Published in final edited form as:

Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2016 November ; 25(11): 1524–1533. doi: 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-16-0346.

The impact of receiving predictive genetic information about Lynch syndrome on individual colonoscopy and smoking behaviors

Joanne Soo-Min Kim[1,2], **Peter C. Coyte**[1,2], **Michelle Cotterchio**[3], **Louise A. Keogh**[4], **Louisa B. Flander**[5], **Clara Gaff**[6,7], and **Audrey Laporte**[1,2]

[1]Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

[2]Canadian Centre for Health Economics, Toronto, Canada

[3]Prevention and Cancer Control, Cancer Care Ontario, Toronto, Canada

[4]Centre for Health Equity, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

[5]Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

[6]Department of Paediatrics, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

[7]Department of Medicine, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

Abstract

Background—This study investigated whether receiving the results of predictive genetic testing for Lynch syndrome—indicating the presence or absence of an inherited predisposition to various cancers, including colorectal cancer—was associated with change in individual colonoscopy and smoking behaviours, which could prevent colorectal cancer.

Methods—The study population included individuals with no previous diagnosis of colorectal cancer, whose families had already-identified deleterious mutations in the mismatch repair or EPCAM genes. Hypotheses were generated from a simple health economics model and tested against individual-level panel data from the Australasian Colorectal Cancer Family Registry.

Results—The empirical analysis revealed evidence consistent with some of the hypotheses, with a higher likelihood of undergoing colonoscopy in those who discovered their genetic predisposition to colorectal cancer and a lower likelihood of quitting smoking in those who discovered their lack thereof.

Conclusion—Predictive genetic information about Lynch syndrome was associated with change in individual colonoscopy and smoking behaviours but not necessarily in ways to improve population health.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR. Joanne Soo-Min Kim. Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Health Sciences Building, 155 College Street Suite 425, Toronto, Ontario, M5T 3M6, Canada. Phone: +1-416-985-8302 Fax: +1-416-978-7350 joanne.kim@mail.utoronto.ca.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Impact—The study findings suggest that the impact of personalized medicine on disease prevention is intricate, warranting further analyses to determine the net benefits and costs.

INTRODUCTION

Personalized medicine refers to the tailoring of preventive, diagnostic, and therapeutic interventions to the characteristics of individuals, using advanced biomedical technologies (1). Its ability to identify genetic susceptibilities to preventable diseases, obtain unequivocal diagnostic results, and tailor drug therapies on an individual basis promises to revolutionize healthcare and improve population health (2,3).

Many promises of personalized medicine have been realized, especially in cancer treatment (4). Its impact in cancer prevention, such as predictive genetic testing—assessing whether individuals with a family history, but no previous diagnosis, of a genetic disorder carry their family's deleterious genetic mutation and are at elevated risk of developing the disease in the future—has also been demonstrated. For example, positive results from predictive genetic testing for hereditary breast cancer or Lynch syndrome are associated with increased adherence to risk-reducing strategies, such as prophylactic surgery or surveillance (5), although behavioural change from predictive genetic information has generally been deemed less than expected (6,7).

Building on this literature, this study investigated whether receiving a positive or negative result from predictive genetic testing for Lynch syndrome was associated with change in individual health behaviours in Australasians. The lifetime probability of developing colorectal cancer is estimated to be 54% to 74% for men and 30% to 52% for women with Lynch syndrome, compared to 5% to 6% for the general population (8,9,10). Various health behaviours have been demonstrated to reduce the risk of hereditary colorectal cancer in Lynch syndrome families, such as colonoscopy use (11,12), smoking (13,14), and other lifestyle behaviours, including diet (15). Based on data availability, this study focused on colonoscopy and smoking behaviours. Colonoscopy is recommended for the prevention and early detection of colorectal cancer for individuals at elevated risk (11), and its use has been shown to change upon genetic testing for Lynch syndrome (16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23). Smoking represents a broader array of health behaviours that also affect the incidence of colorectal cancer, but the impact of genetic testing for Lynch syndrome on smoking, or any other lifestyle behaviours, is yet to be assessed.

From a simple health economics model, we generated hypotheses on the impact of the new information that the advanced biomedical technology provides. We then tested the hypotheses against individual-level panel data. Our study distinguished individuals with a positive genetic predisposition ("carriers") from those without ("non-carriers"), as well as individuals who received their genetic testing results ("receivers") from those who did not ("non-receivers").

In what follows, we present our hypotheses, data, and empirical strategy. We then describe our results. The final section discusses and concludes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Hypotheses

We developed a model of utility maximization under uncertainty that incorporated Ehrlich and Becker's concepts of self-insurance and self-protection (24). The full model is presented in Supplementary Materials and Methods. Briefly, our model characterized the occurrence of colorectal cancer as a probabilistic event, where carriers have a higher probability of developing colorectal cancer, compared to non-carriers (8,9). The probability of developing colorectal cancer was defined as a combination of exogenously-determined genetics and endogenously-determined health behaviours, namely, colonoscopy use and smoking. Receivers, unlike non-receivers, have an opportunity to change their behaviours, based on the results that are returned to them. Our model predicts that carriers who receive their genetic information are more likely to undergo colonoscopy but less likely to smoke, compared to carriers who do not receive their genetic information, as the opportunity cost of foregoing healthy behaviours rises with increasing risk. Our model also predicts that non-carriers who receive their genetic information are less likely to undergo colonoscopy but more likely to smoke, compared to non-carriers who do not receive their genetic information, as the opportunity cost of investing in healthy behaviours rises with decreasing risk. The predictions were tested empirically.

Data Source

We used data from the Australasian Colorectal Cancer Family Registry (ACCFR) for the statistical analysis. Ethics approval for the analysis was obtained from the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Toronto, Canada. Detailed descriptions of the ACCFR were provided by Newcomb *et al.* (25) and Jenkins *et al.* (26). Here, we provide an overview of the ACCFR registrant recruitment, data collection, and genetic testing.

