

1 Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Colonoscopy 2 Wait Times by Procedure Indication in Quebec

3
4 Melina Thibault MScPH, MScPHDS,¹ Alan Barkun MSc MD, MC,² Myriam Martel BSc,² and W.
5 Alton Russell PhD¹

6
7 ¹ Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics, and Occupational Health, McGill University,
8 Montreal, QC, Canada.

9 ² Gastroenterology, McGill University, The Montreal General Hospital, GI Division, Montreal, QC,
10 Canada

11
12 **Acknowledgements:** Thank you to our collaborators, *Ministère de la Santé et des Services*
13 *sociaux*, especially Oronzo de Benedictis, for their help with the provincial dataset. Similar
14 gratitude is expressed to l'*Institut national d'excellence en santé et en services sociaux*.

15 **Abstract**

16 **Background:** Patients are referred for colonoscopy for symptom assessment, screening, and
17 surveillance. Public health measures to mitigate the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic
18 disrupted services and increased patient delays for colonoscopy services in Quebec. The
19 differential impact of these interruptions by colonoscopy indication is largely unknown.

20
21 **Methods:** Using 2018–2022 retrospective clinical data from two high-volume Montreal
22 endoscopy centres and provincial administrative data, we characterized changes in
23 colonoscopy wait times and the proportion of waitlisted patients who were delayed (wait time
24 exceeded provincial guidelines) by procedure indication and demographics. We used regression
25 to examine patient characteristics associated with delayed procedures during pre- and intra-
26 COVID-19 periods. We used time series analysis to characterize trends in the proportion of
27 waitlisted patients delayed.

28
29 **Results:** The COVID-19-related public health measures resulted in record-high delays (median
30 increase in wait times of 34-159% across indications). While older patients experienced longer
31 wait times pre-pandemic, intra-COVID-19 wait times increased disproportionately for patients
32 younger than 50. The proportion of waitlisted patients delayed peaked mid-2020 (56.9% for
33 screening; 56.0% for symptom assessment patients). By early 2022, the proportion delayed had
34 fallen to 37.3% for screening patients but remained at 53.8% for symptom assessment patients.

35
36 **Conclusions:** In Quebec, intra-COVID-19 colonoscopy delays disproportionately impacted
37 symptom assessment procedures and younger patients. Additional capacity or improved
38 triaging may be needed to address persistent delays. Understanding the effects of the pandemic
39 on colonoscopy services can help inform strategies to mitigate harms from on-going delays in
40 Quebec.

41 Introduction

42 In Quebec, COVID-19 Public Health Emergency measures caused a sharp, temporary reduction
43 in colonoscopy capacities, increasing wait times. Delays in elective colonoscopies (e.g. for
44 cancer screening) can negatively impact patient health outcomes and have costly downstream
45 resource demands.^{1,2} Colonoscopies are vital to the management and diagnosis of digestive
46 pathologies, notably, colorectal cancer (CRC). CRC is the most prevalent non-reproductive
47 neoplasm in Canada.^{3,4} Modelers estimated that pandemic-related delays in colorectal cancer
48 (CRC) detection and treatment during 2020-21 will lead to 60,000 – 70,000 excess life years
49 lost in the next 10 years in Canada.^{5/20/2024 7:52:00 AM}

50
51 Quebec's standardized colonoscopy triage sheet (CTS) uses 21 indications to triage
52 colonoscopy referrals into five tiers with associated maximum medically acceptable delays
53 **[Figure S1; Table S1-S2]**.⁶ Referral indications fall under three categories: *screening* for CRC,
54 *surveillance* to detect recurrent pre-cancers or disease, and *symptom assessment* for patients
55 with suspected disease.^{6,7} The impact of restricted access to colonoscopy during the COVID-19
56 pandemic across procedure indications and patient demographic groups has not been reported.
57 In this study, we analyzed patient demographic and clinical characteristics associated with
58 delayed colonoscopy and characterized the evolution of colonoscopy delays by procedure
59 indication throughout the pandemic.

60 Methods

61
62 Using data from two high-volume endoscopy centres in Montreal, we conducted a retrospective
63 cohort study to analyze wait times and delays in colonoscopies. We used descriptive analyses
64 to profile patient characteristics at time of referral, regression to identify associations between
65 clinical and demographic factors and delays, and time series analysis to examine trends in the
66 proportion of the colonoscopy waitlist that was delayed during the pandemic. Delay analyses
67 were based on the guidelines for maximum delay indicated on the CTS for screening and
68 symptom assessment indications. Delay analyses excluded surveillance indications, for which
69 the CTS contains no maximum delay **[Figure S1]**.

71 *Study Population and Data Pre-processing*

72
73 All patients aged 18 or older who underwent a colonoscopy between August 29, 2018, and
74 August 11, 2022, at two hospital-based Montreal endoscopy centres were eligible for inclusion.
75 We included patients' first colonoscopy with a completed referral sheet. We excluded patients
76 rescheduled due to inadequate bowel preparation or with postal codes that were missing,
77 ambiguous, or from outside of Quebec, or patients classified as priority one on their CTS.

