

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

Time from diagnosis to treatment of colorectal cancer in an Australian cohort: how it varies and relates to survival

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031421
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-May-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Roder, David; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Karapetis, Christos; Flinders University, Medical Oncology Olver, Ian; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Keefe, Dorothy; South Australia Department of Health, South Australian Cancer Service; The University of Adelaide, Adelaide Medical School Padbury, Robert; Flinders University, Medical Oncology Moore, James; Royal Adelaide Hospital, Colorectal Surgery; The University of Adelaide, Adelaide Medical School Joshi, Rohit; The University of Adelaide, Adelaide Medical School; Adelaide Oncology and Haematology, Cancer Research and Clinical Trials Wattchow, David; Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Surgery and Perioperative Medicine; Flinders University, Medical Oncology Worthley, Dan; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Gastrointestinal Cancer Biology Miller, Caroline; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Population Health; The University of Adelaide, School of Public Health Holden, Carol; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Population Health Buckley, Elizabeth; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Powell, Kate; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Population Health Buranyi-Trevarton, Dianne; South Australia Department of Health, South Australian Cancer Service Fusco, Kellie; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Price, Timothy ; The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Clinical Cancer Research; The University of Adelaide Medical School
Keywords:	Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Epidemiology < ONCOLOGY, PUBLIC HEALTH, Colorectal surgery < SURGERY
	HEALTH, Colorectal surgery < SURGERY

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

Time from diagnosis to treatment of colorectal cancer in an Australian cohort: how it varies and relates to survival

Roder D*1, Karapetis C², Olver I¹, Keefe D^{3, 5}, Padbury R², Moore J^{5, 6}, Joshi R^{5,7}, Wattchow D^{2, 4}, Worthley DL⁸, Miller C^{9,10}, Holden C⁹, Buckley E¹, Powell K⁹, Buranyi-Trevarton D³, Fusco K¹, Price T^{5, 11}

¹ Cancer Research Institute, University of South Australia, Adelaide, SA, Australia

² Medical Oncology, Flinders University, Bedford Park, SA, Australia

³ South Australian Cancer Service, South Australia Department of Health, Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁴ Surgery and Perioperative Medicine, Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Bedford Park, SA, Australia

⁵ Adelaide Medical School, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁶ Colorectal Surgery, Royal Adelaide Hospital, Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁷ Adelaide Oncology and Haematology, Cancer Research and Clinical Trials, North Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁸ Gastrointestinal Cancer Biology, South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁹ Population Health, South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Adelaide, SA, Australia

¹⁰ School of Public Health, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA, Australia

¹¹ Clinical Cancer Research, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Woodville, SA, Australia

* Corresponding author

Email: david.roder@unisa.edu.au

Phone: +61 8 8302 2640

Word count: 4,172

Abstract

Objectives

Determine time to treatment of colorectal cancer and survival

Background

Contrary evidence exists of associations of time to treatment following diagnosis with survival. Some early studies indicated lower survival with longer time, but others showed the reverse, potentially reflecting early scheduling of high-risk cases. We investigated time to treatment at four major public hospitals for benchmarking and to explore associations with survival.

Methodology

Clinical registry data were used where diagnosis was recorded as preceding treatment. Times to treatment were analysed employing rank-order tests and multiple logistic regression. Disease-specific survival was analysed by time to treatment using unadjusted Kaplan-Meier estimates and adjusted Cox proportional hazards regression.

Participants

South Australian registry data, 1980-2010.

Results

Treatment (any type) commenced for 87% of surgical cases ≤ 60 days of diagnosis, with 80% had surgery within this period. Of those receiving radiotherapy, 59% began this treatment ≤ 60 days, and of those receiving systemic therapy, the corresponding proportion was 56%. Adjusted analyses showed treatment delay >60 days was more likely for rectal cancers, 2006-2010 diagnoses, residents of northern than other metropolitan regions, and for surgery, younger ages <50 years, and unexpectedly, those residing closer to metropolitan services. Adjusting for clinical and sociodemographic factors, and diagnostic year, better survival occurred in ≤ 2 years from diagnosis for time to treatment >30 days. Survival in the 3-10 years post-diagnosis generally did not differ by time to treatment, except for lower survival for any treatment >90 days for surgical cases. *Conclusions*

- Lower survival ≤2 years from diagnosis for cancers treated ≤30 days from diagnosis is consistent with other study results attributed to preferencing more complicated cases for earlier care.
- Lower 3-10-year survival for treatment of surgical cases for cancers first treated > 90 days from diagnosis is consistent with the U-shaped relationship reported in some other studies.