ACCFR Registrant Recruitment

Between 1997 and 2007, the ACCFR used several recruitment strategies. Individuals who were diagnosed with their first colorectal cancer between the ages of 18 and 59 years (1997–2001) or 18 and 49 years (2001–2006) were identified from the population-based Victorian Cancer Registry. Cases of colorectal cancer or other Lynch syndrome-related cancers (i.e., of the endometrium, stomach, small intestine, urinary tract, or central nervous system) were also identified from seven family cancer clinics across Australia and New Zealand. From these clinics, individuals at high risk of Lynch syndrome were also identified, using the Amsterdam criteria (27). All identified individuals, known as probands, were invited to register with the ACCFR. The probands' first- and second-degree relatives, as well as other relatives with previous diagnosis of any cancer, were also invited to register with the ACCFR (25). Therefore, the ACCFR registrants comprised individuals with previous diagnosis of colorectal cancer or other Lynch syndrome-related cancers and their first-, second-, and more distant relatives with or without any cancer.

ACCFR Data Collection

The ACCFR registrants were asked to complete an interviewer-administered questionnaire at enrollment ("baseline") and after five years ("follow-up"). The baseline questionnaire asked about the registrants' socio-demographic factors (e.g., age, sex, marital status, and education), health behaviours (e.g., colonoscopy use and smoking), and medical conditions (e.g., previous cancer diagnosis). The follow-up questionnaire obtained updates on the registrants' health behaviours and medical conditions. All reported incidents of Lynch syndrome-related cancers were verified against medical records (25,26).

ACCFR Genetic Testing

The ACCFR registrants were asked to provide a blood sample for the purpose of conducting research and not for the purpose of genetic testing *per se*. Instead, blood samples of the registrants whose families had previously-identified deleterious mutations in the MMR or EPCAM genes were tested for their families' genetic mutations by the ACCFR. Therefore, the registrants did not choose to undergo genetic testing, and the availability of their results at the ACCFR was free of potential selection bias associated with the choice to undergo genetic testing. The registrants were informed of the availability of their results and referred to a genetic counseling clinic to receive formal re-testing and their results free of charge (28,29,30).

Study Participant Selection

The study population for the analysis included all registrants of the ACCFR that would have been eligible for predictive genetic testing for Lynch syndrome, having: 1) no previous diagnosis of colorectal cancer at follow-up so that the testing would be truly predictive; and 2) a family with a previously-identified deleterious mutation in the MMR or EPCAM genes so that testing for that mutation would conclusively distinguish carriers from non-carriers. A total of 1,753 registrants of the ACCFR satisfied the conditions and had been tested and identified as either carriers or non-carriers of their families' deleterious mutations in the MMR or EPCAM genes. However, 1,246 of the 1,753 individuals had insufficient information on whether or when their genetic testing results had been disclosed to them and were excluded from the analysis. Therefore, the study sample for the analysis comprised 507 individuals who had sufficient information on whether or when their results had been disclosed to them.

Measures and Statistical Analysis

We used logit regression to estimate the probability that an individual underwent colonoscopy or smoked between baseline and follow-up (i.e., yes/no), $I_{B\text{-}F}$ or $S_{B\text{-}F}$, respectively, as a function of: the carrier status (i.e., carrier/non-carrier), G; the receiver status at follow-up (i.e., receiver/non-receiver), R_F; previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up (i.e., yes/no), H_F; the interaction of the carrier and receiver statuses and previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up, G x R_F, G x H_F, R_F x H_F, and G x R_F x H_F; a vector of the socio-demographic (i.e., age at follow-up, sex, marital status, and education) and colorectal cancer awareness (i.e., degree of relatedness to family probands) factors, D_F; and colonoscopy use or smoking at baseline (i.e., yes/no), I_B or S_B, respectively. In other words:

$$\text{logit}\left(P(I_{B-F})\right) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 G + \alpha_2 R_F + \alpha_3 H_F + \alpha_4 GxR_F + \alpha_5 GxH_F + \alpha_6 R_F xH_F + \alpha_7 GxR_F xH_F + \alpha_8 D_F + \alpha_9 I_B + \varepsilon_I$$

$$\text{logit}\left(P(S_{B-F})\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 G + \beta_2 R_F + \beta_3 H_F + \beta_4 GxR_F + \beta_5 GxH_F + \beta_6 R_F xH_F + \beta_7 GxR_F xH_F + \beta_8 D_F + \beta_9 S_B + \varepsilon_S$$

Table 1 provides the full variable list, including the scales and sources of the variables.

Colonoscopy use and smoking between baseline and follow-up (i.e., $I_{B\text{-}F}$ and $S_{B\text{-}F}$), as well as before baseline (i.e., I_B and S_B), were defined in terms of propensity (i.e., yes/no) to undertake the behaviours. We adjusted for the respective behaviours at baseline (i.e., I_B or S_B), following suggestions by others to account for any baseline imbalance in the outcome variables (31). We repeated the analysis on colonoscopy use within two years of follow-up and smoking at follow-up, adjusting for colonoscopy use within two years of baseline and smoking at baseline, respectively, to ensure the relevance of the behaviours at those time-points. We also conducted subgroup analyses only on the study participants who had undergone colonoscopy or smoked before baseline (i.e., I_B = yes or S_B = yes) to eliminate any baseline imbalance.

The carrier status (i.e., G) distinguished carriers, who carried any deleterious mutations in the MMR or EPCAM genes, from non-carriers, who did not carry their families' deleterious mutations in the MMR or EPCAM genes.

The receiver status at follow-up (i.e., R_F) distinguished 392 receivers, who had received their genetic testing results before follow-up, from 115 non-receivers, who had either received their results after follow-up (n=80) or never received them (n=35), among the 507 study participants.

The receiver status at follow-up (i.e., receiver/non-receiver) only allowed for the comparison of those who had received their results versus those who had not, which was not a pre- and post-intervention study design. To address this shortcoming, we conducted a subgroup analysis that directly compared 43 receivers, who had received their results between baseline and follow-up, and 80 non-receivers at follow-up, who had received their results after follow-up, in a pre- and post-intervention study design.

Previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up (i.e., H_F) distinguished those who had been diagnosed with some non-colorectal cancer cancer before follow-up from those who had not. We adjusted for this factor and interacted it with the carrier and receiver statuses at follow-up, following the observations of another study reporting that previous cancer diagnosis affected individual health behaviours differentially among receiver/non-receiver carrier/non-carrier subgroups (32). None of the study participants had had colorectal cancer at follow-up, since we selected for individuals with no previous diagnosis of colorectal cancer at follow-up. We also conducted subgroup analyses only on the study participants with no previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up (i.e., H_F = no) to eliminate any endogeneity associated with the variable.