79 *Data Collection*

80
81 Patient data were extracted from electronic medical records (sociodemographic characteristics)
82 the CTS (indication, referral date) and pathology database (histological findings). We labelled

83 colonoscopies prior to March 15, 2020, as “pre-COVID-19” and procedures after April 15, 2020,
84 as “intra-COVID-19” [Tables S1-S2]. We grouped colonoscopies by indication as: “screening”
85 (e.g. Faecal Immunochemical Test (FIT) positive, referral for family history), “surveillance” (e.g.
86 follow-up colonoscopy), or “symptom assessment” (e.g. gastrointestinal distress) [Figure S1;
87 Tables S1]. If multiple indications were selected, we used the one with the highest priority. We
88 labelled patients as delayed once their time on the waitlist exceeded the maximum
89 recommended delay per the CTS.

90

91 *Descriptive Analysis*

92

93 We performed univariate logistic regression, ANOVA (analysis of variance), and chi-squared
94 tests to examine covariates (age, sex, colonoscopy category, body mass index [BMI],
95 neighbourhood-level Material Deprivation Centile (MDC) and Social Deprivation Centile (SDC),
96 and urban vs. rural home address) [linkage described in Supplement II].⁸⁻¹⁰ We conducted
97 two-sided independent-samples t-test to compare pre- and intra-COVID-19 patients wait times
98 (from CTS referral to procedure date) across procedure indications.

99

100 *Regression Analyses*

101

102 We conducted univariable (“unadjusted”) and multivariable (“adjusted”) regressions to compare
103 associations between patient characteristics and delayed procedures by procedure indication
104 [Supplement III].

105

106 We used logistic regression to analyse characteristics associated with delayed procedure.
107 Included covariates were COVID-19 period (pre- or intra-), sex, age, MDC, SDC, colonoscopy
108 type, colonoscopy category, and interaction terms.¹¹ To investigate the COVID-19 impact on the
109 **degree** of delay, we generated “normalized wait times,” defined as the ratio of a patients’ actual
110 wait time to targeted wait time based on their CTS [Equation 1].

111

112 **Equation 1. Normalized wait time per patient.**

$$\frac{\text{Date}_{\text{procedure}} - \text{Date}_{\text{referral}}}{\text{Time}_{\text{indication}}}$$

where:

Time_{indication} is the timeline (14, 60, or 6 months) recommended on the referral form according to the patient’s indication

Date_{procedure} is the date of the patient’s colonoscopy

Date_{referral} is the date the patient’s referral form was received by the endoscopic centre

113

114

115 Normalized wait times are ≤ 1 if patients were not delayed and > 1 if they were. We used a
116 generalized linear model with a link function selected using diagnostic tests, considering normal,
117 exponential, logistic, beta, lognormal, and Weibull [Figure S4-S5].^{12,13}

118

119 We selected regression coefficients using a stepwise selection algorithm with sequential
120 replacement.¹⁴ We used ANOVA testing on nested models to confirm appropriate covariates.
121 We selected the best-fitting model based on AIC criterion, favouring parsimonious models.
122 Sensitivity analyses and sub-analyses are described in **[Supplement III]**.

123

124 *Time Series Analysis*

125

126 We developed seasonal autoregressive integrated moving average models (ARIMA) to
127 describe the proportion of the colonoscopy waitlist delayed for symptom and screening patients
128 over time, accounting for seasonal trends at the weekly, monthly, and yearly level.¹⁵ We further
129 decomposed our time series data using a robust Multiple Seasonal-Trend decomposition using
130 Loess (MSTL) model,^{16–19} accounting for weekly, monthly, and/or yearly seasonal cycles and
131 aberrant behaviour caused by COVID-19 measures **[Supplement IV]**.

132

133 We conducted a counterfactual analysis to estimate the impact of COVID-19 on delayed
134 patients by colonoscopy category. We fit Seasonal Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average
135 with Exogenous Variables (SARIMAX) models using March 13, 2020, as a changepoint for
136 symptom colonoscopies and March 19th, 2020, for screening colonoscopies. Changepoints were
137 selected from dates shortly before or after the declaration of the public health emergency in
138 Quebec (March 13th, 2020) using AIC and BIC criterion from candidate SARIMAX models.
139 These models assumed a permanent rise in the proportion of delayed colonoscopies (step
140 change) and a change in slope (ramp). The ramp term was calculated using the mean percent
141 difference in the monthly province-wide dataset after March 13th, 2022. We plotted the
142 counterfactual against observed values for 80 days (e.g. a forecast of how the waitlist would
143 have evolved without the interruption of emergency COVID-19 public health measures,
144 estimated from the pre-changepoint data using SARIMAX modelling).

145

146 Full model selection and diagnostic procedures are outlined in **[Supplement IV]**. All analyses
147 used R software version 4.1.2. This study was approved by the McGill University Health Centre
148 Research Ethics Board.

149

150 **Results**

151 After excluding 20 priority 1 patients, 33 patients from outside Quebec, and 41 with missing or
152 ambiguous postal codes, the dataset included 7,438 pre-COVID colonoscopy procedures and
153 7,122 intra-COVID procedures. **[Figure 1]**. Average age was higher for surveillance patients
154 compared to symptom or screening, and average age increased among intra-COVID-19
155 procedures across all three colonoscopy categories **[Table S3-S5]**.

156

157 On average, patients undergoing colonoscopies for symptom assessment were from more
158 socially and materially deprived neighbourhoods compared with those referred for screening
159 and surveillance indications **[Table 1]**. Neighbourhood deprivation was largely consistent

160 between pre- and intra-COVID periods, except for a small decrease in social deprivation among
161 screening patients **[Table S3-S5]**.

