, responses were accepted up to 8 months after the intervention. The consent and all three questionnaires were available in electronic and paper form on the REDCap

platform [24]. All study documents were written in French. For more details on the procedure, see our study protocol [18].

Outcome measures

Our primary outcome was self-reported appropriate screening uptake measured 6 months after the intervention. Screening was considered appropriate when participants at low risk completed FIT, those at high risk completed colonoscopy, and those at moderate risk completed colonoscopy or FIT. Since waiting time for colonoscopy can be long [8], a colonoscopy appointment was considered as a completed test.

Secondary outcomes

Overall screening participation (at T2) was calculated as the proportion of individuals who completed any CRC screening test.

Anxiety related to the printed materials (at T1) was assessed using six items adapted from the Spilberger's State-Trait Anxiety Inventory [25]. Participants were asked to respond to these items after having read the brochure.

See [Supplementary materials](#) for the questionnaires in French and English.

Quality assurance, citizen engagement, and ethical considerations

Only validated questionnaires or questionnaires pre-tested in previous studies were used. After entering data in REDCap [24], 20% of responses collected using paper questionnaires were double checked. Five individuals of the target population (a citizen advisory group) were involved in development of the materials for participants, and in interpretation and dissemination of the results. The trial was monitored by an institutional monitoring team and received approval from the Ethics committee of the canton of Vaud on March 2, 2022 (project ID 2021-02431).

Sample size

Estimations of the sample size were explained in detail in our study protocol [18]. It was expected that 60% of the individuals eligible for screening would be at low risk, 10% at high risk, and 30% at moderate risk. Our intervention was expected to increase appropriate screening in low and high-risk participants, but not those at moderate risk. To detect a difference of 10% between groups with power of 80% and an alpha of 5%, we needed 393 individuals in each group. After considering attrition of about 10%, the final sample size was estimated at 440 individuals in each group (880 in total).

During recruitment, we realized that nearly all participants eligible for the study were at low risk, leading us to recalculate our sample size. With 95% of participants at low risk, we would need 451 participants in total to have 80% power to detect a 15% change in appropriate screening.

Randomization

The REDCap automatic randomization module was programmed with the block factor varying between 4 and 8. Randomization was carried out after entering the risk score and risk level by clicking on the button “Randomize”. The trial team member who carried out the randomization was not blinded. Participants were told that the study aim was to compare two brochures on CRC screening. They, therefore, were not aware of group assignment. The trial statistician who conducted the primary outcome analyses was blinded to participants’ group assignments.

Statistical methods

Intention to treat analyses were conducted. Randomization quality was tested using a 2-tailed chi-squared or Fisher exact tests for categorical variables; Student's t-test or Mann-Whitney U tests were used for continuous variables. The primary outcome was analyzed using 2-tailed chi-squared test. Participants who refused screening and those who did not respond to the follow-up questionnaire were treated as not having done a screening test in both groups. Pre-specified subgroup analyses for the main outcome were performed by sex, nationality, education, occupation, French proficiency level, household size, family history of CRC and polyps using a proportion test. The overall participation was tested using 2-tailed chi-squared test. The other secondary analyses were conducted using 2-tailed t-test. Data analyses were performed using the Stata 16 [33] and R software packages [32].

Important changes to methods after trial commencement

After trial commencement, several modifications to the protocol were made. Given the lower than expected response rate after the first wave of invitations in May – June 2022, 2000 more invitations were sent in August – September 2022. An additional letter was sent to the participants to communicate their identification code in the Vaud screening program as this information is mandatory to activate the participants' personal file in the screening program database. The primary outcome's data collection procedure was also slightly changed. In addition to the mailed questionnaire, the participants who had not responded were contacted by the phone, which allowed us to collect an additional 27 responses.