Key words

Oncology epidemiology, protocols & guidelines, quality in health care, public health, colorectal surgery

BMJ Open

Strengths and limitations of this study

Strengths

- Broad clinical registry data available on diagnosis, treatment, and sociodemographic covariables
- strong engagement of lead clinicians and health administrators responsible for colorectal cancer management in South Australia
- translation of results into policy and practice in South Australia will be facilitated by members of the research team who are also participants in a formal population-wide program administered by research, government and provider representatives to improve colorectal cancer management and decrease colorectal cancer deaths

Limitations

- Sufficiently precise diagnostic and treatment dates limited to 65% of registry cases
- Data limited to four major public hospitals

Introduction

Australia has a high age-standardised incidence of colorectal cancer about 87% above the world average.¹ The corresponding colorectal cancer mortality rate is lower although still about 22% above the world average.¹ Colorectal cancer is second only to prostate cancer in numbers reported annually by Australian cancer registries and second only to lung cancer in numbers of cancer deaths.² Age-standardised incidence has been stable, with the 2012-2014 rate falling within 1-2% of the rate for 1982-1984, but with the colorectal cancer mortality rate approximately halved between these periods.² This difference reflects increases in 5-year relative survival from 52% in 1982-1986 to 70% in 2011-2015.^{3,4}

South Australian clinical registry data for colorectal cancer covering four major public hospitals showed equivalent survival and survival increases to national figures during 1980-2010, with fiveyear disease-specific survival increasing from 48% to 63% for all stages combined.⁵ Stage distributions were largely unchanged, with survival increases attributed to gains in stage-specific survival.⁵ Increases were particularly pronounced for regional stage.⁵ Survival increases followed increased use of adjuvant systemic therapies, particularly for regional disease.⁵ For rectal cancers, a significant increase in use of adjuvant radiotherapy was reported. The increases in adjuvant therapy were consistent with clinical practice guidelines.⁵ Systemic therapies evolved from a common use of single-agent 5FU to 5FU and leucovorin. FOLFOX (± bevacizumab) and capecitabine (± oxaliplatin) also became more common protracted infusion of 5FU for colonic cancer and with radiotherapy for rectal cancers.⁵

While survival increases were attributed to changes in use of systemic therapy and radiotherapy, and increased surgical specialization,⁵ other influences were possible. One was changes in time from diagnosis to surgical treatment.⁶ In the United Kingdom, treatment delays were regarded as negatively related to survival and concerns were expressed that delays may be increasing due to increased demands for colonoscopy from population screening.^{7, 8} While there is limited evidence of effects of treatment delays on survival, early evidence points to a possible negative effect.^{6, 7, 8} Delays were also viewed negatively as a likely source of psychosocial stress.^{6, 8} Cancer UK has indicated that ideally treatment would commence within one month of diagnosis but has recommended commencement within two months as a realistic target.⁹

Evidence of effects of time to treatment on survival have been mixed.¹⁰⁻¹⁸ Early studies generally pointed to lower survival with longer delay, but later studies varied with some showing better survival for longer delay, and some showing a U-shaped relationship with lower survival at both ends of the follow-up period.^{6-8, 10-18} This has raised questions of whether the relationship varies with the clinical environment, with lower survival for short delays potentially reflected triaging of more aggressive cancers for early treatment in some settings.^{12, 13, 15, 17}

In this study we explore times from diagnosis to treatment, trends in these times, variations across the patient population, and associations with survival. To establish a historic baseline, we analysed colorectal cancer data (2000-2010 diagnoses) from the South Australian registry data. Analyses indicated times to treatment and outcomes across the patient population at these hospitals by cancer stage, patient age, sex, socioeconomic status, service access, local health network of residence (as applying in the study period) and diagnostic epoch. We investigated whether a U-shaped relationship existed between time to treatment and survival, as reported elsewhere.^{6, 17}

The study was restricted to cancers where the registry had enough diagnostic detail from biopsies and other clinical sources to record a diagnosis date in advance of treatment, thereby providing an intervening period for analysis (65% of cases). This is analogous to common registry practice of restricting survival analyses to cancers where diagnosis dates preceded dates of death.¹⁹