162
163 Wait times were longer in the intra-COVID-19 period for all age groups, sexes, and indications
164 apart from male screening patients aged >74 **[Figure 2.b; Figure 2.c]**. Median wait time
165 increased from 46 to 62 days (34% increase) for screening colonoscopies; from 28 to 67 days
166 (139% increase) for symptom assessment; and from 74 days to 192 (159% increase) for
167 surveillance **[Figure 2.a]**. Patients <50 years old experienced the largest increase in proportion
168 of procedures delayed **[Figure 2.b]**. The proportion of delayed procedures increased among
169 screening [increase of 15.2%; CI 14.5 to 16.0; $p < 0.001$] and symptom assessment indications
170 [increase of 17.2%; CI 16.6, 17.7; $p < 0.001$]. Detection of clinically significant lesions was
171 higher for rural patients (45.2% vs 39.0%, $p < 0.05$) **[Table S7; Figure S2]** and was higher intra-
172 COVID-19 for symptom assessment patients (28.7% to 34.6%; $p < 0.001$) **[Table 2]**.

173
174 *Predictors of Delayed Procedure*
175
176 Among symptom assessment and screening indications (n=9237), 784 pre-COVID-19 (16.3%)
177 and 2142 intra-COVID-19 procedures (48.6%) were delayed.

178
179 In the adjusted model, intra-COVID-19 procedures had higher odds of delay [OR 4.73, 95% CI
180 4.30, 5.22, $p < 0.001$] and female patients experienced on average 11% greater odds of having
181 a delayed procedure than males [OR: 1.11 95% CI (1.01, 1.22) $p = 0.042$]. While older patients
182 experienced greater delays on average. Estimating the interaction between age and the COVID-
183 19 period found that increased age was protective against delay during the intra-COVID-19
184 period: a 10-year increase in age yielded a 23% reduction in odds of having a delayed intra-
185 COVID-19 procedure in the fully adjusted model [OR: 0.77 95% CI (0.72, 0.82) $p < 0.001$]
186 **[Table 3]**. Sub-analyses revealed that patients with positive FIT were on average older and
187 experienced less delay compared to screening patients without positive FIT **[Figure S3]**.

188
189 *Predictors of Normalized Wait Times*
190
191 Pre-COVID-19, most patients were seen on time (normalized wait time ≤ 1). In the intra-COVID
192 period, normalized wait times increased to 0.55 (+0.14) for screening patients and to 1.1 (+0.65)
193 for symptom patients **[Table S9]**.²⁰⁻²²

194
195 From our log linear regression model, normalized wait times increased by 0.76 [Adjusted
196 estimate 1.76 95% CI (1.68, 1.84) $p < 0.001$] for patients with intra-COVID-19 times **[Table 4]**.
197 Age was strongly associated with increases in normalized wait times, with an 11% increase per
198 10-year increase in age [adjusted estimate 1.11 95% CI (1.08, 1.13) $p < 0.001$]. Additionally,
199 there was a significant crossover interaction between COVID-19 period (pre- or intra-) and age
200 [0.89 (95% CI 0.86, 0.91) $p < 0.001$]. **[Figure 3]**. This interaction indicates a reversal of the effect
201 of age on wait times across strata of the COVID-19 period.

202

203 *Time Series Analysis*

204

205 For both screening and symptom assessment indications, counterfactual SARIMAX models
206 suggested that without the pandemic, the proportion of colonoscopies delayed would have
207 decreased slightly in the 80 days after the public health emergency was declared (to 30.0% for
208 symptom assessment; to 23.4% for screening). Instead, they increased (to 50.9% for symptom
209 assessment; 39.4% for screening). After adjusting for time-varying weekly and monthly patterns,
210 MSTL analysis uncovered a peak in the proportion of screening procedures delayed in August
211 2020 (56.9% of waitlist delayed) followed by a decline. The proportion of screening procedures
212 delayed has still not returned to pre-pandemic levels (mean proportion delayed of 22.7% in
213 2019 compared to mean proportion delayed of 37.3% in the first 6 months of 2022) **[Figure 5]**.
214 For symptom procedures, MSTL analysis showed a slow decline in proportion delayed pre-
215 COVID-19, followed by a sharp increase in 2020 that peaked at 56.0% in May 2020). The
216 proportion delayed did not return to pre-pandemic levels (53.8% in the first 6 months of 2022 vs
217 33.6% in 2019).

218 **Interpretation**

219 In 2020, public health COVID-19 measures in Quebec interrupted routine medical care,
220 including colonoscopies.^{20,21} We found a sharp climb in delayed procedures for screening and
221 symptom patients in 2020. In 2022, the proportion of patients delayed remained higher than pre-
222 pandemic levels, particularly for symptom assessment indications.