Data Sharing

Deidentified individual participant data are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Results

Participant characteristics

Of 6,200 mailed invitations, 5,396 went to a valid address, 1,059 individuals responded to the invitation letter (19.6% of valid addresses), and 946 signed the main consent form (17.5%). Among them, 318 were excluded because they did not meet inclusion criteria (Table 1), 87 because they responded after the end of the recruitment, 19 because they did not complete questionnaire 1, and seven because of an error at randomization (see Figure 1 and Table 1). The remaining 515 participants were randomized to the intervention (n=258) or the control group (n=257). The mean age was 52.2 years (SD=2.2) and the mean 15-year CRC risk was 1.4% (SD=0.5). Stratification by risk level showed that 98.1% (n=505) of the participants were at low risk, 1.9% (n=10) were at moderate risk and 0 at high risk. Sociodemographic characteristics, family history of polyps or CRC, and the baseline intention to be screened were similar between intervention and control groups (Table 2). Post-randomization, five withdrawals were registered in the intervention group and 3 in the control group. Seven participants withdrew without giving any reason and one because of insufficient knowledge of French. An additional two participants were excluded post-randomization at T1 (1 from the intervention and 1 from the control group) as they had done screening before receiving our printed materials. Finally, 42 participants (16 in the intervention and 26 in the control group) did not complete the

follow-up questionnaire after reminders (see Figure 1). Participants without data for the primary outcome were assumed to not have completed a screening.

Figure 1. Flowchart of participants

=== Insert Figure 1 here ===

Table 1. Exclusion reasons.

Note: multiple reasons for exclusion are possible.

Table 2. Participants baseline characteristics.

FIT: fecal immunochemical test

Primary outcome

At 6 months, 37% of the participants who received the intervention underwent risk-appropriate screening compared to 23% in the control group (14% absolute increase, 95% CI 6% to 22%). Results are represented in Table 3. Subgroup analysis by sex, education, French level, household size, and family history of CRC and polyps for the main outcome did not reveal statistically significant heterogeneity in the effect of the intervention between groups (see Supplementary table 2). There was a trend towards a greater effect of the intervention on women than men.

Table 3. Proportions of screening tests completed by participants at low and moderate risk by group.

Secondary outcomes

Overall screening uptake was 50% participation in the intervention and 49% in the control group (1% absolute difference, 95% CI -0.07, 0.1). Subgroup analyses by sex, education, French level, household size, and family history of CRC and polyps did not reveal significant differences between groups (see Supplementary table 3). Anxiety related to the intervention was low in both groups with the mean of 1.5 (SD=0.5) in the intervention group and 1.6 (SD=0.5) in the control group. The 2-tailed t-test revealed a t-statistic of -1.449 (df=444) and p=0.15. As the mean anxiety was low, no subgroup analyses were performed.

Discussion

This trial aimed at studying the effect of communicating personalized CRC risk and risk-appropriate screening recommendations on participants' screening behavior. Participants who received the intervention were 14% more likely to undergo risk-appropriate screening compared to control group participants, who received materials comparing colonoscopy and FIT as equal options. Overall screening participation was not affected by the intervention. These results support the use of personalized screening recommendations to better allocate colonoscopy resources in areas offering direct screening colonoscopy.

Our main results are in line with Emery et al. [15] in which personalized screening increased risk appropriate screening by 21%. Their intervention was delivered in person and followed by a consultation with a general practitioner who could order a fecal blood test or book a colonoscopy appointment. In our study, the intervention was a mailed brochure. Although the brochure explained how to access screening, additional steps were required to get a FIT kit or to book a colonoscopy appointment.

We believe that for a study with a simple design without face-to-face interactions and medical staff involvement, the increase in 14% in risk-appropriate screening is a promising result. This result could be because we gave a clear recommendation about screening along with individual risk information.

We had a greater impact on appropriate screening than Skinner et al. [16], who did not show a significant impact of communicated risk and multiple screening. We suppose that recommending more than one screening option could hamper decision-making and reduce screening uptake. In our study, we recommended FIT to the people at low risk. Colonoscopy was presented as an alternative option if the participant did not agree with our recommendation. We intentionally used short and tailored messages to avoid overwhelming the participants with the information and facilitate decision making.