Methods

Our data source was the South Australian clinical cancer registry, which is authorised under Section 64, Part 7 of the South Australian Health Care Act (2008) to support service monitoring and quality assurance.⁵ Research ethics approval was obtained from the South Australian Human Research Ethics Committee. Data were extracted for the 2000-2010 diagnostic period and dates of diagnosis and treatment checked from available pathology and clinical reporting to optimize accuracy. Times to treatment start were calculated in days from diagnosis to treatment of 2,746 colorectal cancers.²⁰ Cases were excluded where presenting acutely with bowel obstruction or perforation and treated surgically on day one.

Public and Patient Involvement

Registry development and workplans had substantial patient and consumer involvement through a formalized cancer planning and monitoring processes. Funders reviewing workplans included the Cancer Council South Australia through the Beat Cancer Project. Specialist clinics identify topics for review, of which some are based on/prompted by the questions raised by patients.

The use of the registry was approved by the Department of Health Research Ethics Committee and University of South Australia Research Ethics Committee, both with active consumer involvement, thereby providing another level of public and consumer input.

This study involved the use of routinely collected registry data specifically authorized under state law and planned by clinical experts and consumers.

Participants all attended specialized oncology clinics with whom we work. We work with these clinics in developing consumer messages for distribution to patients and other relevant stakeholder groups.

Analyses were undertaken for surgical, radiotherapy and systemic therapies respectively, and for any of these treatments among surgical cases. Cases were classified by: Australian Clinico-Pathological Stage and grade,²¹ age at diagnosis, sex, area socioeconomic status,²² geographic access to specialist radiotherapy and other specialist metropolitan services based on postcode address (coded as high, medium or low), local health network of residence, as applying during the study period (i.e., northern metropolitan, central metropolitan, southern metropolitan, country south and country north), and diagnostic period (2000-2005 and 2006-2010) (see Tables 1-3). Operational definitions are available in previous publications.^{5, 21, 22}

Time from diagnosis to treatments start was categorised in days for cross-tabulations with clinical and sociodemographic variables. The Spearman rank test was used to analyse ordinal clinical and sociodemographic predictors; Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA for multinomial predictors, and Whitney U test for predictors measured on a binary scale.^{23, 24} For multiple logistic regression analyses of time as the outcome variable, time was reduced to a binary outcome of ">30 or \leq 30 days" and ">60 or \leq 60 days" respectively.^{23, 24}

Disease-specific survival was analysed by time to treatment using Kaplan-Meier product-limit estimates (unadjusted) and Cox proportional hazards regression (adjusted for co-variables shown in Tables 2 and 3).^{23, 24} The decision to use disease-specific survival rather than relative survival was supported by similar results applying to the two methods in South Australia at a population level.⁵ Also, there were not lifetables (as required for relative survival) for patients referred to specialist clinics at these hospitals who often had extensive comorbidity and other complications.⁵ Results are

presented using conventional non-hierarchical analyses as they were similar by hospital setting without evidence of clustering.

Results

A. Time from diagnosis to treatment start (colorectal)

<u>Unadjusted analyses</u> – Time from diagnosis to treatment start (Table 1)

Surgery: The proportion of surgical cases receiving surgery ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 80% (59% ≤ 30 days). Time to first surgical treatment was associated with: (a) age at diagnosis (p< 0.001) - shorter time for older patients; (b) sex (p=0.003) – shorter time for females; (c) local health network of residence (p=0.026) – longer time for northern metropolitan; (d) tumour sub-site (p< 0.001) – longer time for rectum; and (e) diagnostic period (p< 0.001) – longer time for 2006-2010. Significant associations were not found for other characteristics (p ≥ 0.118).

Radiotherapy: The proportion receiving radiotherapy whose treatment started ≤ 60 days was 59% (21% ≤ 30 days). Time to radiotherapy was associated with: (a) age at diagnosis (p=0.042) – longer time for older patients; and (b) tumour sub-site (p<0.001) – shorter time for rectum (note: radiotherapy was uncommon for colonic cancers). Significant associations were not found for other characteristics (p ≥ 0.114).

