The 2020 U.S. cancer screening deficit and the timing of adults' most recent screen: A population-based quasi-experiment

Jason Semprini^{1,2} and Radhika Ranganthan³

¹University of Iowa, College of Public Health; ²University of Iowa, Department of Health
 ⁷ Management Policy; ³University of South Carolina, School of Public Health

Abstract In 2020, cancer screenings declined, then rebounded, resulting in a cancer screening 9 deficit. The significance of this deficit, however, has yet to be quantified from a population health perspective. Our study addresses this evidence gap by examining how the pandemic changed the 11 timing of American adults' most recent cancer screen. We obtained population-based, cancer 12 screening data from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. Mammograms, pap smears, 13 and colonoscopies were each specified as a variable of mutually exclusive categories to indicate the timing since the most recent screening (never, 0-1 years, 1-2 years, 3+ years). Our 15 quasi-experimental design restricts the sample to adults surveyed in January, February, or March. 16 We then leverage a quirk in the BRFSS implementation and consider adults surveyed in the 17 second year of each survey wave as the guasi-treatment cohort. Next, we constructed Linear and 18 Logistic regression models which control for exogenous sociodemographic characteristics, state 19 fixed effects, and temporal trends. Our results suggest that the deficit in 2020 was largely due to 20 a one year delay among adults who receive annual screening, as the proportion of adults 21 reporting a cancer screen in the past year declined by a nearly identical proportion of adults 22

- ²³ reporting their most recent cancer screen 1-2 years ago (3% to 4% points). However, the relative
- change was higher for mammograms and pap smears (17%) than colonoscopies (4%). We also
- ²⁵ found some evidence that the proportion of women reporting never having completed a
- ²⁶ mammogram declined in 2020, but the mechanisms for this finding should be further explored
- ²⁷ with the release of future data. Our estimates for the pandemic's effect on cancer screening rates
- ²⁸ are smaller than prior studies, but because we account for temporal trends we believe prior
- ²⁹ studies overestimated the effect of the pandemic and underestimated the overall downward
- ³⁰ trend in cancer screenings across the country leading up to 2020.
- 31

8

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice. 1 of 26

*For correspondence:

jason-semprini@uiowa.edu

[†]The authors have no conflict of interests to disclose [‡]This work received no funding [§]Preliminary work for this study was presented at 10th Annual Symposium on Global Cancer Research (National Cancer Institute)

Present address: [§]145 N. Riverside Dr. N265, Iowa City, IA United States

32 Background

- ³³ Despite the critical importance of early cancer detection, cancer screening rates in America are well
- ³⁴ below public policy targets, rife with racial and socioeconomic disparities, and despite considerable
- resources, stagnating (Suran 2022; Sabatino et al. 2022; Benavidez et al. 2021). Then came 2020,
- ³⁶ the first year of the COVID-19 Pandemic.
- ³⁷ Even before the first wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic, predictions for cancer prevention and
- ³⁸ control systems were dire. Given the elevated risk to cancer patients, either from adverse COVID-
- ³⁹ 19 outcomes or consequences of delayed cancer treatment, health systems needed to adapt to
- ensure the safety of cancer patients during these initial months of the pandemic (Al-Quteimat and
- Amer 2020; Anderson et al. 2020; Matos et al. 2021). These risk mitigation and continuity of care
- ⁴² policies may have prevented dramatic declines in the proportion of cancer patients receiving care
- (Davidson et al. 2022; Semprini 2022). Unfortunately, cancer screening was less of a priority during
- the early months of the public health emergency (DeJong, Katz, and Covinsky 2021).

Cancer screening could have been impacted by a number of federal, state, or local public health
 emergency policies, as well as by the changing priorities and capacities of health systems, and by
 individual social distancing behaviors (Cancino et al. 2020; Richards et al. 2020; DeJong, Katz, and
 Covinsky 2021). More recent research illuminated the role of financial stress and time costs as
 individual-level barriers to cancer screening, both of which may have compounded the strain on
 health systems attempting to resume cancer screening programs (Hanna et al. 2022; Peoples et al.
 2022; Findling, Blendon, and Benson 2020).

There has been no shortage of evidence highlighting the stark decline in cancer screening 52 services during the initial stages of the pandemic. Evidence from hospital records or insurance 53 claims have suggested that, compared to pre-pandemic levels, mammograms, pap smears and colonoscopies declined 60% to 90% in March/April 2020 (Duszak et al. 2020; Bakouny et al. 2021; Staib, Catlett, and DaCosta Byfield 2021, However, subsequent research has found that in the later 56 months of 2020, claims and records of cancer screenings returned to pre-pandemic levels (Chen 57 et al. 2021); DeGroff et al. 2021; Labaki et al. 2021; McBain et al. 2021; Bello, Chang, and Massar-58 weh 2022; Drescher et al. 2022). Still, the pandemic created a major cancer screening deficit which 60 may be difficult to address despite recent investment in "return to screening" initiatives (Chen et al. 60

- 2021: Hanna et al. 2022: Kelkar et al. 2022). Even as America returns to screening, some are being
- left behind (Mafi et al. 2022. In fact, among the adults reporting having delayed cancer screenings
- ⁶³ during the 2020 pandemic year only 25% have plans to return to screening (Suran 2022).

New Contributions

- ⁶⁵ Clearly, the COVID-19 pandemic created a cancer screening deficit in 2020. However, our under-
- standing of this deficit is limited to hospital and claims based data, which is not necessarily a valid
- ⁶⁷ representation of the population's screening behavior. Moreover, the limited population-based

- research has attempted to quantify changing patterns in cancer screening by comparing rates in
- 59 2020 with 2019, or an average of prior years, essentially assuming that any change observed in
- 2020 was due to the pandemic (Fedewa et al. 2022; Dennis, Hsu, and Arrington 2021; Richard-
- ⁷¹ son 2022). This assumption, however, may not be valid as several factors could impact temporal
- r2 screening patterns (Semprini 2022). Finally, few studies have attempted to infer the significance of
- rathis decline or deficit in cancer screenings in terms of how the time since the most recent cancer
- screen may have changed (Fedewa et al. 2022). This is critical for "return to screening" initiatives,
- as targeting or prioritizing health system capacity should consider the pandemic's effect on the tim-
- ⁷⁶ ing of a cancer screen; not just for adults who delayed care for a year, but for adults who delayed
- ⁷⁷ for longer or even delayed initiating their first cancer screen.
- 78 Our study addresses these evidence gaps by designing a population-based quasi-experimental
- ⁷⁹ Event History Analysis, where we compare the year-by-year change in the timing of the most recent
- ⁸⁰ cancer screen among adults not exposed to the 2020 pandemic with the change in adults exposed
- to a full year of the pandemic. This approach allows us to control for temporal trends in screening
- ⁸² patterns and rigorously assess the internal validity of our design.
- 83 Results
- 84 Event-History Estimates (Linear Model)
- In short, we find evidence that in 2020, exposure to the COVID-19 pandemic was associated with
- ⁸⁶ changing patterns of self-reported cancer screenings. Our estimates reveal that for the guasi-
- ⁸⁷ treatment cohort (late survey wave) in 2020, reports of a cancer screen in the past year declined
- as reports of a most recent cancer in the past 1-2 years increased. In 2020 for the quasi-treatment
- so cohort, we also estimate a significant decline in self-reports of never having had a mammogram,
- which corresponds to a 33% relative decline from baseline rates of women reporting never having
- on completed a mammogram. The absolute change for reporting a most recent mammogram in the
- past 1-2 years increased 4.2% points, which corresponds to a 17.5% increase from pre-pandemic
- rates of having reported a recent mammogram in 1-2 years. Similarly, the absolute change for re-
- porting a most recent pap smear in the past 1-2 years increased 4.2% points, representing a 17.3%
- relative increase from pre-pandemic rates. Finally, reports of a colonoscopy in the past year were
- estimated to have declined by 3.5% points, a 4.3% relative change from baseline.

