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

3

4 Melina Thibault MScPH, MScPHDS,<sup>1</sup> Alan Barkun MSc MD, MC,<sup>2</sup> Myriam Martel BSc, <sup>2</sup> and W.

- 5 Alton Russell PhD<sup>1</sup>
- 6
- 7 <sup>1</sup> Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics, and Occupational Health, McGill University,
- 8 Montreal, QC, Canada.
- <sup>2</sup> 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

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

20

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

28

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

35

**Conclusions:** In Quebec, intra-COVID-19 colonoscopy delays disproportionately impacted symptom assessment procedures and younger patients. Additional capacity or improved triaging may be needed to address persistent delays. Understanding the effects of the pandemic on colonoscopy services can help inform strategies to mitigate harms from on-going delays in 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.<sup>1,2</sup> 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.<sup>3,4</sup> 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.<sup>53/20/2024 7:52:00 AM</sup>
- 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 [Figure S1; Table S1-S2].<sup>6</sup> Referral indications fall under three categories: screening for CRC, 53 surveillance to detect recurrent pre-cancers or disease, and symptom assessment for patients 54 with suspected disease.<sup>6,7</sup> The impact of restricted access to colonoscopy during the COVID-19 55 pandemic across procedure indications and patient demographic groups has not been reported. 56 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 indication throughout the pandemic. 59

# 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 proportion of the colonoscopy waitlist that was delayed during the pandemic. Delay analyses 66 67 were based on the guidelines for maximum delay indicated on the CTS for screening and symptom assessment indications. Delay analyses excluded surveillance indications, for which 68 69 the CTS contains no maximum delay [Figure S1].

70

# 71 Study Population and Data Pre-processing

72

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

- 78
- 79 Data Collection

80

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

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

90

92

# 91 Descriptive Analysis

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

- 99
- 100 Regression Analyses
- 101

We conducted univariable ("unadjusted") and multivariable ("adjusted") regressions to compare
 associations between patient characteristics and delayed procedures by procedure indication
 [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.<sup>11</sup> 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.

Date<sub>procedure</sub> - Date<sub>referral</sub>

Time<sub>indication</sub>

where:

Time<sub>indication</sub> is the timeline (14, 60, or 6 months) recommended on the referral form according to the patient's indication Date<sub>procedure</sub> is the date of the patient's colonoscopy

- 113 Date<sub>referral</sub> is the date the patient's referral form was received by the endoscopic centre
- 114

Normalized wait times are  $\leq 1$  if patients were not delayed and >1 if they were. We used a generalized linear model with a link function selected using diagnostic tests, considering normal,

117 exponential, logistic, beta, lognormal, and Weibull [Figure S4-S5].<sup>12,13</sup>

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

123

#### 124 Time Series Analysis

125

We developed seasonal autoregressive integrated moving average models (ARIMA) to describe the proportion of the colonoscopy waitlist delayed for symptom and screening patients over time, accounting for seasonal trends at the weekly, monthly, and yearly level.<sup>15</sup> We further decomposed our time series data using a robust Multiple Seasonal-Trend decomposition using Loess (MSTL) model,<sup>16–19</sup> accounting for weekly, monthly, and/or yearly seasonal cycles and 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 with Exogenous Variables (SARIMAX) models using March 13, 2020, as a changepoint for 135 symptom colonoscopies and March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2020, for screening colonoscopies. Changepoints were 136 137 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

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

149

#### 150 Results

After excluding 20 priority 1 patients, 33 patients from outside Quebec, and 41 with missing or ambiguous postal codes, the dataset included 7,438 pre-COVID colonoscopy procedures and 7,122 intra-COVID procedures. **[Figure 1]**. Average age was higher for surveillance patients compared to symptom or screening, and average age increased among intra-COVID-19 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 between pre- and intra-COVID periods, except for a small decrease in social deprivation amongscreening 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 legions 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

Among symptom assessment and screening indications (n=9237), 784 pre-COVID-19 (16.3%)
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 period: a 10-year increase in age yielded a 23% reduction in odds of having a delayed intra-184 185 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

190

189 Predictors of Normalized Wait Times

191 Pre-COVID-19, most patients were seen on time (normalized wait time ≤1). In the intra-COVID

- period, normalized wait times increased to 0.55 (+0.14) for screening patients and to 1.1 (+0.65)
   for symptom patients [Table S9].<sup>20-22</sup>
- 194