We controlled for the study participants' age at follow-up (i.e., years), sex (i.e., female/male), marital status (i.e., married or common-law/single), education (i.e., less than high school/vocational, training, or high school/college, university, or more), and degree of relatedness to their family probands (i.e., self or identical twin/first/second/third/higher degree)—factors previously identified to affect individual health behaviours that modulate the risk of cancer (32,33,34,35). The degree of relatedness to family probands also addressed potential heterogeneity in the study participants' awareness of colorectal cancer from their family relationships.

All statistical tasks were performed with the Stata (version 12.1) software (36). The estimation results on the carrier and receiver statuses and previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up and their interaction terms were linearly combined to compare the receivers and non-receivers in the various carrier/non-carrier cancer/no-cancer subgroups to test the hypotheses from the previous section.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 reports the descriptive statistics on the study participants and non-participants. The study participants were, on average, in their mid-forties at baseline, more often female, and predominantly married or in a common-law relationship and had high-school education or more. Before baseline, 71% and 47% of the study participants had ever undergone colonoscopy or smoked, respectively, while 47% and 17% had undergone colonoscopy within two years or were currently smoking, respectively. By baseline, 13% had been diagnosed with some non-colorectal cancer cancer. Compared to the 507 study participants, the 1,246 non-participants were significantly older, more often male, more often single, with lower levels of education, more distant relatives to their family probands, and less likely to have undergone colonoscopy.

The study participants were stratified by the carrier and receiver statuses. The receivers were older than the non-receivers, suggesting that the receivers enrolled in the ACCFR earlier than the non-receivers. The carriers were younger than the non-carriers, which was expected, since identifying individuals with no previous diagnosis of colorectal cancer leads to selection for carriers who are younger than non-carriers. At baseline, the receivers had higher rates of colonoscopy use, compared to the non-receivers, likely because the receivers were older than the non-receivers and already under colon screening. Indeed, aging is a good predictor of colonoscopy use (37). The carriers had higher rates of previous diagnosis of non-colorectal cancer cancer, compared to the non-carriers, which was expected, since the carriers' genetic mutations predisposed them to colorectal cancer, as well as other cancers (8). No other significant differences or indications of systemic differences were observed among the receiver/non-receiver carrier/non-carrier subgroups.

Estimation Results

Table 3 reports the estimation results of the logit regression models on the likelihood of undergoing colonoscopy or smoking between baseline and follow-up. Odds ratios (ORs)

greater (or less) than one indicate higher (or lower) probabilities for undergoing colonoscopy or smoking versus not undergoing colonoscopy or smoking, respectively, between baseline and follow-up.

There were significant associations between the likelihood of undergoing colonoscopy between baseline and follow-up and the single and interaction terms of the carrier and receiver statuses and previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up. The study participants who discovered that they carried a genetic mutation predisposing to colorectal cancer (i.e., receiver carriers) were more likely to undergo colonoscopy, compared to those who were also carriers but had not received their results (i.e., non-receiver carriers). However, this was only true for the study participants with no previous cancer diagnosis (OR = 13.124, p-value < 0.001) and not for those with previous cancer diagnosis (OR = 1.502, p-value = 0.698). The study participants who discovered that they did not carry a genetic mutation predisposing to colorectal cancer (i.e., receiver non-carriers) were not different from those who were also non-carriers but had not received their results (i.e., non-receiver non-carriers) in their colonoscopy use (OR = 1.213, p-value = 0.587 for no previous cancer diagnosis; OR = 0.702, p-value = 0.717 for previous cancer diagnosis).

There were also significant associations between the likelihood of smoking between baseline and follow-up and the single and interaction terms of the carrier and receiver statuses and previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up. The study participants who discovered that they did not carry a genetic mutation predisposing to colorectal cancer (i.e., receiver non-carriers) were more likely to smoke, compared to those who were also non-carriers but had not received their results (i.e., non-receiver non-carriers). This was because the receiver non-carriers were less likely to quit smoking, and not because the receiver non-carriers were more likely to take up smoking, compared to the non-receiver non-carriers (see Supplementary Table S1). However, this was only true for the study participants with no previous cancer diagnosis (OR = 4.147, p-value = 0.037) and not for those with previous cancer diagnosis (OR = 0.025, p-value = 0.089). The study participants who discovered that they carried a genetic mutation predisposing to colorectal cancer (i.e., receiver carriers) were not different from those who were also carriers but had not received their results (i.e., non-receiver carriers) in their smoking behaviour (OR = 0.802, p-value = 0.702 for no previous cancer diagnosis; OR = 1.511, p-value = 0.800 for previous cancer diagnosis).

The ORs on the other explanatory variables were consistent with expectations. For colonoscopy, the age terms suggested increasing colonoscopy use until 57 years of age and decreasing colonoscopy use thereafter. Being female versus male was associated with a higher likelihood of undergoing colonoscopy. Closer relatives to family probands had a higher likelihood of undergoing colonoscopy, compared to more distant relatives. For smoking, the age terms suggested decreasing smoking with age. Being married or in a common-law relationship versus being single was associated with a lower likelihood of smoking. Higher education was associated with a lower likelihood of smoking. For both colonoscopy and smoking, each behaviour at baseline was a significant and positive predictor of itself between baseline and follow-up. The area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve, Somers' D_{xy} rank correlation, and Brier's score indicated good predictive abilities of the models.

Supplementary Table S2 and Table S3 report the results of the subgroup analyses, estimated only on the study participants who had undergone colonoscopy or smoked before baseline, respectively. Supplementary Table S4 reports the results of the subgroup analyses, estimated only on the study participants with no previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up. The results presented in Supplementary Table S2, Table S3, and Table S4 were in agreement with those presented in Table 3, although the results in Supplementary Table S2, Table S3, and Table S4 were lacking power, due to the smaller sample sizes.

Table 4 reports the estimation results of the logit regression models on the likelihood of undergoing colonoscopy within two years of follow-up or smoking at follow-up. Because some of the interaction terms involving previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up did not have any observations and could not be estimated, these models were estimated on the study participants with no previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up.

The results presented in Table 4 were in agreement with those presented in Table 3, although the results in Table 4 were lacking power, due to the smaller sample sizes.