223

224 Older patients had greater delays in care and treatment pre-COVID-19, but increased delays
225 during the intra-COVID period disproportionately impacted patients under 50. Patients under 50
226 are not included in CRC screening protocols in Canada, although CRC screening ages have
227 been lowered in the US due to increasing rates of CRC.^{23,24} The disproportionate impact on
228 younger patients could have several causes. Firstly, early pandemic messaging encouraging
229 telehealth alternatives over in-person primary care may have inadvertently led young patients to
230 delay colonoscopies.²⁵ Secondly, young people may have developed greater healthcare
231 avoidant behaviours over the pandemic,²⁶ however evidence from other countries is mixed.²⁷
232 Lastly, the healthcare system prioritized FIT positive patients²⁸, who tend to be older²⁹ and carry
233 a heightened risk of CRC findings, and worsened oncological prognoses.³⁰

234

235 While FIT is considered to have more clinical and analytical sensitivity over other tests in
236 detecting occult blood, a marker for neoplasms,³¹ how the prioritization of FIT patients impacted
237 other colonoscopy-seeking patients has not been explored. FIT positive patients in Quebec may
238 constitute a higher risk population than participants in other screening programs,³² as the
239 province has the highest positivity threshold across Canada (175ng/mL),³³ which may support
240 their prioritization. Our study suggests that with finite colonoscopy resources, wait times for
241 other indicated conditions may have been displaced by this reorganization. Indeed, the degree
242 of delay noted in our analyses supports smaller increases in wait times for FIT patients (e.g.
243 screening patients).

244

245 Intra-COVID-19 patients saw increased wait times irrespective of sociodemographic
246 characteristics. Though disparities were small, we found that women had slightly longer wait
247 times compared to men, and patients from more materially deprived neighbourhoods had longer
248 normalized wait times. These are concerning trends, given reports of socio-cultural barriers in
249 CRC screening for women³⁴ and the disproportionate burden of CRC among those in Canadian
250 low neighbourhood income quintiles.³

251

252 Province-wide data indicates continued delays in colonoscopy access, as in several
253 countries.^{2,35-37} As of August 12, 2023, roughly 130,000 patients were on the waitlist for
254 colonoscopies, compared to 59,000 on February 29, 2020.³⁸ Chronic understaffing, mandated
255 overtime, and increased rates of burnout across healthcare workers continue to undermine
256 efforts to combat waitlist delays.³⁹

257

258 Our study had several limitations. Selection into the study was based on patients having a
259 referral form, which is a suggested but not compulsory practice used by >70% of referral
260 centres in Quebec.⁴⁰ Systematic differences between patients referred with and without the form
261 could bias our findings. Patients who were referred but never seen for a colonoscopy were not
262 included, so we likely underestimated the proportion of waitlisted patients delayed. Given the
263 relative urgency of symptom assessment and screening patients, we estimate that patients most
264 impacted by this bias were those referred for surveillance indications, which were not our focus.
265 Furthermore, the lack of a set deadline for Priority 5 and Follow-up colonoscopies, meant an
266 inability to include them in our delay analysis. Future studies could use surveillance patients'
267 complete endoscopic history to determine whether procedures exceeded wait time guidelines.

268

269 This is the first study of its kind in the province. While data was constrained to two endoscopic
270 centres, comparisons with administrative data indicated consistent secular trends across the
271 province [**Figure 6**]. Province-wide digitization of colonoscopy records could enable monitoring
272 of colonoscopy access across patient groups, enabling more granular evaluation of the impact
273 of interventions to mitigate harms from delayed procedures.

274

275 Our study offers insight into the effects of COVID-19 on colonoscopy wait times, highlighting
276 significant increases in wait times for certain patient groups and factors associated with delays.
277 While acknowledging limitations, our analysis focused on how public health decisions,
278 especially the triaging of FIT positive referrals and prioritization of older age groups, affected
279 patient access to healthcare services. These results underscore the demand for healthcare
280 strategies that could both lessen the impact of future disruptions on colonoscopy services and
281 ensure timely access to care for patients. They also highlight the need for accessible
282 information, potentially through digitized patient records, to inform these decisions.

283

284

285 **Funding:**

286

287 No direct funding was received for this research project. Dr. Russell was supported by a salary
288 award (Chercheur-boursier) from the Fonds de Recherche du Québec – Santé.