		2010*Late 2012*Late		*Late	2014*Late		2016*Late		2020*Late		2020 Relative Change	
	Never	-0.006	(0.018)	0.009	(0.016)	-0.013	(0.014)	-0.017	(0.012)	-0.029*	(0.013)	-33.0%
Mammagram	<1 Year	-0.011	(0.023)	-0.030	(0.024)	0.004	(0.023)	0.020	(0.021)	-0.021	(0.034)	-3.5%
Mammogram	1-2 Years	-0.008	(0.020)	0.003	(0.018)	0.002	(0.020)	-0.000	(0.016)	0.031*	(0.015)	17.5%
	3+ Years	0.025	(0.021)	0.018	(0.018)	0.007	(0.012)	-0.002	(0.015)	0.020	(0.024)	11.5%
	Never	0.017	(0.010)	-0.011	(0.014)	-0.024*	(0.009)	-0.009	(0.010)	-0.011	(0.012)	-22.2%
Pap Smear	< I Year	0.019	(0.023)	0.015	(0.025)	0.046^	(0.020)	-0.007	(0.015)	-0.043	(0.031)	-13.5%
•	1-2 Years	-0.008	(0.015)	-0.014	(0.017)	0.003	(0.017)	0.024	(0.014)	0.042*	(0.019)	17.3%
	3+ Years	-0.028	(0.015)	0.010	(0.019)	-0.026	(0.017)	-0.008	(0.017)	0.012	(0.018)	10.2%
Colonoscopy	Never	0.025	(0.017)	0.045*	(0.021)	0.042	(0.029)	-0.011	(0.022)	-0.010	(0.020)	-1.06
	<1 Year	-0.032	(0.022)	-0.012	(0.017)	-0.031	(0.030)	0.013	(0.018)	-0.035*	(0.016)	-4.3%
	1-2 Years	0.016	(0.031)	-0.035	(0.020)	0.011	(0.025)	-0.009	(0.019)	0.030	(0.016)	3.8%
	3+ Years	-0.009	(0.020)	0.002	(0.012)	-0.023	(0.019)	0.008	(0.018)	0.015	(0.019)	2.1%

Table 1. Year-by-Year Differences in Screening Rates for Late Survey Cohort

⁹⁷ Table 1 reports the year-by-year differences in cancer screening rates between the early and late

⁹⁸ survey cohorts. All analyses control for exogenous sociodemographic characteristics, state-level fixed

⁹⁹ effects, and temporal trends (year fixed effects). Robust standard errors were clustered at the state

100 level and reported in parentheses. The relative change was estimated by computing the semi-elasticity

(relative marginal effect) of belonging to the late survey cohort in 2020. * p < 0.05.

¹⁰² Marginal Effect Estimates (Logistic Model)

¹⁰³ Figures 1-3 visually report the non-linear, average marginal effect estimates (derived from the re-

¹⁰⁴ sults of the multinomial logistic model). Here, for each screening type and category, the average

¹⁰⁵ marginal effect of belonging to the quasi-treatment cohort for each year of the analysis. For our

¹⁰⁶ 2020 year of interest, we estimate average marginal effects significantly different than zero for

¹⁰⁷ mammograms in the past 1-2 years, pap smears in the past 1-2 years, and colonoscopies in the

¹⁰⁸ past year. However, we also see years when the average marginal effect of belonging to the quasi-

¹⁰⁹ treatment cohort was significantly different than zero in pre-pandemic years.



Figure 1: Marginal Effect of Late Survey Group on Rates of Most Recent Mammogram

- Figure 1 shows the marginal effect estimates for each category of the most recent self-reported mam-
- mograms for the late-survey wave cohort. These estimates were based on the results of the multinomial
- ¹¹⁴ logistic model and were averaged across all observations.



Figure 2: Marginal Effect of Late Survey Group on Rates of Most Recent Pap Smear

Figure 2 shows the marginal effect estimates for each category of the most recent self-reported pap smears for the late-survey wave cohort. These estimates were based on the results of the multinomial logistic model and were averaged across all observations.



¹²⁰ Figure 3: Marginal Effect of Late Survey Group on Rates of Most Recent Colon/Sigmoidoscopy

122 Figure 3 shows the marginal effect estimates for each category of the most recent self-reported colono-

123 scopies for the late-survey wave cohort. These estimates were based on the results of the multinomial

124 logistic model and were averaged across all observations.

125 Sensitivity Checks

Our effect estimates and inference do not appear sensitive to linear or non-linear model spec-126 ification. Supplemental table 2 shows the 2020*Late effect estimates for the linear probability 127 model specification and the multinomial logistic model specification. For each type of screening 128 and screening category, none of the estimates are significantly different from each other. Further, 129 our inference (whether to reject the null hypothesis that screening rates were similar in 2020 for 130 the late survey cohort) changed. The major takeaway from Table 2 in the supplemental file is that 131 the effect estimates in the non-linear model were more precise (smaller standard errors) for sig-132 nificant estimates for mammograms and colonoscopies. 133

Now while the estimates do not change with regard to including state-fixed effects, clustering 134 robust standard errors, and weighting our analyses, our inference would change depending on the 135 preferred specification. In the supplemental file, table 3 shows the alternative designs (Alt 1 - no 136 state fixed effects, Alt 2 - no state fixed effects, no clustering robust standard errors, Alt 3 - no state 137 fixed effects, no clustering robust standard errors, and no probability sampling weights). For each 138 of the three alternative specifications, the effect estimates for having never reported a mammo-139 gram in 2020 lose their significance. Moreover, for effect estimates of mammograms in the past 140 year and past 1-2 years, inference appears to change across alternative specifications. Inference 141 for the effect estimates on pap smears and colonoscopies also, slightly, varies across alternative 142 specifications. However, more interest were the increased number of significant pre-trend test 143

- statistics when excluding state fixed effects for both types of screenings. We suggest that this
- ¹⁴⁵ finding warrants inclusion the of the state-fixed effects to account for differential, time-invariant
- screening rates between quasi-treatment cohorts. Moreover, failing to account for clustering and
- weighting within each state may also add noise to our inference. Compared to our primary specifi-
- cation, our sensitivity analyses result in more differential pre-trend tests where we reject the null
- hypothesis (of no differential trends). Thus, we conclude that our primary specification is the most
- 150 internally valid design.

Assessing internal validity

- ¹⁵² Comparability of quasi-treatment cohorts
- Upon observing the unadjusted reports of a most recent cancer screen prior to 2020, we find 153 little convincing evidence to believe that screening rates in the two groups differed before the first 154 pandemic year. Supplemental Figures 2-4 visually depict the unadjusted cancer screening rates for 155 our guasi-treatment (late survey wave) and guasi-control (early survey wave), for each year in our 156 analyses. For each category of mammograms and pap smears, we see nearly identical trends and 157 levels in the most recent screening from 2010-2018. For adults reporting never having completed 158 a colonoscopy and adults reporting a colonscopy in the past year, we do see some possible non-150 common levels from 2010-14, but the trends and levels appear similar from 2016-2018. 160 The results of our two-sample proportion tests further validate our assumption, that these two 161 guasi-treatment cohorts had similar baseline screening rates. Note that Table 4 in the supplemen-162 tal files does report a few screening outcomes with p-values under 0.05, but these test statistics are not significantly different than zero after accounting for multiple hypothesis testing (significance 164
- threshold p < 0.0125). Further, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that the sample composition

of these two quasi-treatment groups are significantly different from each other (Table 5 in supplemental files).