Table 5 reports the estimation results of the logit regression model on the likelihood of undergoing colonoscopy between baseline and follow-up, in a subgroup analysis that directly compared the 43 receivers, who had received their results between baseline and follow-up, and the 80 non-receivers at follow-up, who had received their results after follow-up, in a pre- and post-intervention study design. Because some of the interaction terms involving previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up did not have any observations and could not be estimated, this model was estimated on the study participants with no previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up. Because none of the 43 and 80 study participants were first-degree relatives to their family probands, the degree of relatedness to family probands variable had four, instead of five, categories. For smoking, because the 43 receivers, who had received their results between baseline and follow-up, were lacking information on smoking at follow-up and automatically omitted from the estimation, the model could not be estimated.

The results presented in Table 5 were in agreement with those presented in Table 3, although the results in Table 5 were lacking power, due to the smaller sample size. For example, the carriers who had received their results between baseline and follow-up (i.e., receiver carriers) were more likely to undergo colonoscopy, compared to the carriers who had not received their results until after follow-up (i.e., non-receiver carriers) (OR = 6.121, p-value = 0.088).

DISCUSSION

We found strong evidence of a higher likelihood of undergoing colonoscopy for individuals with a family history of Lynch syndrome, but no previous cancer diagnosis, upon learning that they were carriers of a genetic mutation predisposing to colorectal cancer. There was also strong evidence of a lower likelihood of quitting smoking for individuals with a family history of Lynch syndrome, but no previous cancer diagnosis, upon learning that they were non-carriers of a genetic mutation predisposing to colorectal cancer. These empirical findings were consistent with the hypotheses generated from our simple health economics

model. They also agreed well with previous studies that reported substitutive effects between genetic endowments and personal health behaviours in economic (38,39,40) and clinical (16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23) literature. They were also congruent with a previous study that reported modulating effects of previous cancer diagnosis (32). The empirical findings were robust to factors analyzed in subsequent and subgroup analyses, involving the recent colonoscopy use and current smoking measures and the pre- and post-intervention study design.

However, no empirical evidence was found to support the hypotheses that individuals with a family history of colorectal cancer are less likely to undergo colonoscopy upon learning their non-carrier status and also more likely to quit smoking upon learning their carrier status. These discrepancies may imply the receivers' misunderstanding of their genetic status and/or difficulty in accepting the new information. Indeed, some of the previous studies also found non-carriers who continued to undergo colonoscopy (18) and identified the family history of colorectal cancer, as opposed to new information obtained through predictive genetic testing, as the most significant attribute to one's perceived risk (41). Further, a recent study using the ACCFR data identified individuals from colorectal cancer-causing mutation-carrying families who perceived their risk of having colorectal cancer as high and did not receive or refused genetic testing results (28). A lack of guidance on appropriate colon screening behaviours may have been another factor, and further research on the screening advice given to receivers by their physicians is required. The discrepancies may also imply the receivers' difficulty in overcoming an addiction and/or understanding that smoking is associated with high risk of colorectal cancer (13,14). Alternatively, the lack of significant evidence may reflect the fact that the predicted change from "use" to "no-use" would not be captured in our data if the study participants who received their genetic testing results between baseline and follow-up had undergone colonoscopy or smoked after baseline but before receiving their results.

Our study had many strengths. To the best of our knowledge, it was the first to investigate the impact of receiving predictive colorectal cancer genetic information on individual smoking behaviour and offered the longest follow-up duration of five years among the studies of its kind on colorectal cancer (16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23). However, there were several limitations.

Of the 1,753 individuals in the ACCFR who were potentially eligible for inclusion in our study, 1,246 had insufficient information on whether or when their genetic testing results had been disclosed to them and were excluded from the analysis. Our descriptive statistics identified significant differences in age, sex, marital status, education, degree of relatedness to family probands, and colonoscopy use between the study participants and non-participants. Being female and receiving family support have been shown to be positively associated with individual health behaviours that modulate the risk of colorectal cancer (32,37). Consistent with these observations, the study non-participants, who were more often male and more distant relatives to their probands, compared to the study participants, were less likely to have undergone colonoscopy. Therefore, the findings of our study might have been biased towards predicting healthier behaviours than it would have, had it included the study non-participants from the study population. In other words, the higher likelihood of

undergoing colonoscopy for individuals upon learning that they were carriers and the lower likelihood of quitting smoking for individuals upon learning that they were non-carriers might in fact be lower in a broader population.

Because the ACCFR registrants did not choose to obtain genetic testing, the availability of their results was free of potential selection bias associated with the choice to undergo genetic testing. While there was potential selection bias associated with the choice to receive genetic testing results, our descriptive statistics found no indications of systemic differences between the receivers and non-receivers other than age, which was adjusted for in all our regression models. Further, the majority of the non-receivers at follow-up (i.e., 80 out of 115) did receive their results after follow-up, suggesting against inherent differences between the receivers and non-receivers in their choice to receive genetic testing results. Rather, the receiver status at follow-up was an artificial distinction, made to take advantage of the differential timing in the receipt of the results. Nevertheless, this being an observational study, there remain concerns that the receiver/non-receiver carrier/non-carrier subgroups were inherently different from each other on some unmeasured characteristics. Specifically, the lower likelihood of quitting smoking for individuals upon learning that they were non-carriers was driven by the particularly low rate of smoking in the non-receiver non-carriers. Our study must be replicated on different populations, to test not only the generalizability of our study findings but also their robustness.

For the majority of the receivers (i.e., 343 out of 392), the exact dates of their receipt were unavailable. As some of these receivers had likely received their results before baseline, baseline for the receivers did not necessarily represent “pre-intervention”. Therefore, the receiver status at follow-up only allowed for the comparison of those who had received their results versus those who had not, which was not a pre- and post-intervention study design. Assuming that behavioural change from this new information generally occurs shortly after its receipt, we took a conservative approach by including these individuals in our empirical analysis and still discovered significant effects. Further, our analysis on a pre- and post-intervention study design subgroup found consistent results, although the results were lacking power, due to the smaller sample sizes. Future studies may benefit from larger sample sizes.