289

290 **Potential conflict of interests:**

291

292 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

293 References

294

- 295 1. Yong JH, Mainprize JG, Yaffe MJ, et al. The impact of episodic screening interruption:
296 COVID-19 and population-based cancer screening in Canada. *J Med Screen*.
297 2021;28(2):100-107. doi:10.1177/0969141320974711
- 298 2. Lantinga MA, Theunissen F, Borg PCJ ter, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on
299 gastrointestinal endoscopy in the Netherlands: analysis of a prospective endoscopy
300 database. *Endoscopy*. 2021;53(2):166. doi:10.1055/a-1272-3788
- 301 3. Lee S. Canadian Cancer Statistics. Canadian Cancer Society. Accessed April 6, 2023.
302 <https://cancer.ca/en/research/cancer-statistics/canadian-cancer-statistics>
- 303 4. Kadakuntla A, Wang T, Medgyesy K, et al. Colorectal cancer screening in the COVID-19
304 era. *World J Gastrointest Oncol*. 2021;13(4):238-251. doi:10.4251/wjgo.v13.i4.238
- 305 5. Malagón T, Yong JHE, Tope P, Miller WH, Franco EL. Predicted long-term impact of
306 COVID-19 pandemic-related care delays on cancer mortality in Canada. *Int J Cancer*.
307 2022;150(8):1244-1254. doi:10.1002/ijc.33884
- 308 6. Sharara N, Nolan S, Sewitch M, Martel M, Dias M, Barkun AN. Assessment of a
309 Colonoscopy Triage Sheet for Use in a Province-Wide Population-Based Colorectal
310 Screening Program. *Can J Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2016;2016:e4712192.
311 doi:10.1155/2016/4712192
- 312 7. Overholt BF, Brooks-Belli L, Grace MG, et al. Evaluating Screening Age for Colonoscopy: A
313 Quality Assurance Assessment. *J Clin Gastroenterol*. 2010;44(7):e147.
314 doi:10.1097/MCG.0b013e3181cadce5
- 315 8. Pebesma E. Simple Features for R: Standardized Support for Spatial Vector Data. *R J*.
316 2018;10(1):439-446.
- 317 9. Pebesma E, Bivand R. *Spatial Data Science | With Applications in R*. 1st ed. Chapman and
318 Hall/CRC; 2023. Accessed July 18, 2023.
319 [https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.1201/9780429459016/spatial-data-science-](https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.1201/9780429459016/spatial-data-science-edzer-pebesma-roger-bivand)
320 [edzer-pebesma-roger-bivand](https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.1201/9780429459016/spatial-data-science-edzer-pebesma-roger-bivand)
- 321 10. The Canadian Index of Multiple Deprivation. Open Government. Published June 12, 2019.
322 Accessed July 18, 2023. [https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/e68f896c-349f-4215-a192-](https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/e68f896c-349f-4215-a192-3bd859a21416)
323 [3bd859a21416](https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/e68f896c-349f-4215-a192-3bd859a21416)
- 324 11. Lüdtke D. ggeffects: Tidy Data Frames of Marginal Effects from Regression Models. *J*
325 *Open Source Softw*. 2018;3(26):772. doi:10.21105/joss.00772
- 326 12. Cullen AC, Frey HC. *Probabilistic Techniques in Exposure Assessment: A Handbook for*
327 *Dealing with Variability and Uncertainty in Models and Inputs*. Springer Science & Business;
328 1999.
- 329 13. Delignette-Muller ML, Dutang C. fitdistrplus: An R Package for Fitting Distributions. *J Stat*
330 *Softw*. 2015;64:1-34. doi:10.18637/jss.v064.i04


- 331 14. Marhuenda Y, Morales D, del Carmen Pardo M. Information criteria for Fay–Herriot model
332 selection. *Comput Stat Data Anal.* 2014;70(C):268-280.
- 333 15. Hyndman RJ, Khandakar Y. Automatic Time Series Forecasting: The forecast Package for
334 R. *J Stat Softw.* 2008;27:1-22. doi:10.18637/jss.v027.i03
- 335 16. Petropoulos F, Apiletti D, Assimakopoulos V, et al. Forecasting: theory and practice. *Int J*
336 *Forecast.* 2022;38(3):705-871. doi:10.1016/j.ijforecast.2021.11.001
- 337 17. Cleveland RB, Cleveland WS, Terpenning I. STL: A Seasonal-Trend Decomposition
338 Procedure Based on Loess. *J Off Stat.* 1990;6(1):3.
- 339 18. Bandara K, Hyndman RJ, Bergmeir C. MSTL: A Seasonal-Trend Decomposition Algorithm
340 for Time Series with Multiple Seasonal Patterns. Published online July 28, 2021. Accessed
341 August 1, 2023. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.13462>
- 342 19. Hyndman RJ. Time Series Decomposition. Winona State University. Published March 4,
343 2019. Accessed August 2, 2023.
344 [http://course1.winona.edu/bdeppa/FIN%20335/Handouts/Time_Series_Decomposition.html](http://course1.winona.edu/bdeppa/FIN%20335/Handouts/Time_Series_Decomposition.html#stl-decomposition)
345 #stl-decomposition
- 346 20. Vogel L. How can Canada improve worsening wait times? *CMAJ.* 2020;192(37):E1079-
347 E1080. doi:10.1503/cmaj.1095895
- 348 21. Moir M, Barua B. Waiting Your Turn: Wait Times for Health Care in Canada, 2022 Report.
349 Published online December 8, 2022. Accessed September 7, 2023.
350 <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/3336916/waiting-your-turn/4135742/>
- 351 22. Bellégo C, Benatia D, Pape L. Dealing with Logs and Zeros in Regression Models.
352 Published online March 22, 2022. Accessed August 11, 2023.
353 <http://arxiv.org/abs/2203.11820>
- 354 23. Helsingen LM, Kalager M. Colorectal Cancer Screening — Approach, Evidence, and Future
355 Directions. *NEJM Evid.* 2022;1(1):EVIDra2100035. doi:10.1056/EVIDra2100035
- 356 24. Siegel RL, Jakubowski CD, Fedewa SA, Davis A, Azad NS. Colorectal Cancer in the Young:
357 Epidemiology, Prevention, Management. *Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book.* 2020;(40):e75-
358 e88. doi:10.1200/EDBK_279901
- 359 25. Karan A. To control the covid-19 outbreak, young, healthy patients should avoid the
360 emergency department. *BMJ.* 2020;368:m1040. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1040
- 361 26. Arnetz BB, Goetz C, vanSchagen J, Baer W, Smith S, Arnetz JE. Patient-reported factors
362 associated with avoidance of in-person care during the COVID-19 pandemic: Results from a
363 national survey. *PLOS ONE.* 2022;17(8):e0272609. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0272609
- 364 27. Islam MI, Freeman J, Chadwick V, Martiniuk A. Healthcare Avoidance before and during the
365 COVID-19 Pandemic among Australian Youth: A Longitudinal Study. *Healthcare.*
366 2022;10(7):1261. doi:10.3390/healthcare10071261