168 Differential Trend Tests

We found evidence that screening rates in 2020 were significantly different between the two quasi-169 treatment cohorts. To infer a causal effect, however, we rely on the assumption that, in the absence 170 of the pandemic, the change in screening rates would not have been observed for the late-survey 171 wave cohort. To test the validity of this assumption, we empirically tested for differential trends 172 prior to 2020. In the supplemental file, table 6 reports the year-by-year effect estimates (absolute 173 differences) between quasi-treatment cohorts after excluding year 2020 from the analysis. We 174 find no statistically significant differences in these effect estimates for mammograms. Moreover, 175 the joint test of significance for each mammogram category exceeds the threshold to reject the 176 null hypothesis that 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016 coefficients equal zero (note, multiple hypothesis 177 testing threshold set at p < 0.0125). 178

We do however, detect the potential for differential trends in pap smears, specifically for adults reporting never having completed a pap smear and having completed a pap smear in the past year. The source of the potential pre-trend differences are observed in 2014. For both categories, we reject the null hypothesis that pap smear screening trends were similar prior to 2020 (p < 0.0125). Additionally, we detect the presence of differential trends for adults reporting their most recent colon/sigmoidoscopy three or more years prior. Again, the source of the differential pre-trend is observed in 2014. We reject the null hypothesis that, prior to 2020, reports of a colon/sigmoidoscopy

three or more years ago were similar between the two quasi-treatment groups (p < 0.0125).

187 Discussion/Conclusion

The dire predictions and early evidence that cancer screening dramatically declined prompted investment and capacity for "return to screening" initiatives and patient prioritization policies (loung 180 et al. 2022: Sprague et al. 2021). However, most early predictions focused on the initial decline. 190 as opposed to the subsequent rebound, and so did most of the early research. Even the research 191 which accounted for the rebound, failed to account for other, non-pandemic factors which could be 192 biasing the cancer screening deficit estimate. Our study does not claim that the pandemic had no 193 impact on cancer screening rates over the course of 2020. We found higher proportions of women 194 completing their most recent mammogram and pap smear 1-2 years ago. We also found lower proportion of adults completing their colonoscopy in the past year. However, our point estimates 196 are smaller than the most recent population-based research (Fedewa et al. 2022). We attribute 197 this difference to the fact that our study includes adults exposed, not just to the entire pandemic 198 vear, but to the "rebound period". Additionally, our Event-History design attempts to control for 190 temporal changes which could be affecting cancer screening rates in ways unrelated to the pan-200 demic, which other studies may fail to identify with simple pre/post designs. The implications of 201 our findings suggest that "return to screening" initiatives and prioritization policies based on the 202 overestimated effects of the pandemic on screening, may fail to achieve greater screening adher-203 ence. This is especially true for adults who have been delaying recommended cancer screenings 204 for three or more years, delays which started before the pandemic year. To advance cancer eq-205 uity, future research must continue monitoring the post-2020 cancer screening rebound to assess who is still delaying cancer screenings and how effective programs are mitigating these long-term 207 delays. Finally, our results not only signal delayed cancer screening in 2020, but increased initia-208 tion. The proportion of women reporting to have never completed a mammogram declined for 209 our late cohort in 2020 (relative to the change in the early cohort). Did the "return to screening" 210 policies navigate new patients to their first mammogram? Or, was this decline merely a result of a 211 "lower population denominator" after a year of elevated excess mortality? Future data can help us 212 understand the mechanisms influencing the post-COVID screening rebound, which will be critical for advancing efforts to improve early cancer detection in America well beyond this pandemic.

215 Methods and Materials

216 **Data**

We analyzed data from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), a cross-sectional random-digit-dialed, telephonic survey (both landline and cellphone) of nationally representative sample involving non-institutionalized civilian population, aged 18 years or older, who reside in the United States (CDC 2021). This population based self-reported, ongoing survey is conducted across all 50 states, DC and three US territories, which collects information on behavioral health risks, chronic conditions and the usage of preventive services covering more than 400,000 adult interviews each wave year.

224 Sample

Our study population included non-institutionalized adults 18 years or older, residing in the US (in-225 cluding DC), interviewed between January 1st to March 31st, for the even years (2010 – 2020), Based 226 on BRFSS cancer module eligibility, we included adults who were asked whether or not they have 227 received a mammogram, pap smear and/or sigmoidoscopy/colonoscopy screening services (CDC 228 2021). We then restricted our analysis to adults eligible for each respective cancer screen based on 229 the United States Preventative Task Force: Mammograms (females age 40-74: Pap Smears (females 230 age 25-64); and Colon/sigmoidoscopies (males and females age 45-79) (Mover et al. 2012; Siu et 231 al. 2016; Davidson et al. 2021). Participants from unknown US territories/jurisdictions, those who 232 were interviewed between April 1st to December 31st for the years 2010 to 2020, those interviewed in the years which did not utilize cancer modules (odd years), were all excluded (Supplemental Figure 1). 235

236 Analytical Design

From the perspective of the analyst, the ideal experiment to evaluate how the COVID-19 pandemic 237 impacted cancer screening would be to randomly assign adults into two groups: those exposed 238 and those not exposed to the pandemic. After tracking individual screening behavior over time. 239 any difference observed during the pandemic year (2020) would be attributed to the COVID-19 240 pandemic. This design is comically unrealistic. Unfortunately, quasi-experimental designs using 241 "as-if" randomization into treatment and controls are also infeasible. Because the COVID-19 pan-242 demic was a global event, everyone was exposed and everyone was impacted. Simple pre/post 243 analyses have attempted to measure the change in cancer screening rates, but these approaches 244 fail to account for other temporal factors which could be influencing screening rates in ways unre-245 lated to the pandemic. 246 Rather than attempt to create different groups based on exposure to the pandemic during 247

the pandemic year, we take a different approach by leveraging how BRFSS implements its crosssectional survey over the course of 15 months. Selection into the BRFSS sample is random. When

adults are surveyed, is also random. Therefore there is no reason to expect any observable dif-

²⁵¹ ferences in cancer screening behavior between adults queried early in a single year BRFSS survey

²⁵² wave and adults queried later in that same BRFSS survey wave; except however, during the COVID-

²⁵³ 19 pandemic year.

Our design begins by creating two distinct quasi-cohorts of adult BRESS respondents. The first 25/ cohort only includes adults surveyed between January 1 and March 31 of the first year in each 255 survey wave. We consider this "early" cohort the control group. Our second cohort only includes 256 adults surveyed between January 1 and March 31 of the second year in each survey wave. We 257 consider this "late" cohort the treatment group. Tables 2 (in the supplemental file) reports the can-258 cer screening rates for both quasi-treatment and control cohorts for years 2010-2018. We test for 259 significant differences in proportions between both groups and report the t-statistic and respective p-value to assess the comparability of these groups prior to 2020. We also conduct similar 261 proportion tests for the sample composition of our control variables. 262

Prior to 2020, we hypothesize that screening behavior is not significantly different between our control and treatment groups. We also hypothesize that, prior to 2020, the trends in screening behavior do not differentially vary by group (see statistical analysis section below for details on these identification tests). Evidence that levels and trends did not vary between groups prior to 2020 supports our identification assumption: that any difference in screening rates observed in 2020 should be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Statistical Analysis For each of the three cancer screenings (mammograms, pap smears, and colonoscopies), we model the probability of self-reported cancer screening behavior as mutually exclusive categories related to the timing of the most recent screen. This approach not only allows us to model the change in probabilities over time, but also model how the distribution of cancer screening behavior changes between each timing category. Our initial specification models the probability of a recent cancer screen as a series of linear probability models.