In our study, overall screening uptake did not differ between groups which is in line with findings of Skinner et al [16], Rawl et al [10], and Yen et al [11]. It seems that communicating risk and screening recommendations is insufficient to enhance overall screening uptake. Other interventions like mailed FIT and patient navigation are more effective for increasing CRC screening rates [26].

There has been considerable uncertainty about how to incorporate CRC risk stratification models into organized CRC screening, including concerns that participants may not accept recommendations for less sensitive tests [27, 28].

Personalized screening could be incorporated into organized screening programs as a means of reassuring participants that FIT is appropriate for them. In Switzerland, between 2007 and 2017, fecal blood tests rates decreased from 11% to 5.2% and screening colonoscopy rates increased from 8.2% to 24.9% [4]. Reorienting people at

low risk to FIT would help to offer screening with better risk-benefit balance and use resources more efficiently.

Anxiety related to the brochures was low and did not differ between groups. This is in line with the studies conducted by Smith et al [12] and van Erkelens [29] and the meta-analysis by Edwards [13], which did not reveal an increase in anxiety related to risk-based interventions.

Strengths and limitations

This is one of the first studies examining the impact of personalized CRC risk and screening recommendations on appropriate screening. By nesting the study in an organized program, we were able to recruit a representative portion of the target population and to test an intervention suitable for widespread adoption. Quality of the collected data were ensured by the institutional trial monitoring team and the study steering committee. A citizen advisory group co-designed the study materials.

Our study did have limitations. Only individuals who had not yet been invited to the Program were recruited, which resulted in the inclusion of a younger population with a mean age of 52 years old. Because of the strong influence of age on CRC risk, we therefore had no high-risk participants and could not study screening behavior in people at high risk. In further studies, more effort should be done to recruit such populations.

Our study materials were available only in French. Although the intervention and control brochures were written in plain language and approved by the citizen advisory group, people with limited health literacy could have had difficulties participating. Finally, our recruitment procedure required signing a consent form and completing questionnaires prior to receiving the study materials. This may have created a

selection bias with only motivated individuals included in the study. This would limit our ability to extrapolate our participation rates to routine screening.

Conclusion

This trial demonstrated that an intervention brochure that communicates CRC risk and appropriate screening recommendations can increase risk-appropriate screening uptake among people at low risk without impacting overall participation rate. Future research should evaluate the impact of this approach on high-risk individuals and the impact of personalized screening on the detection of advanced neoplasia. The current results will be valuable for screening programs in Switzerland and other settings relying primarily on screening colonoscopy to optimize CRC screening.