In conclusion, our empirical analysis identified intended and unintended consequences of predictive genetic testing for colorectal cancer, suggesting that the impact of personalized medicine on disease prevention is more intricate than generally expected. The exact consequences of providing individuals with new information about their genetic disease risk will likely differ from one disease to another, with variations in the efficacy of the intervention, penetrance of the genetics, effectiveness of the preventive measures, and individual attitudes towards risk. Therefore, our research findings highlight the need for a fulsome assessment on the benefits and costs of personalized preventive interventions from both the clinical and societal perspectives that take account of individual responses to the resulting new information.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

J.S.-M. Kim was funded by the Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship and the Health Care, Technology, and Place Doctoral Fellowship from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research to pursue her Ph.D. degree, during which time the study was conceived and conducted.

This work was supported by grant UM1 CA167551 from the National Cancer Institute and through cooperative agreements with the following CCFR centers: Australasian Colorectal Cancer Family Registry (U01 CA074778 and U01/U24 CA097735) and Ontario Familial Colorectal Cancer Registry (U01/U24 CA074783).

OTHER SUPPORT

The authors are grateful to Dr. Mark A. Jenkins and Ms. Judi Maskiell for their assistance.

References

1. President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST). PCAST. Washington, DC: 2008. Priorities for Personalized Medicine.
2. Ginsburg GS, McCarthy JJ. Personalized medicine: revolutionizing drug discovery and patient care. Trends Biotechnol. 2001; 19:491–496. [PubMed: 11711191]
3. Bell J. Predicting disease using genomics. Nature. 2004; 429:453–456. [PubMed: 15164070]
4. La Thangue NB, Kerr DJ Kerr. Predictive biomarkers: a paradigm shift towards personalized cancer medicine. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2011; 8:587–596. [PubMed: 21862978]
5. Schneider KI, Schmidtke J. Patient compliance based on genetic medicine: a literature review. J Community Genet. 2014; 5:31–48. [PubMed: 23934761]
6. Heshka JT, Palleschi C, Howley H, Wilson B, Wells PS. A systematic review of perceived risks, psychological and behavioral impacts of genetic testing. Genet Med. 2008; 10:19–32. [PubMed: 18197053]
7. Marteau TM, French DP, Griffin SJ, Prevost AT, Sutton S, Watkinson C, et al. Effects of communicating DNA-based disease risk estimates on risk-reducing behaviours. Cochrane Database Sys Rev. 2010; 10:CD007275.
8. Choi YH, Cotterchio M, McKeown-Eyssen G, Neerav M, Bapat B, Boyd K, et al. Penetrance of colorectal cancer among MLH1/MSH2 carriers participating in the colorectal cancer familial registry in Ontario. Hered Cancer Clin Pract. 2009; 7:14. [PubMed: 19698169]
9. Backes FJ, Cohn DE. Lynch syndrome. Clin Obstet Gynecol. 2011; 5:199–214.
10. Jenkins MA, Baglietto L, Dowty JG, Van Vliet CM, Smith L, Mead LJ, et al. Cancer risks for mismatch repair gene mutation carriers: a population-based early onset case-family study. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2006; 4:489–498. [PubMed: 16616355]
11. Järvinen H, Aarnio M, Mustonen H, Aktan-Collan K, Aaltonen LA, Peltomäki P, et al. Controlled 15-year trial on screening for colorectal cancer in families with hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer. Gastroenterology. 2000; 118:829–834. [PubMed: 10784581]
12. Stupart DA, Goldberg PA, Algar U, Ramesar R. Surveillance colonoscopy improves survival in a cohort of subjects with a single mismatch repair gene mutation. Colorectal Dis. 2009; 11:126–130. 2009. [PubMed: 19143775]
13. Pande M, Lynch PM, Hopper JL, Jenkins MA, Gallinger S, Haile RW, et al. Smoking and colorectal cancer in Lynch syndrome: results from the Colon Cancer Family Registry and the University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center. Clin Cancer Res. 2010; 16:1331–1339. [PubMed: 20145170]

14. Watson P, Ashwathnarayan R, Lynch HT, Roy HK. Tobacco use and increased colorectal cancer risk in patients with hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer (Lynch syndrome). Arch Intern Med. 2004; 164:2429–2431. [PubMed: 15596632]
15. Vasen HF, Blanco I, Aktan-Collan K, Gopie JP, Alonso A, Aretz S, et al. Revised guidelines for the clinical management of Lynch syndrome (HNPCC): recommendations by a group of European experts. Gut. 2013; 62:812–823. [PubMed: 23408351]
16. Burton-Chase AM, Hovick SR, Peterson SK, Marani SK, Vernon SW, Amos C, et al. Changes in screening behaviors and attitudes toward screening from pre-test genetic counseling to post-disclosure in Lynch syndrome families. Clin Genet. 2013; 83:215–220. [PubMed: 23414081]
17. Claes E, Denayer L, Evers-Kiebooms G, Boogaerts A, Philippe K, Tejpar S, et al. Predictive testing for hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer: subjective perception regarding colorectal and at one year post-test. Genet Test. 2005; 9:54–65. [PubMed: 15857188]
18. Collins VR, Meiser B, Ukoumunne OC, Gaff C, St John DJ, Halliday JL. The impact of predictive genetic testing for hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer: three years after testing. Genet Med. 2007; 9:290–297. [PubMed: 17505206]
19. Hadley DW, Jenkins JF, Dimond E, de Carvalho M, Kirsch I, Palmer CG, et al. Colon cancer screening practices after genetic counseling and testing for hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2004; 22:39–44. [PubMed: 14701766]
20. Hadley DW, Jenkins JF, Steinberg SM, Liewehr D, Moller S, Martin JC, et al. Perceptions of cancer risks and predictors of colon and endometrial cancer screening in women undergoing genetic testing for Lynch syndrome. J Clin Oncol. 2008; 26:948–954. [PubMed: 18281669]
21. Halbert CH, Lynch H, Lynch J, Main D, Kucharski S, Rustgi AK, et al. Colon cancer screening practices following genetic testing for hereditary nonpolyposis colon cancer (HNPCC) mutations. Arch Intern Med. 2004; 164:1881–1887. [PubMed: 15451763]
22. Johnson KA, Trimbath JD, Petersen GM, Griffin CA, Giardiello FM. Impact of genetic counseling and testing on colorectal cancer screening behavior. Genet Test. 2002; 6:303–306. [PubMed: 12537654]
23. Wagner A, van Kessel I, Kriege MG, Tops CM, Wijnen JT, Vasen HF, et al. Long term follow-up of HNPCC gene mutation carriers: compliance with screening and satisfaction with counseling and screening procedures. Fam Cancer. 2005; 4:295–300. [PubMed: 16341806]
24. Ehrlich I, Becker GS. Market insurance, self-insurance, and self-protection. J Polit Econ. 1972; 80:623–648.
25. Newcomb PA, Baron J, Cotterchio M, Gallinger S, Grove J, Haile R, et al. Colon Cancer Family Registry: an international resource for studies of the genetic epidemiology of colon cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2007; 16:2331–2343. [PubMed: 17982118]
26. Jenkins M, Maskiell J, Buchanan D, Young J, Antill Y, Arnold J, et al. Australasian Colorectal Cancer Family Registry. 2012 [Accessed in March 2015]
27. Umar A, Risinger JI, Hawk ET, Barrett JC. Testing guidelines for hereditary non-polyposis colorectal cancer. Nat Rev Cancer. 2004; 4:153–158. [PubMed: 14964310]
28. Flander L, Speirs-Bridge A, Rutstein A, Niven H, Win AK, Ait Ouakrim D, et al. Perceived versus predicted risks of colorectal cancer and self-reported colonoscopies by members of mismatch repair gene mutation-carrying families who have declined genetic testing. J Genet Couns. 2014; 23:79–88. [PubMed: 23748873]
29. Keogh LA, Fisher D, Sheinfeld Gorin S, Schully SD, Lowery JT, Ahnen DJ, et al. How do researchers manage genetic results in practice? The experience of the multinational Colon Cancer Family Registry. J Community Genet. 2014; 5:99–108. [PubMed: 23703702]
30. Keogh LA, van Vliet CM, Studdert DM, Maskiell JA, Macrae FA, St John DJ, et al. Is uptake of genetic testing for colorectal cancer influenced by knowledge of insurance implications? Med J Aust. 2009; 191:255–258. [PubMed: 19740045]
31. Vickers AJ, Altman DG. Analysing controlled trials with baseline and follow up measurements. BMJ. 2001; 323:1123–1124. [PubMed: 11701584]
32. Ito H, Matsuo K, Wakai K, Saito T, Kumimoto H, Okuma K, et al. An intervention study of smoking cessation with feedback on genetic cancer susceptibility in Japan. Prev Med. 2006; 42:102–108. [PubMed: 16325899]