275 1) $Y_{its}^m = P(Y^m = y | X_i, t = Y EAR, s = STATE)$

Where Y_{m}^{m} is a binary variable indicating if the respondent reported a cancer screening in time in-276 terval m. X_i is a vector of control variables potentially impacting cancer screening rates, but exoge-277 nous to the COVID-19 pandemic. This set of exogenous dummy variables includes age (five-year 278 age groups), race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and non-Hispanic 279 other), education status (no highschool, high school degree only or GED, some college but no four-280 vear degree, four-year college degree only or at least some graduate-level education and/or de-281 gree), whether the respondent is married, and whether the respondent is male. To account for 282 secular trends in cancer screening, each model includes YEAR, a vector of binary fixed-effects variables indicating the survey wave year. These survey wave fixed effects account for temporal trends

- in cancer screening. Finally, to account for time-invariant, regional behaviors, policies, and health
- ²⁸⁶ systems impacting cancer screening, each model includes s, a vector of binary fixed-effects vari-
- ²⁸⁷ ables indicating the state of residence for each respondent.
- We then estimate the incremental effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on screening behavior Y_{its}^m as:

290 2)
$$\Delta SCREENING^{m} = \frac{\Delta Y_{iis}^{m}}{\Delta PANDEMIC} = \frac{\Delta Y_{iis}^{m}}{\Delta (2020|treatment)}$$

Where the estimated effect equals a change in Y_{its}^m given an incremental change in pandemic status (modeled as the incremental change of a dummy variable indicating if the year is 2020, for adults in the treatment group). Rather than implement a simple pre/post design, we explicitly allow the screening behavior in the treatment group to vary from the screening behavior in the control group for each year of the analysis (Clarke and Tapia-Schythe 2021). The event history study model is defined as:

297 3)
$$Y_{its}^m = \beta * Y EAR'_t * T REATED_i + Y EAR'_t + X'_I + ST ATE'_S + e_{its}$$

B identifies the average association between cancer screening behavior Y^m for adults surveyed in the later part of each BRFSS survey wave. Using 2019 as the arbitrary baseline category, our 299 event history analysis yields five B parameters (2010*Late, 2012*Late, 2014*Late, 2016*Late, and 300 2020*Late) This approach also allows us to test if $\Delta Y_{in}^m = \Delta PANDEMIC = (2020|control) = 0$ 301 (Borusvak, Jaravel, and Spiess 2022). More importantly, we can now visually assess and empiri-302 cally test our identification assumptions (Marcus and SantAnna 2021). Following best practice, we 303 formally conduct pre-treatment differential trend tests by excluding responses in the 2020 survey 304 wave and then recompute equation 3 (Freyaldenhoven, Hansen, and Shapiro 2019). In addition to 305 reporting for each YEAR*TREATED coefficient, we calculate robust Wald statistics (with Bonferonni 306 correction) to test if the trends in cancer screening rates between quasi-treatment and control cohorts jointly equalled zero (Armstrong 2014). Any significant results from these pre-treatment 308 tests would suggest that cancer screening behaviors were differentially changing for treatment. 300 compared to control cohorts, in ways unrelated to the COVID-19 pandemic. Conversely, null re-310 sults provide confidence in the strength of our identifying assumption and supports the validity of 311 our study design. 312

All analyses incorporate BRFSS supplied sampling weights, estimate standard errors robust to heteroskedasticity, and cluster the robust standard errors at the state level (Abadie et al. 2017; Cameron and Miller 2015). The Bonferonni correction method was used to adjust for multiple hypothesis testing for group differences and pre-treatment joint Wald tests (Armstrong 2014.

317 Alternative Specifications

Because of its ability to consistently model time-trends and group (i.e., state) fixed effects, the lin-318 ear probability model is typically the preferred specification in the quasi-experimental literature. 319 However, analytical issues may arise if the linear predictions are estimating potential outcomes 320 outside the bounds of zero and one. In the presence of these nonsensical predictions, the lin-321 ear probability model may be yielding biased estimates. To confront this threat, we construct an 322 alternative set of specifications and model the probability of a recent cancer diagnosis with a multi-323 nomial logistic regression model. After comparing the predicted probabilities of these nonlinear 324 models with the predictions of our linear model, we use the coefficients in the nonlinear models to 325 estimate the average incremental effect of the treatment group (compared to the control group) in 326

each year on the probability of each cancer outcome (Williams 2012). We also extend this marginal

analysis to estimate the semi-elasticity, or relative change from baseline screening rates, for the

treatment group in 2020 (Williams 2012). To support our inference, we test if the point estimates

and standard errors in our linear models are significantly different from the estimates in the non-

linear specifications. A final set of sensitivity analyses relax the model assumptions by 1) removing

the state-specific fixed effects, 2) remove state-specific fixed effects and estimate (unclustered) ro-

³³³ bust standard errors, 3) remove state-fixed effects, estimate (unclustered) robust standard errors,

and ignore probability sampling weights.

References

- Abadie, Alberto, Susan Athey, Guido W. Imbens, and Jeffrey Wooldridge. When Should You Adjust Standard Errors
- for Clustering? Working Paper 24003. Series: Working Paper Series. National Bureau of Economic Research,
- November 2017. Accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.3386/w24003. https://www.nber.org/papers/w24003.

339 Anderson, Roy M., Hans Heesterbeek, Don Klinkenberg, and T. Déirdre Hollingsworth. "How will country-based

- mitigation measures influence the course of the COVID-19 epidemic?" Publisher: Elsevier, *The Lancet* 395,
- no. 10228 (March 21, 2020): 931–934. ISSN: 0140-6736, 1474-547X, accessed April 3, 2020. https://doi.org/10.
- **342** 1016/S0140-6736(20)30567-5. https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(20)30567-5/abstract.
- Armstrong, RA. "When to use the Bonferroni correction." Ophthalmic Physiol Opt, April 2014. Accessed June 2,
- 2022. https://doi.org/10.1111/opo.12131. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24697967/.
- Bakouny, Ziad, Marco Paciotti, Andrew L. Schmidt, Stuart R. Lipsitz, Toni K. Choueiri, and Quoc-Dien Trinh.
- "Cancer Screening Tests and Cancer Diagnoses During the COVID-19 Pandemic." JAMA Oncology 7, no. 3
- (March 1, 2021): 458–460. ISSN: 2374-2437, accessed November 18, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.
- 348 2020.7600. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2020.7600.
- Bello, Ricardo J., George J. Chang, and Nader N. Massarweh. "Colorectal Cancer Screening in the USStill Putting
- the Cart Before the Horse?" JAMA Oncology, May 5, 2022. ISSN: 2374-2437, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.japa.2022.
- 351 //doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2022.0500. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2022.0500.
- 352 Benavidez, Gabriel A., Anja Zgodic, Whitney E. Zahnd, and Jan M. Eberth. "Disparities in Meeting USPSTF Breast,
- Cervical, and Colorectal Cancer Screening Guidelines Among Women in the United States." Preventing
- 254 Chronic Disease 18 (April 15, 2021): E37. ISSN: 1545-1151, accessed March 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.5888/
- pcd18.200315. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8051853/.
- Bitler, Marianne P., Christopher S. Carpenter, and Danea Horn. "Effects of the Colorectal Cancer Control Pro-
- gram." _Eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/hec.4397, Health Economics 30, no. 11 (2021):
- **2667–2685.** ISSN: 1099-1050, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.4397. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.
- com/doi/abs/10.1002/hec.4397.
- Borusyak, Kirill, Xavier Jaravel, and Jann Spiess. Revisiting Event Study Designs: Robust and Efficient Estimation.
- 361 SSRN Scholarly Paper 2826228. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, April 19, 2022. Accessed
- June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2826228. https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2826228.
- Cameron, A. Colin, and Douglas L. Miller. "A Practitioners Guide to Cluster-Robust Inference." Publisher: Univer-
- sity of Wisconsin Press, Journal of Human Resources 50, no. 2 (March 31, 2015): 317–372. ISSN: 0022-166X,
- 1548-8004, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.50.2.317. http://jhr.uwpress.org/content/50/2/317.
- Cancino, Ramon S., Zhaohui Su, Ruben Mesa, Gail E. Tomlinson, and Jing Wang. "The Impact of COVID-19 on
- Cancer Screening: Challenges and Opportunities." Company: JMIR Cancer Distributor: JMIR Cancer Institu-
- tion: JMIR Cancer Label: JMIR Cancer Publisher: JMIR Publications Inc., Toronto, Canada, JMIR Cancer 6, no.
- 2 (October 29, 2020): e21697. Accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.2196/21697. https://cancer.jmir.org/2020/
- зто 2/е21697.
- CDC. "Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System [2010-2020]," 2021. Accessed January 2, 2022. https://www.cdc.
- gov/brfss/annual_data/annual_2020.html.