Bibliography

1. Gandomani, H.S., et al., *Colorectal cancer in the world: incidence, mortality and risk factors*. Biomedical Research and Therapy, 2017. **4**(10): p. 1656-1675.
2. Carroll, M.R., H.E. Seaman, and S.P. Halloran, *Tests and investigations for colorectal cancer screening*. Clin Biochem, 2014. **47**(10-11): p. 921-39.
3. Brenner, H., C. Stock, and M. Hoffmeister, *Effect of screening sigmoidoscopy and screening colonoscopy on colorectal cancer incidence and mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials and observational studies*. Bmj, 2014. **348**: p. g2467.
4. Schneider, R., et al., *Ten-year changes in colorectal cancer screening in Switzerland: The Swiss Health Interview Survey 2007, 2012 and 2017*. Prev Med Rep, 2022. **27**: p. 101815.
5. Sandoval, J.L., et al., *Screening Status as a Determinant of Choice of Colorectal Cancer Screening Method: A Population-Based Informed Survey*. Gastrointest Tumors, 2021. **8**(2): p. 63-70.
6. Quintero, E., et al., *Colonoscopy versus Fecal Immunochemical Testing in Colorectal-Cancer Screening*. New England Journal of Medicine, 2012. **366**(8): p. 697-706.
7. Lauby-Secretan, B., et al., *The IARC Perspective on Colorectal Cancer Screening*. N Engl J Med, 2018. **378**(18): p. 1734-1740.
8. Brändle, K., et al., *Première évaluation du programme vaudois de dépistage du cancer colorectal, 2015-2020*, in (Raisons de santé 335). 2022, Unisanté – Centre universitaire de médecine générale et santé publique: Lausanne.
9. von Karsa, L., J. Patnick, and N. Segnan, *European guidelines for quality assurance in colorectal cancer screening and diagnosis. First Edition--Executive summary*. Endoscopy, 2012. **44 Suppl 3**: p. Se1-8.
10. Rawl, S.M., et al., *A randomized trial of two print interventions to increase colon cancer screening among first-degree relatives*. Patient Educ Couns, 2008. **71**(2): p. 215-27.
11. Yen, T., et al., *Randomized Controlled Trial of Personalized Colorectal Cancer Risk Assessment vs Education to Promote Screening Uptake*. Am J Gastroenterol, 2021. **116**(2): p. 391-400.
12. Smith, S.K., et al., *A decision aid to support informed choices about bowel cancer screening among adults with low education: randomised controlled trial*. BMJ, 2010. **341**: p. c5370.
13. Edwards, A.G., et al., *Personalised risk communication for informed decision making about taking screening tests*. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2013(2): p. CD001865.
14. Chen, H., et al., *Comparison of Colonoscopy, Fecal Immunochemical Test, and Risk-Adapted Approach in a Colorectal Cancer Screening Trial (TARGET-C)*. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol, 2023. **21**(3): p. 808-818.
15. Emery, J.D., et al., *The Colorectal cancer RiSk Prediction (CRISP) trial: a randomised controlled trial of a decision support tool for risk-stratified colorectal cancer screening*. Br J Gen Pract, 2023. **73**(733): p. e556-e565.
16. Skinner, C.S., et al., *Impact of Risk Assessment and Tailored versus Nontailored Risk Information on Colorectal Cancer Testing in Primary Care: A Randomized Controlled Trial*. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev, 2015. **24**(10): p. 1523-30.
17. Butcher, N.J., et al., *Guidelines for Reporting Outcomes in Trial Reports: The CONSORT-Outcomes 2022 Extension*. Jama, 2022. **328**(22): p. 2252-2264.
18. Plys, E., et al., *Colorectal Cancer Screening Decision Based on Predicted Risk: Protocol for a Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial*. JMIR Res Protoc, 2023. **12**: p. e46865.
19. Rosenstock, I.M., *Historical origins of the health belief model*. Health education monographs, 1974. **2**(4): p. 328-335.
20. Hippisley-Cox, J. and C. Coupland, *Identifying patients with suspected colorectal cancer in primary care: derivation and validation of an algorithm*. Br J Gen Pract, 2012. **62**(594): p. e29-37.

21. Hippisley-Cox, J. and C. Coupland, *Development and validation of risk prediction algorithms to estimate future risk of common cancers in men and women: prospective cohort study*. *BMJ Open*, 2015. **5**(3): p. e007825.
22. Usher-Smith, J.A., et al., *Risk Prediction Models for Colorectal Cancer: A Systematic Review*. *Cancer Prev Res (Phila)*, 2016. **9**(1): p. 13-26.
23. Helsingen, L.M., et al., *Colorectal cancer screening with faecal immunochemical testing, sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopy: a clinical practice guideline*. *BMJ*, 2019. **367**: p. l5515.
24. Harris, P.A., et al., *Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support*. *J Biomed Inform*, 2009. **42**(2): p. 377-81.
25. Gauthier, J. and S. Bouchard, *Adaptation canadienne-française de la forme révisée du State-Trait Anxiety Inventory de Spielberger*. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 1993. **25**(4): p. 559.
26. Issaka, R.B., et al., *Population health interventions to improve colorectal cancer screening by fecal immunochemical tests: A systematic review*. *Prev Med*, 2019. **118**: p. 113-121.
27. Moussa, M.A., *Clinical trial size: fixed versus group-sequential designs*. *Methods Inf Med*, 1986. **25**(4): p. 233-6.
28. Taylor, L.C., et al., *Acceptability of risk stratification within population-based cancer screening from the perspective of the general public: A mixed-methods systematic review*. *Health Expect*, 2023. **26**(3): p. 989-1008.
29. van Erkelens, A., et al., *An online self-test added to colorectal cancer screening can increase the effectiveness of familial cancer risk assessment without increasing distress*. *Colorectal Dis*, 2018. **20**(10): p. 897-904.