- 367 28. El Bizri M, Hamidi MW, Mksyartinian P, Stein BD. Canadian Landscape Assessment of
368 Colorectal Cancer Screening during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Curr Oncol*.
369 2023;30(10):8973-8991. doi:10.3390/curroncol30100648
- 370 29. van Wifferen F, de Jonge L, Worthington J, et al. Prioritisation of colonoscopy services in
371 colorectal cancer screening programmes to minimise impact of COVID-19 pandemic on
372 predicted cancer burden: A comparative modelling study. *J Med Screen*. 2022;29(2):72-83.
373 doi:10.1177/09691413211056777
- 374 30. Forbes N, Hilsden RJ, Martel M, et al. Association Between Time to Colonoscopy After
375 Positive Fecal Testing and Colorectal Cancer Outcomes: A Systematic Review. *Clin*
376 *Gastroenterol Hepatol Off Clin Pract J Am Gastroenterol Assoc*. 2021;19(7):1344-1354.e8.
377 doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2020.09.048
- 378 31. Tinmouth J, Lansdorp-Vogelaar I, Allison JE. Faecal immunochemical tests versus guaiac
379 faecal occult blood tests: what clinicians and colorectal cancer screening programme
380 organisers need to know. *Gut*. 2015;64(8):1327-1337. doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2014-308074
- 381 32. Balamou C, Koïvogui A, Rodrigue CM, et al. Prediction of the severity of colorectal lesion by
382 fecal hemoglobin concentration observed during previous test in the French screening
383 program. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2021;27(31):5272. doi:10.3748/wjg.v27.i31.5272
- 384 33. Caron M, Lamarre G, Grégoire P, Simonyan D, Laflamme N. The fecal immunochemical
385 test (fit): Selected aspects regarding its effectiveness for colorectal cancer screening in
386 Quebec City. *Prev Med Rep*. 2018;12:6-11. doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2018.08.003
- 387 34. Kim SE, Paik HY, Yoon H, Lee JE, Kim N, Sung MK. Sex- and gender-specific disparities in
388 colorectal cancer risk. *World J Gastroenterol WJG*. 2015;21(17):5167-5175.
389 doi:10.3748/wjg.v21.i17.5167
- 390 35. de Lima PN, van den Puttelaar R, Hahn AI, et al. Unequal Recovery in Colorectal Cancer
391 Screening Following the COVID-19 Pandemic. *medRxiv*. Published online December 26,
392 2022:2022.12.23.22283887. doi:10.1101/2022.12.23.22283887
- 393 36. Holland J, Cwintal M, Rigas G, et al. The impact of delaying colonoscopies during the
394 COVID-19 pandemic on colorectal cancer detection and prevention. *Surg Endosc*.
395 2022;36(12):9364-9373. doi:10.1007/s00464-022-09211-z
- 396 37. Ricciardiello L, Ferrari C, Cameletti M, et al. Impact of SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic on Colorectal
397 Cancer Screening Delay: Effect on Stage Shift and Increased Mortality. *Clin Gastroenterol*
398 *Hepatol*. 2021;19(7):1410-1417.e9. doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2020.09.008
- 399 38. PowerBI: Tableau de Bord - Performance du réseau de la santé et des services sociaux.
400 Accessed December 14, 2023. <https://app.powerbi.com/groups/me/apps/dac495ff-f275-4e90-9042-b1fa74ba7886/reports/63654f54-9166-411c-9d95-0fc0a363b14d/ReportSectioncf0eac43950c6e71bf5d?ctid=06e1fe28-5f8b-4075-bf6c-ae24be1a7992&experience=power-bi>
- 401
402
403
- 404 39. Duong D, Vogel L. Overworked health workers are “past the point of exhaustion.” *Can Med*
405 *Assoc J*. 2023;195(8):E309-E310. doi:10.1503/cmaj.1096042

406 40. Barkun A. Personal Communication. Published online 2023.

407


Figure 1. Workflow and Patient Count Diagram




[Figure 1. Workflow and Patient Count Diagram. Describes the data management and various analyses conducted during this project as well as the distribution of data based on how different data points were excluded following study inclusion criteria.]

Figure 2. Patient Wait Times and Delays


A. Wait Time Distribution Pre/Intra COVID-19



B. Proportion of Priority 2,3, & 4 Colonoscopy Patients Delayed




C. Rolling 25-day Median Wait Times vs. Guideline (red) by Colonoscopy Category and Priority



[Figure 2. Patient Wait Times and Delays. A. Wait Time Distribution in Days Pre/Post Covid Across Patient Populations. The y-axis of the figure is limited to 500 days to highlight the differences in patient wait time distribution. There were 70 pre-COVID-19 patients and 513 intra-COVID-19 patients with wait times exceeding 500 days. Notches display the 95% CI around the median patient wait time. Considering notches of boxes do not overlap, this provides evidence of a statistically significant difference between the medians both across patient subgroups and across pre/intra COVID-19 periods. **B. Proportion of Priority 2, 3, & 4, Patients Delayed Across Screening and Symptom Patients by Sex and Age.** The proportion delayed of all patients stratified by COVID-19 period, age, and colonoscopy category is shown. The percent difference (delta) in patients delayed is noted]. **C. 25-day Rolling Median Wait Times for Priority 2, 3, & 4 Patients by Colonoscopy Category.** Red lines mark the recommended wait time on the CTS per priority group. Pre- and Intra- Covid-19 median wait times in days per screening and symptom assessment patient groups are shown with priority subtypes. From top to bottom: Screening and Symptom Priority 4 (solid line), Symptom and Screening Priority 3 (dashed line), Symptom Priority 2 (dot-dash line). We see Symptom Priority 3 patients have increased median wait times compared to Screening Priority 3 patients.]