- 373 Chen, Ronald C., Kevin Haynes, Simo Du, John Barron, and Aaron J. Katz. "Association of Cancer Screening Deficit
- in the United States With the COVID-19 Pandemic." JAMA Oncology 7, no. 6 (June 1, 2021): 878–884. ISSN:
- 2374-2437, accessed March 11, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2021.0884. https://doi.org/10.1001/

376 jamaoncol.2021.0884.

- 377 Clarke, Damian, and Kathya Tapia-Schythe. "Implementing the panel event study." Publisher: SAGE Publications,
- The Stata Journal 21, no. 4 (December 1, 2021): 853–884. ISSN: 1536-867X, accessed June 2, 2022. https: //doi.org/10.1177/1536867X211063144. https://doi.org/10.1177/1536867X211063144.
- 380 Davidson, Karina W., Michael J. Barry, Carol M. Mangione, Michael Cabana, Aaron B. Caughey, Esa M. Davis,
- 381 Katrina E. Donahue, et al. "Screening for Colorectal Cancer: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommen-
- dation Statement." JAMA 325, no. 19 (May 18, 2021): 1965–1977. ISSN: 1538-3598. https://doi.org/10.1001/
- **383** jama.2021.6238.
- Davidson, Nancy E., Karen E. Knudsen, Shelley Fuld Nasso, Randall Oyer, Steve Pergam, Lara Strawbridge, and
- Lawrence Shulman. "Cancer Care at the Beginning of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Effects on Patients and
- Early Interventions to Mitigate Stresses on Care." *The Cancer Journal* 28, no. 2 (April 2022): 107–110. ISSN:
- 387
 1528-9117, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1097/PPO.00000000000586. https://journals.lww.com/
- journalppo/Fulltext/2022/03000/Cancer_Care_at_the_Beginning_of_the_COVID_19.5.aspx.
- 389 DeGroff, A., J. Miller, K. Sharma, J. Sun, W. Helsel, W. Kammerer, T. Rockwell, et al. "COVID-19 impact on screening
- test volume through the National Breast and Cervical Cancer early detection program, JanuaryJune 2020, in
- the United States." *Preventive Medicine*, From disruption to recovery: The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic
- on Cancer Screening, 151 (October 1, 2021): 106559. ISSN: 0091-7435, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.
- org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2021.106559. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0091743521001432.
- 394 DeJong, Colette, Mitchell H. Katz, and Kenneth Covinsky. "Deferral of Care for Serious NonCOVID-19 Conditions:
- A Hidden Harm of COVID-19." JAMA Internal Medicine 181, no. 2 (February 1, 2021): 274. ISSN: 2168-6106,
- accessed April 5, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.4016. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.
- **397 4016**.
- ³⁹⁸ Dennis, Leslie K., Chiu-Hsieh Hsu, and Amanda K. Arrington. "Reduction in Standard Cancer Screening in 2020
- throughout the U.S." Number: 23 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute, Cancers 13, no.
- 400 23 (January 2021): 5918. ISSN: 2072-6694, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers13235918.
- 401 https://www.mdpi.com/2072-6694/13/23/5918.
- ⁴⁰² Drescher, Charles W., Adam J. Bograd, Shu-Ching Chang, Roshanthi K. Weerasinghe, Ann Vita, and R. Bryan Bell.
- 403 "Cancer case trends following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic: A community-based observational
- study with extended follow-up." _Eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/cncr.34067, Can-
- 405 *cer* 128, no. 7 (2022): 1475–1482. ISSN: 1097-0142, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.34067.
- https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cncr.34067.
- Duszak, Richard, Jeff Maze, Candice Sessa, Howard B. Fleishon, Lauren P. Golding, Gregory N. Nicola, and Danny
- R. Hughes. "Characteristics of COVID-19 Community Practice Declines in Noninvasive Diagnostic Imaging
- 409 Professional Work." Publisher: Elsevier, Journal of the American College of Radiology 17, no. 11 (November 1,
- 2020): 1453–1459. ISSN: 1546-1440, 1558-349X, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacr.2020.06.
- **411** 031. https://www.jacr.org/article/S1546-1440(20)30742-0/fulltext.