Tables

Table 1. Exclusion reasons

Exclusion reason	n	%
Total excluded	505	100
Colonoscopy up-to-date	223	44.2
FIT up-to-date	36	7.1
FIT and colonoscopy up-to-date	8	1.6
Genetic risk	42	8.3
Inflammatory disease of the colon	6	1.2
Regular control for polyps	58	11.5
Serious disease that could prevent from participation in the study	2	0.4
Unexplained weight loss	7	1.4
Blood in stool	32	6.3
Unusual digestive disorders	79	15.6
Planning to leave Switzerland	1	0.2

Note: multiple reasons for exclusion are possible.

Table 2. Participants baseline characteristics.

	Intervention group (n=258)	Control group (n=257)	Total
Sex			
Women	127/258 (49.2%)	136/257 (52.9%)	263/515 (51.1%)
Men	131/258 (50.8%)	121/257 (40.1%)	252/515 (48.9%)
Age			

n	258	257	515
Mean (SD), years	52.1 (2.1)	52.2 (2.4)	52.18 (2.2)
Min/Max, years	50-67	50-66	50-67
Risk score			
n	258	257	515
Mean (SD)	1.3 (0.4)	1.4 (0.6)	1.38 (0.5)
Min/Max	0.9-4.0	0.9-5.6	0.9-5.6
Risk level			
Low	254/258 (98.4)	251/257 (97.7)	505/515 (98.1%)
Moderate	4/258 (1.6)	6/257 (2.3)	10/515 (1.9%)
High	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Nationality			
Swiss	199/258 (77.1)	186/257 (72.4)	385/515 (74.8%)
Other	59/258 (22.9)	71/257 (27.6)	130/515 (25.4%)
Education			
Compulsory education or less	24/256 (9.4)	16/254 (6.3)	40/510 (7.8%)
Apprenticeship/Maturity	94/256 (36.7)	81/254 (31.9)	175/510 (34.3%)
University/School of applied sciences	135/256 (52.7)	152/254 (59.8)	287/510 (56.3%)
No response	3/256 (1.2)	5/254 (2.0)	8/510 (1.6%)
Occupation			
Employed	227/256 (88.7)	226/255 (88.6)	453/511 (88.7%)
Unemployed	25/256 (10.0)	23/255 (9.0)	48/511 (9.4%)
Retired	3/256 (1.2)	5/255 (2.0)	8/511 (1.6%)
No answer	1/256 (0.4)	1/255 (0.4)	2/511 (0.4%)
French level			
Very good	203/258 (78.7)	203/255 (79.6)	406/513 (79.1%)
Good or poor	55/258 (21.3)	52/255 (20.4)	107/513 (20.9%)
Health literacy			
High	238/258 (92.2)	238/257 (92.6)	476/515 (92.4%)
Moderate or poor	20/258 (7.8)	19/257 (7.4)	39/515 (7.6%)
Household size			
Living with a partner or in family	218/257 (84.8)	216/257 (84.0)	434/514 (84.4%)
Living alone	39/257 (15.2)	41/257 (16.0)	80/514 (15.6%)
CRC family history			
No	251/258 (97.3)	246/256 (96.1)	497/514 (96.7%)
Yes	7/258 (2.7)	10/256 (3.9)	17/514 (3.3%)
Polyp family history			
No	225/258 (87.2)	230/254 (90.6)	455/512 (88.9%)
Yes	33/258 (12.8)	24/254 (9.4)	57/512 (11.1%)
Intention to be screened (1 = not at all, 5 = definitely)			
Mean (SD)	4.08 (1.2)	4.02 (1.2)	4.05 (1.2)