Figure 3: Marginal Effects of Age and COVID-19 in Log-Normal Regression




[Figure 3: Marginal Effects of Age and COVID-19 in Log-Normal Regression


Older age was associated with longer wait times in the pre-COVID period, but this trend reversed in the intra-COVID period.]

Figure 4. SARIMAX Models.

A




B




[Figure 4. SARIMAX Models. A. Raw Time Series of Proportion of Waitlist Volume Delayed Per Patient Population. The red line is the mean of the proportion delayed over time and the dotted lines indicate the standard deviation. A steep increase is noted in 2020 for both patient populations following the beginning of the COVID-19 public health emergency in Quebec. The shaded regions highlight the time window noted in section B.] **B. Counterfactual Plots (2019-2020): Observed vs Predicted:** Data is plotted for August 2019 till June 2020. The counterfactual is in red against the observed data per patient population waitlists for 80 days following the change point. It shows the average predicted trend in this counterfactual with associated prediction intervals (20%, 40%, 60%, and 80%). Weekly seasonality is captured in the predicted line].

Figure 5. MSTL Models



[Figure 5. MSTL Models. A. Screening MSTL. The resulting screening MSTL showed increased variance around the beginning of the intra-COVID-19 period. Annual seasonality is noted, with peaks in the late summer, early fall. **B. Symptom MSTL.** The symptom MSTL similarly described increased variance around the start of the intra-COVID-19 period. Annual seasonality is not significant, approaching a white noise pattern.]

Figure 6. Monthly Colonoscopies in Administrative Provincial Data compared to Endoscopy centres.



[Figure 6. Monthly Colonoscopies in Administrative Provincial Data compared to Endoscopy centres. Endoscopy-providing centres in Quebec, regularly report the number of colonoscopies conducted and FIT administered by fiscal period (13 per year). Reporting is at the discretion of clinics, and some choose to only report symptomatic and screening colonoscopies, excluding surveillance indications. The province-wide data is amalgamated by the provincial ministry and disseminated through a PowerBI dashboard.³⁸ Other data reported includes colonoscopy capacity per centre and the burden of CRC disease. Colonoscopy volumes per financial period was compared to the mean number of colonoscopies performed per reporting body in 2018 and compared across provincial and individual centres' administrative data. There are noted drops in colonoscopy volumes through the holiday period annually (Dec-Jan) and for spring break (Apr-Mar). The sharp decline in colonoscopies following the implementation of COVID-19 public health emergency measures is noted. Similarly, the incline in colonoscopies services as normal working hours resumed is also reflected. We see an effort to increase colonoscopy capacity in 2022-2023.]

Table 1. Summary of Socio-Demographic Variables By Colonoscopy Category. Covariates identified from the referral form and linkage performed are investigated per colonoscopy category.

<i>Colonoscopy Categories</i>	<i>Screening</i> (n = 3143)	<i>Surveillance</i> (n = 4656)	<i>Symptom</i> (n = 6761)	<i>Total</i> (n = 14560)	<i>p-value</i>
Age (years)					< 0.001^c
Mean (SD)	59.76 (11.33)	62.96 (12.18)	56.44 (15.47)	59.24 (13.94)	
Range	18.00-93.00	18.00-95.00	18.00-99.00	18.00-99.00	
Sex					< 0.001¹
Female	1547 (49.2%)	2182 (46.9%)	3692 (54.6%)	7421 (51.0%)	
Male	1596 (50.8%)	2182 (53.1%)	3692 (45.4%)	7139 (49.0%)	
COVID-19					< 0.001¹
Pre	1856 (59.1%)	2231 (47.9%)	3351 (49.6%)	7438 (51.1%)	
Intra	1287 (40.9%)	2425 (52.1%)	3410 (50.4%)	7122 (48.9%)	
BMI					0.005^c
Missing (N)	709	1174	1687	3570	
Mean (SD)	26.727 (5.23)	27.031 (5.14)	26.654 (5.61)	26.790 (5.38)	
Rural					0.067¹
Rural	102 (3.2%)	197 (4.2%)	277 (4.1%)	575 (3.9%)	
Urban	3041 (96.8%)	4459 (95.8%)	6485 (95.9%)	13985 (96.1%)	
Material Deprivation Centile					0.024^c
Mean (SD)	38.65 (31.30)	38.89 (31.00)	40.19 (31.67)	39.44 (31.39)	
Social Deprivation Centile					< 0.001^c
Mean (SD)	51.69 (31.65)	48.06 (31.43)	52.83 (31.69)	51.01 (31.66)	
Time to Procedure (days)					< 0.001^c
Mean (SD)	101.56 (145.5)	223.09 (287.9)	72.03 (97.1)	126.71 (199.8)	

SD, Standard Deviation; 1. Pearson's Chi-squared test; 2. Linear Model ANOVA

Table 2. Summary of Colonoscopy Findings By Colonoscopy Category.