- 412 Fedewa, Stacey A., Jessica Star, Priti Bandi, Adair Minihan, Xuesong Han, K. Robin Yabroff, and Ahmedin Jemal.
- "Changes in Cancer Screening in the US During the COVID-19 Pandemic." JAMA Network Open 5, no. 6 (June
- 414 2022): e2215490-e2215490. ISSN: 2574-3805. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.15490. eprint: https://
- 415 //jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/articlepdf/2792956/fedewa_2022_oi_220453_1653581780.1564.pdf.
- 416 https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.15490.
- 417 Fedewa, Stacey A., K. Robin Yabroff, Priti Bandi, Robert A. Smith, Nigar Nargis, Zhiyuan Zheng, Jeffrey Drope, and
- 418 Ahmedin Jemal. "Unemployment and cancer screening: Baseline estimates to inform health care delivery
- in the context of COVID-19 economic distress." Cancer 128, no. 4 (February 15, 2022): 737–745. ISSN: 1097-
- 420 0142. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.33966.
- 421 Findling, Mary G., Robert J. Blendon, and John M. Benson. "Delayed Care with Harmful Health Consequences-
- Reported Experiences from National Surveys During Coronavirus Disease 2019." JAMA Health Forum 1, no.
- 423 12 (December 14, 2020): e201463. ISSN: 2689-0186, accessed March 11, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1001/
- jamahealthforum.2020.1463. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamahealthforum.2020.1463.
- 425 Freyaldenhoven, Simon, Christian Hansen, and Jesse M. Shapiro. "Pre-event Trends in the Panel Event-Study
- 426 Design." American Economic Review 109, no. 9 (September 2019): 3307–3338. ISSN: 0002-8282, accessed
- June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20180609. https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.20180609.
- 428 Hanna, Karim, Brandy L. Arredondo, Melody N. Chavez, Carley Geiss, Emma Hume, Laura Szalacha, Shannon M.
- 429 Christy, et al. "Cancer Screening Among Rural and Urban Clinics During COVID-19: A Multistate Qualitative
- 430 Study." Publisher: Wolters Kluwer, JCO Oncology Practice, March 7, 2022, OP.21.00658. ISSN: 2688-1527,
- 431 accessed March 29, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1200/OP.21.00658. https://ascopubs.org/doi/full/10.1200/OP.21.00658.
- 432 Joung, Rachel H., Heidi Nelson, Timothy W. Mullett, Scott H. Kurtzman, Sarah Shafir, James B. Harris, Katharine A.
- 433 Yao, Brian C. Brajcich, Karl Y. Bilimoria, and William G. Cance. "A national quality improvement study identi-
- 434 fying and addressing cancer screening deficits due to the COVID-19 pandemic." _Eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.col
- 435 Cancer 128, no. 11 (2022): 2119–2125. ISSN: 1097-0142, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.
- **436** 34157. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cncr.34157.
- 437 Kelkar, Amar H., Jing Zhao, Shu Wang, and Christopher R. Cogle. "Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Colorec-
- tal and Prostate Cancer Screening in a Large U.S. Health System." Number: 2 Publisher: Multidisciplinary
- Digital Publishing Institute, *Healthcare* 10, no. 2 (February 2022): 264. ISSN: 2227-9032, accessed June 2,
- 440 2022. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare10020264. https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9032/10/2/264.
- Labaki, Chris, Ziad Bakouny, Andrew Schmidt, Stuart R. Lipsitz, Timothy R. Rebbeck, Quoc-Dien Trinh, and Toni K.
- Choueiri. "Recovery of cancer screening tests and possible associated disparities after the first peak of the
- 443 COVID-19 pandemic." Cancer Cell 39, no. 8 (August 9, 2021): 1042–1044. ISSN: 1535-6108, accessed June 2,
- **2022.** https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccell.2021.06.019. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S153561082100341X.
- 445 Mafi, John N., Melody Craff, Sitaram Vangala, Thomas Pu, Dale Skinner, Cyrus Tabatabai-Yazdi, Anikia Nelson,
- et al. "Trends in US Ambulatory Care Patterns During the COVID-19 Pandemic, 2019-2021." JAMA 327, no. 3
- (January 18, 2022): 237–247. ISSN: 0098-7484, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.24294.
- 448 https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.24294.
- Marcus, Michelle, and Pedro H. C. SantAnna. "The Role of Parallel Trends in Event Study Settings: An Applica-
- tion to Environmental Economics." Publisher: The University of Chicago Press, Journal of the Association of
- 451 Environmental and Resource Economists 8, no. 2 (March 2021): 235–275. ISSN: 2333-5955, accessed June 2,
- 452 2022. https://doi.org/10.1086/711509. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/711509.

- 453 Matos, Leandro L., Carlos Henrique Q. Forster, Gustavo N. Marta, Gilberto Castro Junior, John A. Ridge, Daisy
- 454 Hirata, Adalberto Miranda-Filho, et al. "The hidden curve behind COVID-19 outbreak: the impact of delay
- in treatment initiation in cancer patients and how to mitigate the additional risk of dying-the head and
- 456 neck cancer model." Cancer causes & control: CCC 32, no. 5 (May 2021): 459-471. ISSN: 1573-7225. https:
- 457 //doi.org/10.1007/s10552-021-01411-7.
- McBain, Ryan K., Jonathan H. Cantor, Anupam B. Jena, Megan F. Pera, Dena M. Bravata, and Christopher M.
- 459 Whaley. "Decline and Rebound in Routine Cancer Screening Rates During the COVID-19 Pandemic." Journal
- of General Internal Medicine 36, no. 6 (June 1, 2021): 1829–1831. ISSN: 1525-1497, accessed June 2, 2022.
- 461 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-021-06660-5. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-021-06660-5.
- Moyer, Virginia A., and U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. "Screening for cervical cancer: U.S. Preventive Ser-
- vices Task Force recommendation statement." Annals of Internal Medicine 156, no. 12 (June 19, 2012): 880-
- 464 891, W312. ISSN: 1539-3704. https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-156-12-201206190-00424.
- Peoples, Anita R., Laura B. Oswald, Jennifer Ose, Bailee Daniels, Caroline Himbert, Cassandra A. Hathaway, Bil-
- jana Gigic, et al. "Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on rural and urban cancer patients' experiences, health
- behaviors, and perceptions." _Eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/jrh.12648, The Jour-
- *nal of Rural Health* n/a (n/a 2022). ISSN: 1748-0361, accessed March 29, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1111/jrh.12648.
- https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jrh.12648.
- ATO Al-Quteimat, Osama M., and Amer Mustafa Amer. "The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Cancer Patients."
- American Journal of Clinical Oncology 43, no. 6 (June 2020): 452–455. ISSN: 0277-3732, accessed Novem-
- ber 18, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1097/COC.00000000000712. https://journals.lww.com/amjclinicaloncology/fulltext/
- 473 2020/06000/the_impact_of_the_covid_19_pandemic_on_cancer.12.aspx.
- 474 Richards, Mike, Michael Anderson, Paul Carter, Benjamin L. Ebert, and Elias Mossialos. "The impact of the COVID-
- 19 pandemic on cancer care." Number: 6 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, *Nature Cancer* 1, no. 6 (June
- 476 2020): 565–567. ISSN: 2662-1347, accessed April 6, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43018-020-0074-y. https:
- 477 //www.nature.com/articles/s43018-020-0074-y.
- 478 Richardson, Lisa C. "Adults Who Have Never Been Screened for Colorectal Cancer, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveil-
- lance System, 2012 and 2020." Preventing Chronic Disease 19 (2022). ISSN: 1545-1151, accessed June 2, 2022.
- 480 https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd19.220001. https://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2022/22_0001.htm.
- 481 Sabatino, Susan A., Trevor D. Thompson, Mary C. White, Jean A. Shapiro, Tainya C. Clarke, Jennifer M. Croswell,
- and Lisa C. Richardson. "Cancer Screening Test Use8213;U.S., 2019." American Journal of Preventive Medicine,
- April 22, 2022. ISSN: 0749-3797, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2022.02.018. https://doi.org/10.1018. https://doi.org/10.1018. https://doi.org/10.1018. https://doi.org/10.1018. https://doi.0018.018. https://doi.org/10.1018. https://doi.org/10.1018. https://doi.0018.018. https://doi.org/10.1018. https://doi.org/10.1018. https://doi.0018.018. https://doi.org/10.1018. https://doi.org/10.1018. https://doi.0018.018. https://doi.0018.018. https://doi.org/10.1018. https://doi.0018.018. https://doi.0018. https://doi
- 484 //www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379722001520.
- Schoenborn, Nancy L., Cynthia M. Boyd, and Craig E. Pollack. "Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer
- screening attitudes, intentions, and behaviors in older adults." _Eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.11
- Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 70, no. 1 (2022): 67–69. ISSN: 1532-5415, accessed June 2, 2022.
- https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.17449. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jgs.17449.
- 489 Semprini, Jason. "How Did the Covid-19 Pandemic Impact Cancer Prevention and Treatment? Examining Nation-
- ally Representative Survey Data." Publisher: Wolters Kluwer, JCO Global Oncology 8 (Supplement_1 2022):
- 18–18. Accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1200/GO.22.24000. https://ascopubs.org/doi/abs/10.1200/GO.22.
- 492 24000.