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

# 203 Time Series Analysis

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 33.6% in 2019). 217

### 218 Interpretation

In 2020, public health COVID-19 measures in Quebec interrupted routine medical care, including colonoscopies.<sup>20,21</sup> We found a sharp climb in delayed procedures for screening and symptom patients in 2020. In 2022, the proportion of patients delayed remained higher than prepandemic 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 been lowered in the US due to increasing rates of CRC.<sup>23,24</sup> The disproportionate impact on 227 228 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 delay colonoscopies.<sup>25</sup> Secondly, young people may have developed greater healthcare 230 avoidant behaviours over the pandemic,<sup>26</sup> however evidence from other countries is mixed.<sup>27</sup> 231 Lastly, the healthcare system prioritized FIT positive patients<sup>28</sup>, who tend to be older<sup>29</sup> and carry 232 a heightened risk of CRC findings, and worsened oncological prognoses.<sup>30</sup> 233

234

235 While FIT is considered to have more clinical and analytical sensitivity over other tests in detecting occult blood, a marker for neoplasms,<sup>31</sup> how the prioritization of FIT patients impacted 236 other colonoscopy-seeking patients has not been explored. FIT positive patients in Quebec may 237 constitute a higher risk population than participants in other screening programs,<sup>32</sup> as the 238 province has the highest positivity threshold across Canada (175ng/mL),<sup>33</sup> which may support 239 240 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).

202

244

251

Intra-COVID-19 patients saw increased wait times irrespective of sociodemographic characteristics. Though disparities were small, we found that women had slightly longer wait times compared to men, and patients from more materially deprived neighbourhoods had longer normalized wait times. These are concerning trends, given reports of socio-cultural barriers in CRC screening for women<sup>34</sup> and the disproportionate burden of CRC among those in Canadian low neighbourhood income quintiles.<sup>3</sup>

- Province-wide data indicates continued delays in colonoscopy access, as in several countries.<sup>2,35–37</sup> As of August 12, 2023, roughly 130,000 patients were on the waitlist for colonoscopies, compared to 59,000 on February 29, 2020.<sup>38</sup> Chronic understaffing, mandated overtime, and increased rates of burnout across healthcare workers continue to undermine efforts to combat waitlist delays.<sup>39</sup>
- 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 centres in Quebec.<sup>40</sup> Systematic differences between patients referred with and without the form 260 could bias our findings. Patients who were referred but never seen for a colonoscopy were not 261 262 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

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

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.
288 289 290 291 292	award (Chercheur-boursier) from the Fonds de Recherche du Québec – Santé. <b>Potential conflict of interests:</b> The authors declare no conflict of interest.

293 294	Ref	erences
295 296 297	1.	Yong JH, Mainprize JG, Yaffe MJ, et al. The impact of episodic screening interruption: COVID-19 and population-based cancer screening in Canada. <i>J Med Screen</i> . 2021;28(2):100-107. doi:10.1177/0969141320974711
298 299 300	2.	Lantinga MA, Theunissen F, Borg PCJ ter, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on gastrointestinal endoscopy in the Netherlands: analysis of a prospective endoscopy database. <i>Endoscopy</i> . 2021;53(2):166. doi:10.1055/a-1272-3788
301 302	3.	Lee S. Canadian Cancer Statistics. Canadian Cancer Society. Accessed April 6, 2023. https://cancer.ca/en/research/cancer-statistics/canadian-cancer-statistics
303 304	4.	Kadakuntla A, Wang T, Medgyesy K, et al. Colorectal cancer screening in the COVID-19 era. World J Gastrointest Oncol. 2021;13(4):238-251. doi:10.4251/wjgo.v13.i4.238
305 306 307	5.	Malagón T, Yong JHE, Tope P, Miller WH, Franco EL. Predicted long term impact of COVID 19 pandemic related care delays on cancer mortality in Canada. <i>Int J Cancer</i> . 2022;150(8):1244-1254. doi:10.1002/ijc.33884
308 309 310 311	6.	Sharara N, Nolan S, Sewitch M, Martel M, Dias M, Barkun AN. Assessment of a Colonoscopy Triage Sheet for Use in a Province-Wide Population-Based Colorectal Screening Program. <i>Can J Gastroenterol Hepatol.</i> 2016;2016:e4712192. doi:10.1155/2016/4712192
312 313 314	7.	Overholt BF, Brooks-Belli L, Grace MG, et al. Evaluating Screening Age for Colonoscopy: A Quality Assurance Assessment. <i>J Clin Gastroenterol</i> . 2010;44(7):e147. doi:10.1097/MCG.0b013e3181cadce5
315 316	8.	Pebesma E. Simple Features for R: Standardized Support for Spatial Vector Data. <i>R J</i> . 2018;10(1):439-446.
317 318 319 320	9.	Pebesma E, Bivand R. <i>Spatial Data Science   With Applications in R</i> . 1st ed. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2023. Accessed July 18, 2023. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.1201/9780429459016/spatial-data-science-edzer-pebesma-roger-bivand
321 322 323	10.	The Canadian Index of Multiple Deprivation. Open Government. Published June 12, 2019. Accessed July 18, 2023. https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/e68f896c-349f-4215-a192-3bd859a21416
324 325	11.	Lüdecke D. ggeffects: Tidy Data Frames of Marginal Effects from Regression Models. J Open Source Softw. 2018;3(26):772. doi:10.21105/joss.00772
326 327 328	12.	Cullen AC, Frey HC. <i>Probabilistic Techniques in Exposure Assessment: A Handbook for Dealing with Variability and Uncertainty in Models and Inputs</i> . Springer Science & Business; 1999.
329 330	13.	Delignette-Muller ML, Dutang C. fitdistrplus: An R Package for Fitting Distributions. <i>J Stat Softw</i> . 2015;64:1-34. doi:10.18637/jss.v064.i04