33. Harmon BE, Little MA, Woekel ED, Ettienne R, Long CR, Wilkens LR, et al. Ethnic differences and predictors of colonoscopy, prostate-specific antigen, and mammography screening participation in the multiethnic cohort. Cancer Epidemiol. 2014; 38:162–167. [PubMed: 24667037]

34. Julian-Reynier C, Resseguier N, Bouhnik AD, Eisinger F, Lasset C, Fourme E, et al. Cigarette smoking in women after BRCA1/2 genetic test disclosure: a 5-year follow-up study of the GENEPSO PS cohort. Genet Med. 2015; 17:117–124. [PubMed: 25010056]

35. Tarr GP, Crowley A, John R, Kok JB, Lee HN, Mustafa H, et al. Do high risk patients alter their lifestyle to reduce risk of colorectal cancer? BMC Gastroenterol. 2014; 14:22. [PubMed: 24507382]

36. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software 2011: Release 12. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP;

37. Madlensky L, Esplen MJ, Gallinger S, McLaughlin JR, Goel V. Relatives of colorectal cancer patients. Am J Prev Med. 2003; 25:187–194. [PubMed: 14507524]

38. Dickie M, Gerking S. Genetic risk factors and offsetting behavior: the case of skin cancer. J Risk Uncertainty. 1997; 15:81–97.

39. Ganz ML. Family health effects: complements or substitutes. Health Econ. 2001; 10:699–714. [PubMed: 11747052]

40. Filipova-Neumann L, Hoy M. Managing genetic tests, surveillance, and preventive medicine under a public health insurance system. J Health Econ. 2014; 34:31–41. [PubMed: 24463140]

41. Spector D. Lifestyle behaviors in women with a BRCA1 or BRCA2 genetic mutation: an exploratory study guided by concepts derived from the Health Belief Model. Cancer Nurs. 2007; 30:E1–E10.

Table 1

Variable list

Variable	Scale	Source (question asked)
Outcomes		
Colonoscopy use between baseline and follow-up	Binomial: Yes/No	Follow-up ACCFR questionnaire *("Since the date of your last interview (baseline), have you had a colonoscopy?")*
Colonoscopy use within two years of follow-up	Binomial: Yes/No	Follow-up ACCFR questionnaire *("Since the date of your last interview (baseline), have you had a colonoscopy?" and "What was your age when you had your most recent (colonoscopy) test?")*
Smoking between baseline and follow-up	Binomial: Yes/No	Follow-up ACCFR questionnaire *("Since the date of your last interview (baseline), have you ever smoked a cigarette a day for three months or longer?")*
Smoking at follow-up	Binomial: Yes/No	Follow-up ACCFR questionnaire *("Do you currently smoke at least one cigarette a day?")*
Exposures		
Carrier status	Binomial: Carrier/Non-carrier	Genetic testing results available at the ACCFR
Receiver status at follow-up	Binomial: Receiver/Non-receiver	Dates of genetic counseling sessions provided from the ACCFR-referred clinics and available at the ACCFR against dates of the ACCFR questionnaire administration Records of previous receipts of genetic testing results from elsewhere before follow-up or refusals to receive genetic testing results from the ACCFR-referred clinics
Previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up	Binomial: Yes/No	Baseline ACCFR questionnaire *("Has a doctor ever told you that you had cancer, leukemia, or a malignant tumour?")* Follow-up ACCFR questionnaire *("Since the date of your last interview (baseline), has a doctor told you that you had any type of cancer, leukemia, or a malignant tumour?")* Pathology reports, hospital records, and cancer registries accessed by the ACCFR
Controls		
Age	Continuous: Years	Baseline and follow-up ACCFR questionnaires *("What is your age?")*
Sex	Binomial: Female/Male	Baseline ACCFR questionnaire *("Are you male or female?")*
Marital status	Binomial: Married or common-law/ Single	Baseline ACCFR questionnaire *("Marital status?")*
Education	Categorical: Less than high school/ High, vocational, or training school/College, university, or more	Baseline ACCFR questionnaire: *("What is the highest level of education that you have completed?")*
Degree of relatedness to family probands	Categorical: Self or identical twin/1st/2nd/3rd/Higher degree	Family information collected at enrollment into the ACCFR
Colonoscopy use before baseline	Binomial: Yes/No	Baseline ACCFR questionnaire *("Have you ever had a colonoscopy?")*
Colonoscopy use within two years of baseline	Binomial: Yes/No	Baseline ACCFR questionnaire