Systemic therapy: The proportion receiving systemic therapy whose treatment started ≤ 60 days was 56% (15% \leq 30 days). Time to systemic therapy was associated with: (a) age at diagnosis (p<0.001) – longer time for older patients; (b) local health network of residence (p=0.004) – shorter time for northern metropolitan; (c) tumour sub-site (p=0.018) – shorter time for rectum; (d) stage (p=0.003) – shorter time for stages A and D (note: systemic therapy was uncommon for stage A); and (e) diagnostic period (p<0.001) – longer time for 2006-2010. Significant associations were not found by other characteristics (p>0.120).

Any treatment (surgical cases): The proportion receiving any treatment who did so starting ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 87% ($62\% \leq 30$ days). Time to any treatment was associated with: (a) age at diagnosis (p=0.048) – although a clear age gradient was not evident; (b) sex (p=0.017) – shorter time for females; (c) local health network of residence (p< 0.001) – longer time for the northern metropolitan area; (d) tumour sub-site (p< 0.001) – longer time for rectum; and (e) diagnostic period (p< 0.001) – longer time for 2006-2010. Significant associations were not found for other characteristics (p ≥ 0.104).

3

Table 1: Percentage of colorectal patients by treatment type and days from diagnosis to treatment start: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

6	Surgery							Radiotherapy					Systemic therapy					Any Treatment						
7	Juigel	-	31 -	61 -		Р	ixaul		31 -	61-		Р	System		31 -	61 -	1	Р						Р
8	n	≤30	60	90	≥90	value	n	≤30	60	90	≥90	value	n	≤30	60	90	≥90	value	n	≤30	31-60	61-90	≥90	value
All cases	1675	59.0	21.2	6.0	13.9	-	616	20.9	37.8	17.4	23.9	-	1556	15.3	40.7	24.6	19.5	-	1675	61.7	25.6	7.1	5.6	-
Аде at diagnosis (years):																								
250	91	59.3	11.0	4.4	25.3	< 0.001	79	24.1	45.6	7.6	22.8	0.042	189	19.6	47.1	19.0	14.3	< 0.001	91	65.9	22.0	3.3	8.8	0.048
50- 59	210	52.9	20.0	5.7	21.4		118	22.0	40.7	17.8	19.5		322	16.5	44.1	20.5	18.9		210	58.7	28.4	7.7	5.3	
đ¢ - 69	388	52.3	22.9	5.9	18.8		188	20.7	35.6	12.3	22.3		498	16.1	38.0	26.7	19.3		388	57.1	29.1	6.8	7.0	
7105 - 79	570	61.1	23.0	5.6	10.4		175	20.1	36.0	16.0	28.0		469	12.6	39.0	26.7	21.7		570	61.9	26.2	7.2	4.8	
8106+	416	65.4	20.0	7.0	7.7		56	17.9	33.9	21.4	26.8		78	11.5	38.5	28.2	21.8		416	66.1	21.2	7.7	5.1	