FIT: fecal immunochemical test

Table 3. Proportions of screening tests completed by participants at low and moderate risk by group.

	Low risk for CRC*		Moderate risk for CRC**		Overall	
	Intervention group n (%)	Control group n (%)	Intervention group n (%)	Control group n (%)	Intervention group n (%)	Control group n (%)
Screening tests completed						
Fecal Immunochemical Test (FIT)	93 (36)	57 (23)	1 (25)	1 (17)	94 (36)	58 (23)
Colonoscopy	35 (14)	67 (27)	1 (25)	1 (17)	36 (14)	68 (26)
No screening	126 (50)	127 (50)	2 (50)	4 (66)	130 (50)	131 (51)
Appropriate screening [#]	93 (37)	57 (23)	2 (50)	2 (33)	95 (37)	59 (23)
Non-appropriate screening	161 (63)	194 (77)	2 (50)	4 (67)	163 (63)	198 (77)
Overall participation in screening						
Screened	128 (50)	124 (49)	2 (50)	2 (33)	130 (50)	126 (49)
Not screened	126 (50)	127 (51)	2 (50)	4 (67)	128 (50)	131 (51)


*Low risk defined as having a 15-year risk of CRC <3%

**Moderate risk defined as having a 15-year risk of CRC ≥3% and <6%

[#]Appropriate screening defined as completing a FIT if at low risk for CRC and either a FIT or colonoscopy if at moderate risk

Figures

Figure 1. CONSORT flow diagram



Supplementary tables

Supplementary table 1

Table 1. Types of information presented in the invention and control brochures.

Types of information presented in the brochure	Intervention brochure			Control brochure
	High risk	Low risk	Moderate risk	
Information about CRC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Information about screening benefits	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Explanation concerning risk levels and how they can be calculated	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Personalized risk score	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Screening recommendations	Personalized: colonoscopy recommended; FIT the alternative	Personalized: FIT recommended; colonoscopy the alternative	Personalized: FIT and colonoscopy are equal options	General: FIT and colonoscopy are equal options
Explanations why recommended test(s) is(are) appropriate	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Short instructions about how uptake FIT / how to prepare bowel for colonoscopy	Yes, instructions for colonoscopy only	Yes, instructions for FIT only	Yes, instructions for both tests	Yes, instructions for both tests
Warning that risk increases with age and encouragements to maintain a healthy lifestyle	Yes	Yes	Yes	Non
Suggestion to consult a doctor if	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

cancer symptoms
occur

Information about health insurance coverage of the screening tests	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
---	-----	-----	-----	-----