<i>Colonoscopy Categories</i>	<i>Screening</i> (n = 3143)	<i>Surveillance</i> (n = 4656)	<i>Symptom</i> (n = 6761)	<i>Total</i> (n = 14560)	<i>p-value</i>
Cancer					< 0.001¹
Prevalence	43 (1.4%)	13 (0.3%)	70 (1.0%)	126 (0.9%)	
Clinically Significant Lesions					< 0.001¹
Prevalence	1371 (43.6%)	2205 (47.4%)	2142 (31.7%)	5718 (39.3%)	

SD, Standard Deviation; 1. Pearson's Chi-squared test

[Table 2. Summary of Colonoscopy Findings By Colonoscopy Category. A patient was deemed to have clinically significant findings if their procedure resulted in the identification of lesions, including acute colitis, polyps [any type], ileocolitis, diverticulosis, haemorrhoids (if this was the presumed source of bleeding), Crohn's, ulcerative colitis, infectious or pseudomembranous colitis, radiation colitis, ischemic colitis, solitary ulcer, vascular lesions, strictures, microscopique colitis, collagenous colitis, adenoma, and/or adenocarcinoma.]

Table 3. Logistic Regression Models for Delayed Procedures.

Covariate	n	Model without interaction term			Model with interaction term	
		Unadjusted OR ¹	Adjusted OR ¹ (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted OR ¹ (95% CI)	p-value
<i>COVID-19</i>						
Pre	4 816	Ref.	Ref.	-	Ref.	-
Intra	4 421	4.86 (4.41-5.35)	4.74 (4.30-5.23)	<0.001	21.81 (14.55-32.84)	< 0.001
<i>Colonoscopy Categories</i>						
Screening	2 478	Ref.	Ref.	-	Ref.	-
Symptom	6 759	2.29 (2.05-2.56)	2.18 (1.94-2.46)	<0.001	2.18 (1.94-2.45)	< 0.001
<i>Sex</i>						
Male	4 311	Ref.	Ref.	-	Ref.	-
Female	4 926	1.14 (1.05-1.25)	1.11 (1.01-1.22)	0.037	1.10 (1.00-1.21)	0.045
<i>Age²</i>						
Per decade	-	1.04 (1.01-1.07)	1.04 (1.01-1.07)	0.016	1.23 (1.16, 1.30)	< 0.001
<i>Deprivation Dentile²</i>						
Material	-	0.99 (0.98-1.01)	0.99 (0.97, 1.00)	0.147	0.99 (0.97, 1.00)	0.124
Social	-	1.00 (0.99-1.02)	1.01 (1.00, 1.03)	0.187	1.01 (0.99, 1.02)	0.219
<i>Covid-19 * Age²</i>						
Pre * Age	-	-	-	-	Ref.	-
Intra * Age	-	-	-	-	0.77 (0.72, 0.82)	< 0.001

OR Odds ratio; CI, Confidence Interval; Ref. referent category

¹ Exponentiated regression coefficient; ² Covariates were rescaled by 10

[Table 3. Logistic Regression Models for Delayed Procedures. A univariable (“unadjusted”) regression is noted, with no adjustment per covariate. Two multivariable (“adjusted”) regression models are displayed, adjusting for covariates: COVID-19 period (pre- or intra-), sex, age, Material Deprivation Centile (converted to dentile), Social Deprivation Centile (converted to dentile), colonoscopy type, and interaction terms. The fully adjusted logistic regression model includes an interaction term between COVID-19 period and age.]

Table 4. Log-Linear Regression Models for Normalized Wait Times.

Covariate	n	Model without interaction term			Model with interaction term	
		Unadjusted OR ¹	Adjusted Estimate ¹ (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted Estimate ¹ (95% CI)	p-value
<i>COVID-19</i>						
Pre	4 793	Ref.	Ref.	-	Ref.	-
Intra	4 388	1.82 (1.74-1.91)	1.76 (1.68-1.84)	<0.001	3.53 (2.96-4.22)	< 0.001
<i>Colonoscopy Category</i>						
Screening	2 471	Ref.	Ref.	-	Ref.	-
Symptom	6 710	1.57 (1.49-1.66)	1.51 (1.44-1.59)	<0.001	1.51 (1.44-1.59)	< 0.001
<i>Sex</i>						
Male	4 287	Ref.	Ref.	-	Ref.	-
Female	4 894	1.06 (1.01-1.11)	1.03 (0.99-1.08)	0.140	1.03 (0.99-1.08)	0.157
<i>Age²</i>						
Per decade	-	1.04 (1.02-1.06)	1.04 (1.03-1.06)	<0.001	1.11 (1.08, 1.13)	< 0.001
<i>Deprivation Dentile²</i>						
Material	-	0.99 (0.99-1.00)	0.99 (0.99-1.00)	0.018	0.99 (0.98, 1.00)	0.013
Social	-	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	1.01 (1.00-1.01)	0.159	1.00 (1.00, 1.01)	0.178
<i>Covid-19 * Age²</i>						
Pre * Age	-	-	-	-	Ref.	-
Intra * Age	-	-	-	-	0.89 (0.86, 0.91)	< 0.001

OR Odds ratio; CI, Confidence Interval; Ref. referent category

¹ Exponentiated regression coefficient

² Covariates were rescaled by 10

[Table 4. Log-Linear Regression Models for Normalized Wait Times. A univariable (“unadjusted”) regression is noted, with no adjustment per covariate. Two multivariable (“adjusted”) regression models are displayed, adjusting for covariates: COVID-19 period (pre- or intra-), sex, age, MDC dentile, SDC dentile, colonoscopy type, and interaction terms. The fully adjusted log-linear regression model includes an interaction term between COVID-19 period and age.]