Sjex:																								
Males	893	56.0	21.9	5.9	16.1	0.003	400	19.8	38.5	18.0	23.8	0.567	910	16.3	39.0	23.8	20.9	0.649	893	59.2	27.3	7.1	6.4	0.017
Fegnales	782	62.4	20.3	6.0	11.3		216	23.1	36.6	16.2	24.1		646	13.9	43.0	25.5	17.5		782	64.4	23.8	7.0	4.7	
Socioeconomic:																								
Ĺġw	544	56.3	22.8	5.9	15.1	0.118	206	16.0	43.2	18.9	21.8	0.826	507	13.4	39.4	26.4	20.7	0.664	544	58.8	28.0	6.6	6.6	0.104
Low-Med	388	60.3	19.8	6.7	13.1		137	24.8	36.5	16.8	21.9		374	16.6	44.9	21.9	16.6		388	62.7	24.9	7.0	5.4	
Med-High	345	58.6	21.4	5.5	14.5		128	24.2	35.2	18.8	21.9		320	16.3	40.0	27.5	16.3		345	61.9	24.1	8.1	5.8	
14Hgh	398	61.8	20.1	5.8	12.3		145	21.4	33.8	14.5	30.3		355	15.8	38.6	22.0	23.7		398	64.4	24.5	6.8	4.3	
Adcessibility:																								
1⊒5 gh	1353	58.9	20.4	6.4	14.3	0.584	475	22.1	36.4	16.8	24.6	0.764	1223	16.4	40.3	24.0	19.3	0.12	1353	61.8	25.1	7.3	5.9	0.992
№ 6d-High	228	61.0	23.2	3.9	11.8		94	17.0	44.7	21.3	17.0		228	10.1	41.2	28.1	20.6		228	62.1	27.3	6.6	4.0	
Popor	94	55.3	27.7	4.3	12.8		47	17.0	38.3	14.9	29.8		105	13.3	43.8	23.8	19.0		94	58.5	29.8	5.3	6.4	
Ьgcal Health Ŋgtwork:																D/								
Northern metro	242	45.9	24.4	12.0	17.8	0.026	106	18.9	34.9	19.8	26.4	0.12	248	16.1	41.5	24.2	7.3	0.004	242	49.6	30.4	12.1	7.9	< 0.001
Central metro	618	61.7	20.2	6.8	11.3		202	21.8	32.7	17.8	27.7		495	17.8	36.6	26.5	19.2		618	64.1	24.0	7.3	4.7	
Southern metro	417	64.3	17.7	3.4	14.6		134	25.4	40.3	14.2	20.1		426	16.7	42.7	20.7	20.0		417	66.8	23.0	4.8	5.3	
83 untry South	155	52.9	27.7	1.9	17.4		74	25.7	40.5	14.9	18.9		159	8.8	41.5	28.3	21.4		155	56.5	31.2	3.9	8.4	
& Juntry North	241	60.2	22.0	5.0	12.9		100	11.2	46.9	19.4	22.4		228	11.0	44.5	25.1	19.4		241	61.9	26.2	7.4	4.5	
Stab-site:																								
G5 lon	1098	65.0	22.1	4.9	7.9	< 0.001	86	11.6	12.8	14.0	61.6	< 0.001	898	13.1	40.2	27.4	19.3	0.018	1098	66.2	23.4	6.0	4.5	< 0.001
Bectum	577	47.5	19.4	8.0	25.1		530	22.5	41.9	17.9	17.7		658	18.2	41.3	20.7	19.8		577	53.1	29.9	9.2	7.8	
ACPS stage:																								
Ag	280	53.9	30.4	7.9	7.9	0.460	50	24.0	44.0	14.0	18.0	0.114	47	25.5	36.2	21.3	17.0	0.003	280	55.4	32.5	7.9	4.3	0.114
48 B9 C9	654	61.5	23.9	4.7	9.9	(A-D)	147	21.1	38.8	21.8	18.4		249	13.3	40.2	27.7	18.9		654	63.3	26.7	5.7	4.3	
29	412	55.6	17.2	6.8	20.4		231	16.0	40.7	21.2	22.1		696	6.6	47.3	27.6	18.5		412	58.9	25.6	8.8	6.8	
40					-						•				•	•	-	-	•	•				