Supplementary table 2. Appropriate screening, subgroup analyses

	Intervention group		Control group		Mean difference		p-value for interaction
	Proportion	95% CI	Proportion	95% CI	Difference	95% CI	
Sex							
Women (n=263)	0.43	0.34, 0.51	0.22	0.15, 0.29	0.2	0.09, 0.32	0.13
Men (n=252)	0.31	0.23, 0.39	0.24	0.16, 0.32	0.07	-0.04, 0.18	
Education							
Compulsory school or less (n=40)	0.33	0.14, 0.52	0.31	0.09, 0.54	0.02	-0.27, 0.32	0.43
Apprenticeship/Maturity/High school/University (n=462)	0.37	0.31, 0.43	0.23	0.18, 0.29	0.14	0.06, 0.22	
French level							
Very good (n=406)	0.35	0.28, 0.42	0.22	0.16, 0.27	0.13	0.05, 0.22	0.71
Good or poor (n=107)	0.44	0.31, 0.57	0.25	0.13, 0.37	0.19	0.01, 0.36	
Household							
Living with a partner or in family (n=434)	0.38	0.31, 0.44	0.21	0.15, 0.26	0.17	0.08, 0.25	0.06
Living alone (n=80)	0.31	0.16, 0.45	0.34	0.2, 0.49	-0.03	-0.24, 0.17	
Family history of CRC and polyps							
Yes (n=72)	0.31	0.16, 0.45	0.18	0.05, 0.31	0.13	-0.07, 0.32	0.98
No (n=443)	0.39	0.31, 0.44	0.24	0.18, 0.29	0.14	0.06, 0.23	

Supplementary table 3. Overall screening uptake, subgroup analyses.

	Intervention group		Control group		Mean difference		p-value for interaction
	Proportion	95% CI	Proportion	95% CI	Difference	95% CI	
Sex							
Women (n=263)	0.56	0.42, 0.65	0.49	0.4, 0.57	0.07	-0.05, 0.19	0.18
Men (n=252)	0.45	0.37, 0.54	0.5	0.41, 0.58	-0.05	-0.17, 0.08	
Education							
Compulsory school or less (n=40)	0.33	0.14, 0.52	0.63	0.39, 0.86	-0.29	-0.59, 0.01	0.07
Apprenticeship/Maturity/High school/University (n=462)	0.52	0.45, 0.58	0.5	0.43, 0.56	0.02	-0.07, 0.11	
French level							
Very good (n=406)	0.51	0.44, 0.58	0.46	0.39, 0.53	0.04	-0.05, 0.14	0.23
Good or poor (n=107)	0.49	0.36, 0.62	0.58	0.44, 0.71	-0.08	-0.27, 0.1	
Household							
Living with a partner or in family (n=434)	0.5	0.43, 0.56	0.47	0.4, 0.53	0.03	-0.07, 0.12	0.41
Living alone (n=80)	0.54	0.38, 0.69	0.61	0.46, 0.76	-0.07	-0.29, 0.14	
Family history of CRC and polyps							
Yes (n=72)	0.59	0.44, 0.74	0.58	0.41, 0.74	0.01	-0.22, 0.24	0.98
No (n=443)	0.49	0.42, 0.55	0.48	0.41, 0.54	0.01	-0.08, 0.1	

Supplementary figure

Timepoint	Study period			
	Enrollment	Allocation	After the allocation	
	T0	0	T1	T2
Enrollment:				
Informed consent	✓			
Eligibility screening	✓			
Calculation of the risk for CRC	✓			
Allocation		✓		
Intervention:				
Mailing of the intervention brochure			✓	
Mailing of the usual care brochure			✓	
Assessments:				
Baseline variables: <i>eligibility, risk factors for CRC, previous screening recommendations from a GP, knowledge about screening for CRC, demographics, and contact information</i>	✓			
Main outcome variables: <i>FIT uptake, colonoscopy uptake or appointment for colonoscopy</i>				✓
Secondary outcome variables				
Intention for screening	✓		✓	✓
Results of the undertaken screening test				✓
Self-efficacy for screening tests			✓	
Emotional reaction to the received risk score			✓	
Perceived barriers to screening			✓	✓
Perceived benefits from screening			✓	
Perceived susceptibility for CRC			✓	
Quality of the brochure and acceptability of the screening recommendations			✓	
Qualitative interviews: <i>Clarity, completeness, and credibility of the information in the brochure, brochure's usefulness for decision-making, and suggestions about brochure design</i>			✓	✓
<i>Motivation for undergoing a specific screening test</i>			✓	✓

CRC=colorectal cancer; GP=general practitioner.

Supplementary figure 1. Schedule of enrolment, interventions, and assessments.