- 14. Marhuenda Y, Morales D, del Carmen Pardo M. Information criteria for Fay–Herriot model
   selection. *Comput Stat Data Anal.* 2014;70(C):268-280.
- 15. Hyndman RJ, Khandakar Y. Automatic Time Series Forecasting: The forecast Package for
   R. J Stat Softw. 2008;27:1-22. doi:10.18637/jss.v027.i03
- 16. Petropoulos F, Apiletti D, Assimakopoulos V, et al. Forecasting: theory and practice. *Int J Forecast.* 2022;38(3):705-871. doi:10.1016/j.ijforecast.2021.11.001
- 17. Cleveland RB, Cleveland WS, Terpenning I. STL: A Seasonal-Trend Decomposition
   Procedure Based on Loess. *J Off Stat.* 1990;6(1):3.
- 18. Bandara K, Hyndman RJ, Bergmeir C. MSTL: A Seasonal-Trend Decomposition Algorithm
   for Time Series with Multiple Seasonal Patterns. Published online July 28, 2021. Accessed
   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.

http://course1.winona.edu/bdeppa/FIN%20335/Handouts/Time\_Series\_Decomposition.html
 #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
- Siegel RL, Jakubowski CD, Fedewa SA, Davis A, Azad NS. Colorectal Cancer in the Young:
   Epidemiology, Prevention, Management. *Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book*. 2020;(40):e75 doi:10.1200/EDBK\_279901
- 25. Karan A. To control the covid-19 outbreak, young, healthy patients should avoid the
   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

- 28. El Bizri M, Hamidi MW, Mksyartinian P, Stein BD. Canadian Landscape Assessment of
   Colorectal Cancer Screening during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Curr Oncol.* 2023;30(10):8973-8991. doi:10.3390/curroncol30100648
- van Wifferen F, de Jonge L, Worthington J, et al. Prioritisation of colonoscopy services in
   colorectal cancer screening programmes to minimise impact of COVID-19 pandemic on
   predicted cancer burden: A comparative modelling study. *J Med Screen*. 2022;29(2):72-83.
   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
- 32. Balamou C, Koïvogui A, Rodrigue CM, et al. Prediction of the severity of colorectal lesion by
   fecal hemoglobin concentration observed during previous test in the French screening
   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 test (fit): Selected aspects regarding its effectiveness for colorectal cancer screening in 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
- 35. de Lima PN, van den Puttelaar R, Hahn AI, et al. Unequal Recovery in Colorectal Cancer
   Screening Following the COVID-19 Pandemic. *medRxiv*. Published online December 26,
   2022:2022.12.23.22283887. doi:10.1101/2022.12.23.22283887
- 36. Holland J, Cwintal M, Rigas G, et al. The impact of delaying colonoscopies during the
   COVID-19 pandemic on colorectal cancer detection and prevention. *Surg Endosc*.
   2022;36(12):9364-9373. doi:10.1007/s00464-022-09211-z
- 37. Ricciardiello L, Ferrari C, Cameletti M, et al. Impact of SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic on Colorectal
   Cancer Screening Delay: Effect on Stage Shift and Increased Mortality. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2021;19(7):1410-1417.e9. doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2020.09.008
- 38. PowerBI: Tableau de Bord Perfomance du réseau de la santé et des services sociaux.
   Accessed December 14, 2023. https://app.powerbi.com/groups/me/apps/dac495ff-f275 401 4e90-9042-b1fa74ba7886/reports/63654f54-9166-411c-9d95-
- 402 0fc0a363b14d/ReportSectioncf0eac43950c6e71bf5d?ctid=06e1fe28-5f8b-4075-bf6c-403 ae24be1a7992&experience=power-bi
- 39. Duong D, Vogel L. Overworked health workers are "past the point of exhaustion." *Can Med Assoc J.* 2023;195(8):E309-E310. doi:10.1503/cmaj.1096042