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 7 of 20

1	
2	

43

2																								
B		79 63.8	12.5	5.0	18.6		162	25.9	29.0	10.5	34.6		516	26.6	33.1	19.6	20.7		279	68.6	17.3	6.5	7.6	
(UK)	(:	50) (51.:	5) (18.2)	(12.1)	(18.2)		(26)	(27.3)	(59.1)	(4.5)	(9.1)		(48)	(26.9)	(34.6)	(15.4)	(23.1)		(50)	(59.2)	(20.4)	(10.2)	(10.2)	
D iagnosis																								
gears: 2000 - 2005	8	69 65.0	17.5	5.4	12.1	< 0.001	335	23.9	34.0	15.8	26.3	0.898	782	17.4	44.2	21.2	17.1	< 0.001	869	68.0	21.4	6.2	4.4	< 0.001
2006 - 2010		06 52.5	25.2	6.6	17.8		281	17.4	42.3	19.2	21.0		774	13.2	37.1	27.9	21.8		806	54.8	30.3	8.0	7.0	
9	*Exc	udes cas	es where	insuffici	ient data	a on date	e of di	agnosis	(see "N	/lethoo	ls")								-					
10		1		D-41-	-1:1	Q4	. 1112	1																
11	ACPS	S- Austra	lian Clini	co-Path	ological	Staging	; UK	– unkno	own															
12																								
13		Adjusted analyses – Predictors of treatment start >30 days from diagnosis (Table 2).																						
14 15	Adjus	sted analy	<u>ses</u> – Pre	dictors	of treati	nent stai	rt >30	days fr	om diag	gnosis	(Table	e 2).												
16	Su	<i>rgery:</i> Si	gnificant	predicto	ors of ti	me to su	rgical	treatme	ent >30	days i	nclude	ed: (a) lo	cal hea	alth netw	work of	resider	ce – rel	ative od	ds (RC)) of 0.5	5 (0.39	, 0.76)		
17 18	fo	<i>Surgery:</i> Significant predictors of time to surgical treatment >30 days included: (a) local health network of residence – relative odds (RO) of 0.55 (0.39, 0.76) for metropolitan central and 0.44 (0.31, 0.63) for metropolitan southern compared with metropolitan northern; (b) tumour site – RO for rectum of 2.07 (1.66,																						
19	2.:	2.57); (c) tumour stage – RO of 0.65 (0.45, 0.93) for stage D (distant metastasis) compared with stage A; (d) grade – RO for high grade (poorly differentiated)																						
20 21	at	at 0.47 (0.25, 0.87) compared with low grade; and (e) diagnostic period – RO of 1.82 (1.48, 2.24) for 2006-2010.																						
22	<i>Radiotherapy:</i> Only tumour site was predictive of time to radiotherapy start >30 days – RO of 0.40 (0.19, 0.83) for rectum (note: radiotherapy was much less																							
23 24	co	mmon fo	r colonic	than rec	etal cano	cers ⁵).																		
25 26	Sy	stemic th	<i>erapy:</i> Si	gnifican	nt predic	tors of t	ime to	system	nic treat	ment s	start >3	30 days	include	ed: (a) tu	umour s	ite – R) for re	ctum of	0.65 (0).48, 0.8	89); (b)			
27	tu	nour stag	e – RO f	or stage	C of 3.	93 (1.85	, 8.36); and (c	c) diagn	ostic j	period	– RO of	£ 0.65 (0.48, 0.	89) for	2006-2	010.							
28 29	Ar	y treatm	ent (surgi	ical case	es): Sigi	nificant p	oredic	tors of t	time to	start o	f any t	reatmen	t>30 d	ays inc	luded: (a) local	health	network	of resi	idence -	- RO of	f 0.56		
30	(0	40, 0.78)	for metr	opolitan	central	and 0.4	4 (0.3	0, 0.63)	for me	tropol	itan so	uthern c	ompar	ed with	metrop	olitan r	orthern	; (b) tun	nour sit	e – RO	of 1.76	5 (1.41,		
31 32	2.	19) for re	ctum; (c)	tumour	stage –	RO of 0).56 (0	0.38, 0.8	30) for s	tage I) com	pared wi	th stag	e A; (d)	grade -	- RO of	0.52 (0).28, 0.9	5) for h	nigh cor	npared	with		
33	lo	w grade;	and (e) d	iagnosti	c period	– RO o	f 1.86	(1.51, 2	2.29) fo	r 2006	5-2010													
34 35	Su	pplement	ary anal	vses with	h tumou	r stage d	classif	ìed as s	tage D	vs A-C	C: RO	odds for	surger	y start >	>30 day	s was l	ower fo	r stage I) for su	irgery a	t 0.69 (0.51,		
36 37	0.9	Supplementary analyses with tumour stage classified as stage D vs A-C: RO odds for surgery start >30 days was lower for stage D for surgery at 0.69 (0.51, 0.92), radiotherapy at 0.56 (0.35, 0.88), systemic therapy at 0.30 (0.22, 0.41), and any treatment (surgical cases) at 0.64 (0.47, 0.86). The RO for systemic																						
38	tre	treatment start >30 days for stage D vs A-C was 0.45 (0.30, 0.67) for 2000-2005 compared with 0.16 (0.10, 0.27) for 2006-2010.																						
39 40																								
40 41																								
42																					Page	8 of 20		

1	
2	
3	

Table 2: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for colorectal cancer starting >30 days of diagnosis by treatment type, stage, and socioeconomic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