- 493 Semprini, Jason. How did the COVID-19 Pandemic impact self-reported cancer screening rates in 12 Midwestern
- states? Type: article. medRxiv, April 18, 2022. Accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.13.
 22273837. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.04.13.22273837v1.
- Siu, Albert L., and U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. "Screening for Breast Cancer: U.S. Preventive Services
- Task Force Recommendation Statement." Annals of Internal Medicine 164, no. 4 (February 16, 2016): 279–
- **498** 296. ISSN: 1539-3704. https://doi.org/10.7326/M15-2886.
- Sprague, Brian L., Ellen S. O'Meara, Christoph I. Lee, Janie M. Lee, Louise M. Henderson, Diana S. M. Buist,
- Nila Alsheik, et al. "Prioritizing breast imaging services during the COVID pandemic: A survey of breast
 imaging facilities within the Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium." *Preventive Medicine*, From disruption
- imaging facilities within the Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium." *Preventive Medicine*, From disruption
 to recovery: The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Cancer Screening, 151 (October 1, 2021): 106540.
- ⁵⁰³ ISSN: 0091-7435, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2021.106540. https://www.sciencedirect.
- 504 com/science/article/pii/S0091743521001249.
- 505 Staib, James, Kierstin Catlett, and Stacey DaCosta Byfield. "Disruptions in cancer screening and diagnoses during
- the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020." Publisher: Wolters Kluwer, Journal of Clinical Oncology 39, no. 28 (October
- 507 2021): 315–315. ISSN: 0732-183X, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2020.39.28_suppl.315.
- 508 https://ascopubs.org/doi/abs/10.1200/JCO.2020.39.28_suppl.315.
- 509 Suran, Melissa. "Stagnant US Mammography Rates and the Influence of COVID-19." JAMA 327, no. 18 (May 10,
- 2022): 1742–1744. ISSN: 0098-7484, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2022.4295. https://
- **511** //doi.org/10.1001/jama.2022.4295.
- Velazquez, Ana I., Jessica H. Hayward, Blake Gregory, and Niharika Dixit. "Trends in Breast Cancer Screening
- in a Safety-Net Hospital During the COVID-19 Pandemic." JAMA Network Open 4, no. 8 (August 6, 2021):
- e2119929. ISSN: 2574-3805, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.19929.
- https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.19929.
- 516 Williams, Richard. "Using the Margins Command to Estimate and Interpret Adjusted Predictions and Marginal
- Effects." The Stata Journal: Promoting communications on statistics and Stata 12, no. 2 (June 2012): 308–331.
- ISSN: 1536-867X, 1536-8734, accessed June 2, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1177/1536867X1201200209. http:
- **519** //journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1536867X1201200209.

520 Supplemental Files

⁵²¹ Supplemental Figure 1: Sample Selection Flow Chart





⁵²³ Supplemental Figure 2: Mammograms

Supplemental Figure 1 shows the year-by-year proportion of adults reporting having never received a mammogram, having received a mammogram in the past year, having received a mammogram 1-2 years ago, and having received a mammogram 3 or more years ago. The "early" cohort are adults surveyed by BRFSS in the first three months of the survey wave and the "late" cohort are adults surveyed

in the final three months (Jan-Mar) or second year of the survey wave.



⁵³⁰ Supplemental Figure 3: Pap Smears

Supplemental Figure 3 shows the year-by-year proportion of adults reporting having never received a pap smear, having received a pap smear in the past year, having received a pap smear 1-2 years ago, and having received a pap smear 3 or more years ago. The "early" cohort are adults surveyed by BRFSS in the first three months of the survey wave and the "late" cohort are adults surveyed in the final three

months (Jan-Mar) or second year of the survey wave.



⁵³⁷ Supplemental Figure 4: Colonoscopies or Sigmoidoscopies

Supplemental Figure 3 shows the year-by-year proportion of adults reporting having never received a
 colonoscopy or sigmoidoscopy, having received a colonoscopy or sigmoidoscopy in the past year, having
 received a colonoscopy or sigmoidoscopy 1-2 years ago, and having received a colonoscopy or sigmoidoscopy 1-2 years ago, and having received a colonoscopy or sigmoidoscopy o

- the survey wave and the "late" cohort are adults surveyed in the final three months (Jan-Mar) or second
- 544 year of the survey wave.

 Table 2. Marginal Effect Estimates for 2020*Late Group (Linear & Multinomial Logistic Regression Models)

		Model			
		Linear	Logistic		
	Novor	-0.029*	-0.028***		
	Never	(0.013)	(0.000)		
	<1 Voor	-0.021	-0.022		
Mammogram	<1 Year	(0.034)	(0.030)		
Wannogram	1 2 Voarc	0.031*	0.031***		
	I-Z TEdis	(0.015)	(0.000)		
	2+ Voars	0.020	0.020		
	ST reals	(0.024)	(0.037)		
	Never	-0.011	-0.010		
		(0.012)	(0.038)		
	<1 Year	-0.043	-0.055		
Pap Smear	i i cui	(0.031)	(0.069)		
r up Shieur	1-2 Years	0.042*	0.038*		
	1210015	(0.019)	(0.027)		
	3+ Years	0.012	0.028		
	5. rears	(0.018)	(0.019)		
		-0.010	-0.016		
	Never	(0.020)	-0.010		
		(0.020)	0.019)		
Colonoscony /	<1 Year	-0.035°	-0.043		
Colonoscopy /		(0.010)	0.001)		
Sigmoluoscopy	1-2 Years	(0.030	0.030		
		0.010	0.004)		
	3+ Years	0.015	0.021		
		(0.019)	(0.024)		

Supplemental - Table 2 reports the 2020*Late effect estimates from our primary linear regression model (left column) and the alternative non-linear multinomail logistic regression model (right column). p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001.

		M	ammogra	am	F	Pap Smea	r	Colonoscopy / Sigmoidoscopy			
		2020*Late	se	Pre-Trend Test (p)	2020*Late	se	Pre-Trend Test (p)	2020*Late	se	Pre-Trend Test (p)	
Alt. 1		-0.028	(0.014)	0.290	-0.013	(0.012)	0.000^	-0.002	(0.020)	0.009^	
Alt. 2	Never	-0.028	(0.015)	0.540	-0.013	(0.012)	0.005^	-0.002	(0.027)	0.081	
Alt. 3		0.005	(0.006)	0.581	-0.013	(0.012)	0.108	0.010	(0.011)	0.010^	
Alt. 1		-0.030	(0.032)	0.047	-0.055	(0.031)	0.110	-0.042*	(0.016)	0.356	
Alt. 2	<1 Year	-0.030	(0.028)	0.368	-0.055*	(0.025)	0.612	-0.042*	(0.020)	0.294	
Alt. 3		-0.047***	(0.012)	0.083	-0.055*	(0.025)	0.008^	-0.043***	(0.009)	0.014	
Alt. 1		0.036*	(0.016)	0.854	0.050*	(0.021)	0.157	0.026	(0.016)	0.207	
Alt. 2	1-2 Years	0.036	(0.023)	0.935	0.050*	(0.022)	0.338	0.026	(0.019)	0.331	
Alt. 3		0.031***	(0.009)	0.398	0.050*	(0.022)	0.933	0.035***	(0.009)	0.416	
Alt. 1		0.022	(0.022)	0.366	0.017	(0.017)	0.011^	0.019	(0.020)	0.001^	
Alt. 2	3+ Year	0.022	(0.024)	0.539	0.017	(0.025)	0.275	0.019	(0.023)	0.260	
Alt. 3		0.011	(0.009)	0.618	0.017	(0.025)	0.056	-0.002	(0.009)	0.085	

Table 3. Sensitivity

548 Supplemental - Table 3 reports the 2020*Late effect estimates for three alternative linear probability

regression models. Alt 1 removes the state-level fixed effects. Alt 2 removes the state-level fixed effects

and does not cluster robust standard errors at the state-level, opting only to estimate unclustered robust

standard errors. Alt 3 removes fixed effects, does not cluster robust standard errors, and does not weight

the analyses by BRFSS supplied sampling weights. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001.