Variable	Scale	Source (question asked)
		("Have you ever had a colonoscopy?" and "What was your age when you last had this (colonoscopy) test?")
Smoking before baseline	Binomial: Yes/No	Baseline ACCFR questionnaire *("Have you ever smoked at least one cigarette a day for three months or longer?")*
Smoking at baseline	Binomial: Yes/No	Baseline ACCFR questionnaire *("Do you currently smoke at least one cigarette a day?")*

Table 2

Descriptive statistics

	Study participants		Study non-participants		Participants vs. Non-participants	Receivers at follow-up				Non-receivers at follow-up				Non-/Receivers vs. Non-/Carriers
						Carriers		Non-carriers		Carriers		Non-carriers		
	n	%/M(SD)	n	%/M(SD)	*p*-value	n	%/M(SD)	n	%/M(SD)	n	%/M(SD)	n	%/M(SD)	*p*-value
Total n	507	100%	1,246	100%		171	44%	221	56%	45	39%	70	61%	
Socio-demographic factors														
Age (years)														
At baseline	507	43.7(14.5)	1,232	48.0(16.3)	<0.001***	171	41.5(14.1)	221	46.8(14.3)	45	37.8(13.3)	70	43.0(15.2)	<0.001***
At follow-up	500	48.9(14.5)	925	52.6(15.6)	<0.001***	165	46.9(14.0)	220	52.1(14.2)	45	42.9(13.2)	70	47.7(15.5)	<0.001***
Sex														
Female (vs. male)	507	61%	1,246	56%	0.049*	171	66%	221	60%	45	51%	70	56%	0.206
Marital status														
Married or common-law (vs. single)	505	74%	1,240	69%	0.043*	170	70%	220	77%	45	73%	70	76%	0.486
Education														
Less than high school	497	31%	1,224	37%	0.046*	168	26%	215	34%	45	31%	69	33%	0.421
High, vocational, or training school		43%		39%			45%		43%		49%		36%	
College, university, or more		26%		24%			29%		23%		20%		30%	
Colorectal cancer awareness														
Degree of relatedness to family probands														
Self or identical twin	499	4%		3%	0.005*	171	8%	217	4%	45	0%	66	0%	0.330
1st degree		23%		25%			20%		24%		29%		23%	
2nd degree		27%		33%			27%		28%		22%		29%	
3rd degree		16%		17%			16%		15%		16%		18%	
Higher degree		29%		22%			28%		29%		33%		30%	
Health behaviours														
Colonoscopy use (vs. no use)														

	Study participants		Study non-participants		Participants vs. Non-participants	Receivers at follow-up				Non-receivers at follow-up				Non-/Receivers vs. Non-/Carriers
						Carriers		Non-carriers		Carriers		Non-carriers		
	n	%/M(SD)	n	%/M(SD)	*p*-value	n	%/M(SD)	n	%/M(SD)	n	%/M(SD)	n	%/M(SD)	*p*-value
Before baseline	507	71%	1,229	59%	<0.001***	171	77%	221	76%	45	53%	70	53%	<0.001***
Within two years of baseline	367	47%	908	35%	<0.001***	129	60%	157	46%	34	35%	47	21%	<0.001***
Between baseline & follow-up	491	68%	832	52%	<0.001***	161	94%	217	58%	45	62%	68	43%	<0.001***
Within two years of follow-up	449	54%	779	40%	<0.001***	156	91%	197	35%	35	37%	61	30%	<0.001***
Smoking (vs. no smoking)														
Before baseline	506	47%	1,240	47%	0.507	170	49%	221	49%	45	53%	70	34%	0.115
At baseline	506	17%	1,232	16%	0.354	170	18%	221	17%	45	20%	70	9%	0.259
Between baseline & follow-up	454	21%	385	21%	0.483	144	23%	200	22%	44	25%	66	12%	0.264
At follow-up	454	17%	384	17%	0.474	144	19%	200	18%	44	20%	66	5%	0.042*
Health outcome														
Previous cancer diagnosis (vs. no diagnosis)														
At baseline	507	13%	1,246	12%	0.379	171	19%	221	12%	45	9%	70	7%	0.032*
At follow-up	507	19%	1,246	17%	0.329	171	26%	221	15%	45	20%	70	11%	0.022*

n, sample size. M, mean. SD, standard deviation. vs., versus. Statistical comparisons between the study participants and non-participants were made, using the Fisher's exact test for binomial variables, chi-squared test for categorical variables, and Mann-Whitney U test for continuous variables. Statistical comparisons among the four receiver/non-receiver carrier/non-carrier subgroups were made, using chi-squared test for binomial and categorical variables and Mann-Whitney U test for continuous variables.

Significance:

*** for 0.001;

* for 0.05.

Table 3

Estimation results of the logit regression models on colonoscopy use and smoking between baseline and follow-up

	Colonoscopy use between baseline and follow-up (vs. no use)			Smoking between baseline and follow-up (vs. no smoking)		
Observations	473			442		
Pseudo R^2	0.288			0.449		
Area under ROC curve	0.842			0.917		
Somers' D	0.566			0.794		
Brier score	0.157			0.108		
	OR	***p*-value**	**lrtest**	**OR**	***p*-value**	**lrtest**
Carrier status × Receiver status at follow-up × Previous cancer diagnosis at follow-up						
Carrier (vs. non-carrier)	2.358	0.089		2.226	0.302	
Receiver (vs. non-receiver)	1.213	0.587		4.147	0.037*	
Previous cancer diagnosis (vs. no diagnosis)	0.640	0.638		27.499	0.120	
Carrier receiver (vs. non-carrier non-receiver)	10.822	0.001***	<0.001***	0.193	0.067	0.031*
Carrier with previous cancer diagnosis (vs. non-carrier with no diagnosis)	2.001	0.604		0.084	0.344	
Receiver with previous cancer diagnosis (vs. non-receiver with no diagnosis)	0.579	0.600		0.006	0.026*	
Carrier receiver with previous cancer diagnosis (vs. non-carrier non-receiver with no diagnosis)	0.198	0.309		314.316	0.043*	
Linear combination						
Receiver carrier (vs. non-receiver carrier) with no previous cancer diagnosis	13.124	<0.001***		0.802	0.702	
Receiver carrier (vs. non-receiver carrier) with previous cancer diagnosis	1.502	0.698		1.511	0.800	
Receiver non-carrier (vs. non-receiver non-carrier) with no previous cancer diagnosis	1.213	0.587		4.147	0.037*	
Receiver non-carrier (vs. non-receiver non-carrier) with previous cancer diagnosis	0.702	0.717		0.025	0.089	
Socio-demographic factors						
Age at follow-up						
Age (years)	1.132	0.034*	0.079	0.852	0.060	<0.001***
Age squared	0.999	0.049*		1.001	0.262	
Female (vs. male)	2.489	<0.001***		1.213	0.563	
Married or common-law (vs. single)	1.100	0.759		0.397	0.020*	