7 8		Surgery		Radiotherapy	S	ystemic therapy	Any treatment		
9 10	N	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	
1Age at 1Aiagnosis 1Gyears):									
1450 (ref.)	91	1.00	79	1.00	189	1.00	91	1.00	
1 <u>5</u> 1 8 0 - 59	210	1.15 (0.68, 1.95)	118	1.06 (0.52, 2.15)	322	1.18 (0.71, 1.94)	210	1.20 (0.70, 2.05)	
180 - 69	388	1.16 (0.71, 1.90)	188	1.16 (0.60, 2.25)	498	1.25 (0.79, 2.00)	388	1.26 (0.76, 2.08)	
18 170 - 79	570	0.95 (0.59, 1.53)	175	1.13 (0.58, 2.22)	469	1.51 (0.93, 2.45)	570	1.20 (0.73, 1.95)	
200+	416	0.82 (0.50, 1.34)	56	1.09 (0.44, 2.73)	78	2.20 (0.95, 5.10)	416	1.04 (0.63, 1.72)	
²¹ Sex:									
22 2 B //ale 2 (fref.)	893	1.00	400	1.00	910	1.00	893	1.00	
2Female	782	0.85 (0.69, 1.05)	216	0.72 (0.47, 1.11)	646	1.08 (0.80, 1.47)	782	0.88 (0.72, 1.09)	
26 2 ³ ocioeco 290mic:				Ĩ,					
$\frac{1}{2}$ bow (ref.)	544	1.00	206	1.00	507	1.00	544	1.00	
³ p _{ow-med}	388	1.17 (0.87, 1.59)	137	0.73 (0.40, 1.33)	374	0.92 (0.61, 1.39)	388	1.14 (0.84, 1.54)	
31 ₃ Med-high	345	1.06 (0.78, 1.42)	128	0.55 (0.30, 1.01)	320	0.89 (0.58, 1.38)	345	0.98 (0.73, 1.32)	
3 B ligh	398	1.05 (0.77, 1.42)	145	0.78 (0.42, 1.46)	355	0.94 (0.61, 1.45)	398	1.05 (0.77, 1.42)	
34 35 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34					D,				
3High 3(gref.)	1353	1.00	475	1.00	1223	1.00	1353	1.00	
3Med-high	228	0.62 (0.36, 1.08)	94	1.28 (0.45, 3.65)	228	0.78 (0.30, 2.00)	228	0.75 (0.43, 1.31)	
4 P oor	94	0.83 (0.45, 1.52)	47	1.14 (0.36, 3.58)	105	0.60 (0.23, 1.57)	94	0.89 (0.49, 1.63)	
4£ocal 4£lealth 4¥letwork:						2/			
45 orthern 45 orthern 46 netro 40 ref.)	242	1.00	106	1.00	248	1.00	242	1.00	
4 Central	618	0.55 (0.39, 0.76)	202	0.90 (0.47, 1.72)	495	0.99 (0.62, 1.57)	618	0.56 (0.40, 0.78)	
Southern metro Country South Country	417	0.44 (0.31, 0.63)	134	0.68 (0.35, 1.33)	426	0.84 (0.52, 1.35)	417	0.44 (0.30, 0.63)	
Country South	155	0.86 (0.51, 1.43)	74	0.52 (0.20, 1.38)	159	2.40 (0.90, 6.39)	155	0.78 (0.47, 1.30)	
56 ⁰¹¹¹¹	241	0.78 (0.43, 1.43)	100	1.60 (0.49, 5.18)	228	2.03 (0.76, 5.39)	241	0.73 (0.40, 1.34)	
5 Fumour									
5 §ite: 5©olon 6@ref.)	1098	1.00	86	1.00	898	1.00	1098	1.00	