	Survey Wave Group								
		E	ary	L	ate	Т	р		
Mammogram	Never	0.342	(0.007)	0.355	(0.009)	1.860	0.200		
	<1 Year	0.400	(0.007)	0.379	(0.008)	-3.000	0.100		
	1-2 Years	0.116	(0.001)	0.121	(0.003)	5.000	0.040		
	3+ Years	0.143	(0.004)	0.145	(0.004)	0.500	0.670		
Pap Smear	Never	0.088	(0.003)	0.102	(0.006)	4.670	0.040		
	<1 Year	0.467	(0.008)	0.420	(0.009)	-5.880	0.030		
	1-2 Years	0.172	(0.003)	0.186	(0.009)	4.670	0.040		
	3+ Years	0.274	(0.008)	0.292	(0.008)	2.250	0.150		
Colon/Sigmoidoscopy	Never	0.417	(0.006)	0.417	(0.012)	0.000	1.000		
	<1 Year	0.211	(0.005)	0.195	(0.008)	-3.200	0.090		
	1-2 Years	0.159	(0.004)	0.146	(0.008)	-3.250	0.080		
	3+ Years	0.213	(0.006)	0.242	(0.010)	4.830	0.040		

Table 4. Self-reported rates (2010-2018) of most recent cancer screening for early and late survey groups

553 Supplemental - Table 4 reports the rates for each mutually exclusive cancer screening category (as a

proportion) of the total sample of adults surveyed by BRFSS in years 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2018.

The rates are stratified by adults surveyed early in the survey wave and adults surveyed later in the survey

⁵⁵⁶ wave. The t-statistic is the result of the two-sample proportion test.

Survey Wave Group								
Demographic Group	Early		L	ate	т	р		
Age 18-24	0.126	(0.002)	0.134	(0.003)	4.000	0.060		
Age 25-29	0.081	(0.002)	0.091	(0.006)	5.000	0.040		
Age 30-34	0.094	(0.002)	0.103	(0.003)	4.500	0.050		
Age 35-39	0.081	(0.001)	0.088	(0.003)	7.000	0.020		
Age 40-44	0.089	(0.001)	0.088	(0.002)	-1.000	0.420		
Age 45-49	0.080	(0.001)	0.077	(0.001)	-3.000	0.100		
Age 50-54	0.097	(0.001)	0.094	(0.002)	-3.000	0.100		
Age 55-59	0.081	(0.001)	0.081	(0.003)	0.000	1.000		
Age 60-64	0.080	(0.001)	0.077	(0.002)	-3.000	0.100		
Age 65-69	0.061	(0.001)	0.059	(0.003)	-2.000	0.180		
Age 70-74	0.048	(0.001)	0.043	(0.004)	-5.000	0.040		
Age 75-79	0.038	(0.001)	0.030	(0.001)	-8.000	0.020		
Age 80-84	0.043	(0.002)	0.034	(0.002)	-4.500	0.050		
non-Hispanic White	0.659	(0.031)	0.581	(0.065)	-2.520	0.130		
non-Hispanic Black	0.114	(0.011)	0.106	(0.019)	-0.730	0.540		
non-Hispanic other race/ethnicity	0.074	(0.010)	0.100	(0.026)	2.600	0.120		
Hispanic	0.136	(0.027)	0.197	(0.055)	2.260	0.150		
No primary education	0.002	(0.001)	0.003	(0.001)	1.000	0.420		
Primary education only	0.041	(0.005)	0.053	(0.011)	2.400	0.140		
Some High School education, no degree	0.092	(0.002)	0.093	(0.004)	0.500	0.670		
High School degree only	0.285	(0.008)	0.270	(0.015)	-1.870	0.200		
Some college education, no bachelor's degree	0.305	(0.005)	0.308	(0.007)	0.600	0.610		
Bachelor's degree or more	0.274	(0.007)	0.273	(0.007)	-0.140	0.900		
Married	0.524	(0.005)	0.515	(0.009)	-1.800	0.210		
Divorced	0.105	(0.002)	0.101	(0.004)	-2.000	0.180		
Widowed	0.066	(0.002)	0.059	(0.004)	-3.500	0.070		
Seperated	0.024	(0.001)	0.024	(0.001)	0.000	1.000		
Never Married	0.237	(0.005)	0.251	(0.010)	2.800	0.110		
Unmarried Partner	0.044	(0.002)	0.050	(0.005)	3.000	0.100		

Table 5. Demographic rates (2010-2018) for early and late survey groups

⁵⁵⁷ Supplemental - Table 5 reports the rates each demographic group (used as independent variables in

the primary analysis) of the total sample of adults surveyed by BRFSS in years 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016,

and 2018. The rates are stratified by adults surveyed early in the survey wave and adults surveyed later

in the survey wave. The t-statistic is the result of the two-sample proportion test.

		Pre-Treatment Coefficient Estimates								
		2010*Late		2012*Late		2014*Late		2016*Late		Joint Test (p)
	Never	-0.007	(0.018)	0.006	(0.016)	-0.013	(0.014)	-0.018	(0.012)	0.307
Mammogram	<1 Year	-0.012	(0.023)	-0.022	(0.024)	0.002	(0.025)	0.021	(0.021)	0.027
	1-2 Years	-0.008	(0.021)	0.000	(0.019)	0.001	(0.020)	-0.001	(0.016)	0.965
	3+ Years	0.027	(0.021)	0.016	(0.018)	0.010	(0.013)	-0.003	(0.015)	0.499
Pap Smear	Never <1 Year	0.017 0.019 -0.012	(0.011) (0.022) (0.014)	-0.009 0.018 -0.018	(0.012) (0.026) (0.017)	-0.025** 0.045* 0.001	(0.008) (0.021) (0.017)	-0.010 -0.006 0.022	(0.010) (0.015) (0.014)	0.000^ 0.007^ 0.319
	3+ Years	-0.012	(0.014)	0.009	(0.019)	-0.021	(0.018)	-0.006	(0.017)	0.249
	Never	0.019	(0.017)	0.015	(0.019)	0.019	(0.019)	-0.024	(0.018)	0.257
Colonoscopy/	<1 Year	-0.030	(0.019)	-0.023	(0.013)	-0.037	(0.023)	-0.009	(0.013)	0.445
Sigmoidoscopy	1-2 Years	0.012	(0.020)	-0.021	(0.015)	0.006	(0.015)	-0.009	(0.013)	0.096
	3+ Years	-0.011	(0.010)	0.014	(0.011)	-0.018*	(0.008)	-0.016	(0.009)	0.002^

Table 6. Pre-Trend Tests

561 Supplemental - Table 6 reports the year-by-year coefficients of the event-history analyses (excluding

⁵⁶² 2020) with year 2018 as the baseline. Significant coefficients indicate differences in screening rate levels

⁵⁶³ between quasi-treatment cohorts. The Joint Test (p) column reports the p-value from the Wald test, testing

if each of the reported coeffiecient jointly equals zero. The Bonferonni correction was used to account

for multiple hypotheses. * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001. Note: $\land p <$ multiple-test corrected

significance level for Joint Test.