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

#### 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

Patient Type 🖨 Screening 🚔 Surveillance 🚔 Symptom

100

C







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



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. 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. 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.<sup>38</sup> 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 and effort to increase colonoscopy capacity in 2022-2023.]

Colonoscopy Categories	<i>Screening</i> (n = 3143)	Surveillance (n = 4656)	<i>Symptom</i> (n = 6761)	<i>Total</i> (n = 14560)	p-value
Age (years)					< 0.001 <sup>2</sup>
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					< 0.001 <sup>1</sup>
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					< 0.001
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 <sup>2</sup>
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 Depriv	ation Centile				0.024 <sup>2</sup>
Mean (SD)	38.65 (31.30)	38.89 (31.00)	40.19 (31.67)	39.44 (31.39)	
Social Deprivation Centile					< 0.001 <sup>2</sup>
Mean (SD)	51.69 (31.65)	48.06 (31.43)	52.83 (31.69)	51.01 (31.66)	
Time to Procedure (days)				< 0.001 <sup>2</sup>	
Mean (SD)	101.56 (145.5)	223.09 (287.9)	72.03 (97.1)	126.71 (199.8)	

 Table 1. Summary of Socio-Demographic Variables By Colonoscopy Category.
 Covariates identified

 from the referral form and linkage performed are investigated per colonoscopy category.
 Covariates identified

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

	•			• •	
Colonoscopy Categories	Screening (n = 3143)	<i>Surveillance</i> (n = 4656)	<i>Symptom</i> (n = 6761)	<i>Total</i> (n = 14560)	p-value
Cancer					< 0.001 <sup>°</sup>
Prevalence	43 (1.4%)	13 (0.3%)	70 (1.0%)	126 (0.9%)	
Clinically Sign	ificant Lesions				< 0.001 <sup>1</sup>
Prevalence	1371 (43.6%)	2205 (47.4%)	2142 (31.7%)	5718 (39.3%)	

Table 2. Summary of Colonoscopy Findings By Colonoscopy Category.

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.]

			Model without interaction term		Model with interaction term		
Covariate	n	Unadjusted OR <sup>1</sup>	Adjusted OR <sup>1</sup> (95% CI)	p- value	Adjusted OR <sup>'</sup> (95% CI)	p- value	
COVID-19							
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	
Colonoscopy	Categories						
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	
Sex							
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	
Age <sup>2</sup>							
Per decade	-	1.04 (1.01-1.07)	1.04 (1.01-1.07)	0.016	1.23 (1.16, 1.30)	< 0.001	
Deprivation Dentile <sup>2</sup>							
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	
Covid-19 * Ag	Covid-19 * Age <sup>2</sup>						
Pre * Age	-	-	-	-	Ref.	-	
Intra * Age	-	-	-	-	0.77 (0.72, 0.82)	< 0.001	

 Table 3. Logistic Regression Models for Delayed Procedures.

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

<sup>1</sup> Exponentiated regression coefficient; <sup>2</sup> 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.]

			Model without interac	tion term	Model with interaction term	
Covariate	n	Unadjusted OR <sup>1</sup>	Adjusted Estimate <sup>1</sup> (95% CI)	p- value	Adjusted Estimate <sup>1</sup> (95% CI)	p- value
COVID-19						
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
Colonoscop	y Category					
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
Sex						
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
Age <sup>2</sup>						
Per decade	-	1.04 (1.02-1.06)	1.04 (1.03-1.06)	<0.001	1.11 (1.08, 1.13)	< 0.001
Deprivation	Dentile <sup>2</sup>					
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
Covid-19 * /	$Age^{-2}$					
Pre * Age	-	-	-	-	Ref.	_
Intra * Age	-	-	-	-	0.89 (0.86, 0.91)	< 0.001

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Exponentiated regression coefficient

<sup>2</sup> 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.]