	Colonoscopy use between baseline and follow-up (vs. no use)			Smoking between baseline and follow-up (vs. no smoking)		
Education (vs. less than high school)						
High, vocational, or training school	1.503	0.176	0.380	1.118	0.764	0.010**
College, university, or more	1.160	0.655		0.321	0.019*	
Colorectal cancer awareness						
Degree of relatedness to family probands (vs. self or identical twin)						
1st degree	0.721	0.700	0.020*	0.808	0.820	0.776
2nd degree	0.460	0.356		0.753	0.754	
3rd degree	0.400	0.286		0.438	0.389	
Higher degree	0.245	0.091		0.788	0.794	
Baseline health behaviours						
Colonoscopy use before baseline (vs. no use)	4.414	<0.001***				
Smoking before baseline (vs. no smoking)				210.723	<0.001***	
Constant	0.015	0.014*		0.866	0.948	

OR, odds ratio. ROC, receiver operating characteristic. lrtest, likelihood ratio test, using chi-squared statistics. vs., versus.

Significance:

*** for 0.001;

** for 0.01;

* for 0.05.

Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2017 May 01.

Table 4

Estimation results of the logit regression models on recent colonoscopy and current smoking

	Colonoscopy use within two years of follow-up (vs. no use)			Smoking at follow-up (vs. no smoking)		
Observations	248			362		
Pseudo R^2	0.363			0.569		
Area under ROC curve	0.872			0.943		
Somers' D	0.567			0.832		
Brier score	0.185			0.0618		
	OR	***p*-value**	**lrtest**	**OR**	***p*-value**	**lrtest**
Carrier status x Receiver status at follow-up						
Carrier (vs. non-carrier)	0.749	0.706	<0.001***	5.450	0.135	0.120
Receiver (vs. non-receiver)	0.903	0.847		8.549	0.030*	
Receiver carrier (vs. non-receiver non-carrier)	59.740	<0.001***		0.117	0.365	
Linear combination						
Receiver carrier (vs. non-receiver carrier)	53.928	<0.001***		1.002	0.998	
Receiver non-carrier (vs. non-receiver non-carrier)	0.903	0.847		8.549	0.030*	
Socio-demographic factors						
Age at follow-up						
Age (years)	1.156	0.117	0.002**	1.130	0.365	0.102
Age squared	0.999	0.301		0.998	0.225	
Female (vs. male)	1.676	0.139		1.028	0.954	
Married or common-law (vs. single)	0.857	0.747		0.756	0.603	
Education (vs. less than high school)						
High, vocational, or training school	2.152	0.066	0.105	0.463	0.189	0.183
College, university, or more	1.038	0.938		0.280	0.078	
Colorectal cancer awareness						
Degree of relatedness to family probands (vs. self or identical twin)						

	Colonoscopy use within two years of follow-up (vs. no use)			Smoking at follow-up (vs. no smoking)		
1st degree	1.103	0.915		2.066	0.699	
2nd degree	1.092	0.922	0.740	2.321	0.648	0.852
3rd degree	0.597	0.601		1.294	0.893	
Higher degree	0.709	0.704		1.342	0.874	
Baseline health behaviours						
Colonoscopy use within two years of baseline (vs. no use)	1.624	0.202				
Smoking at baseline (vs. no smoking)				97.021	<0.001***	
Constant	0.002	0.007**		0.001	0.076	

OR, odds ratio. ROC, receiver operating characteristic. lrtest, likelihood ratio test, using chi-squared statistics. vs., versus.

Significance:

*** for 0.001;

** for 0.01;

* for 0.05.

Table 5

Estimation results of the logit regression model on colonoscopy use between baseline and follow-up on the pre- and post-intervention study design subgroup

	Colonoscopy use between baseline and follow-up (vs. no use)		
Observations	94		
Pseudo R^2	0.275		
Area under ROC curve	0.829		
Somers' D	0.653		
Brier score	0.156		
	OR	***p*-value**	**lrtest**
Carrier status × Receiver status at follow-up			
Carrier (vs. non-carrier)	2.708	0.121	0.011*
Receiver (vs. non-receiver)	0.849	0.835	
Carrier receiver (vs. non-carrier non-receiver)	7.208	0.136	
Linear combination			
Receiver carrier (vs. non-receiver carrier)	6.121	0.088	
Receiver non-carrier (vs. non-receiver non-carrier)	0.849	0.835	
Socio-demographic factors			
Age at follow-up			
Age (years)	1.078	0.533	0.482
Age squared	0.999	0.684	
Female (vs. male)	3.577	0.035*	
Married or common-law (vs. single)	1.556	0.556	
Education (vs. less than high school)			
High, vocational, or training school	1.450	0.589	0.571
College, university, or more	2.200	0.297	
Colorectal cancer awareness			
Degree of relatedness to family probands (vs. self or identical twin)			
2nd degree	0.581	0.465	0.096
3rd degree	0.429	0.304	
Higher degree	0.153	0.021*	
Baseline health behaviours			
Colonoscopy use before baseline (vs. No use)	5.070	0.007**	
Constant	0.020	0.209	

OR, odds ratio. ROC, receiver operating characteristic. lrtest, likelihood ratio test, using chi-squared statistics. vs., versus.

Significance:

** for 0.01;

* for 0.05.