2								
Rectum	577	2.07 (1.66, 2.57)	530	0.40 (0.19, 0.83)	658	0.65 (0.48, 0.89)	577	1.76 (1.41, 2.19)
⁴ (incl.								
Rectosig.)								
7ACPS								
8stage:	• • •	4.00	-					1.00
₉ A (ref.)	280	1.00	50	1.00	47	1.00	280	1.00
1 B	654	0.87 (0.64, 1.17)	147	1.03 (0.46, 2.28)	249	1.78 (0.81, 3.90)	654	0.80 (0.59, 1.08)
11 12	412	0.99 (0.72, 1.37)	231	1.56 (0.72, 3.38)	696	3.93 (1.85, 8.36)	412	0.89 (0.65, 1.23)
1 B	279	0.65 (0.45, 0.93)	162	0.71 (0.33, 1.55)	516	0.83 (0.40, 1.71)	279	0.56 (0.38, 0.80)
14 15 ^{UK})	(50)	(0.67, (0.31, 1.48))	(26)	(0.93 (0.28, 3.06))	(48)	(0.84 (0.27, 2.62))	(50)	(0.65 (0.33, 1.25))
1Grade:								
¹ Well diff. ¹⁸ (ref.)	58	1.00	25	1.00	37	1.00	58	1.00
2010d diff.	1212	0.68 (0.39, 1.20)	429	1.34 (0.50, 3.58)	1054	1.18 (0.43, 3.22)	1212	0.72 (0.42, 1.25)
2 P oorly 2 2 ndiff.	285	0.47 (0.25, 0.87)	99	0.87 (0.62, 5.67)	309	1.28 (0.45, 3.68)	285	0.52 (0.28, 0.95)
2¢UK)	(120)	(1.48 (0.75, 2.95))	(63)	(1.02 (0.33, 3.12))	(156)	(0.41, (0.14, 1.17))	(120)	(1.44 (0.74, 2.81))
² ⁴ / ₂ ⁴ /2/ ₂ ⁴ / ₂ / ₂ / ₂ ⁴ / ₂ / ₂ /2				0				
₂ year:								
27000 -	869	1.00	335	1.00	782	1.00	869	1.00
2 8 005								
2 2 006 -	806	1.82 (1.48, 2.24)	281	1.48 (0.97, 2.26)	774	0.65 (0.48, 0.89)	806	1.86 (1.51, 2.29)
30 010								

*Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods")

RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff. – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated.

Adjusted analyses – Predictors of treatment start exceeding >60 days (Table 3)

Surgery: Predictors of time to surgery >60 days for surgical cases included: (a) age at diagnosis – RO of 0.50 (0.29, 0.85) for 70-79 and 0.48 (0.27, 0.85) for 80+ compared with <50years ; (b) service accessibility – RO of 0.37 (0.18, 0.74) for medium and 0.40 (0.18, 0.89) for poor compared with high metropolitan service accessibility; (c) local health network of residence – RO of 0.58 (0.39, 0.86) for metropolitan central and 0.51 (0.33, 0.78) for metropolitan south compared with metropolitan north; (d) tumour site – RO for rectum of 3.39 (2.59, 4.42); (e) tumour stage – RO of 2.32 (1.54, 3.50) for stage C and 1.76 (1.11, 2.78) for stage D compared with stage A; (f) grade – RO of 0.51 (0.27, 0.98) for intermediate and 0.38 (0.18, 0.79) for high compared with low grade; and (g) diagnostic period – RO of 1.56 (1.20, 2.03) for 2006-2010.

Radiotherapy: Predictors of time to radiotherapy start >60 days for cases treated by radiotherapy included (a) older age at diagnosis – compared with age<50 years, RO of 2.22 (1.20, 4.09) for 60-69 years, 2.00 (1.08, 3.71) for 70-79 years, and 2.30 (1.04, 5.08) for 80+ years; and (b) tumour site – RO lower at 0.18 (0.11, 0.32) for rectum (note: radiotherapy was uncommon for colonic cases).

1										
2 3	~									
4	Syster	nic thei	rapy: Predictors of t	ime to	sys					
5	therap	oy inclu	ded: (a) older age at	t diagn	osis					
6	for 60)-69 yea	ars, 1.83 (1.27, 2.64)) for 70)-79					
7 8	sub-si	ite – RC) for rectum of 0.78	(0.63	09					
9				(0.02,	0.9					
10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		6-2010.							
11 12	Any ti	reatmen	nt (surgical cases): I	Predict	ors					
13	local	health r	network of residence	e – RO	at (
14	0.69)	for met	ropolitan south com	pared [•]	wit					
15 16	1.82 (1.34.2	.46); (d) grade – RC	of 0.4	3 ((
17	diagnostic period – RO of 1.59 (1.18, 2.15)									
18	-	-								
19 20	Suppl	ementa	ry analyses with tun	nour st	age					
21	days o	did not	vary, with RO for st	age D	of 1					
22	radiot	herapy.	, 0.83 (0.66, 1.31) fo	or syste	emio					
23 24	cases)		\bigcirc						
24 25	cuses).								
26										
27	Table	3: Rela	ative odds (95% CL	s) of tr	eatr					
28 29	treatn	treatment type, stage, and socio-demograph								
30	2010	diagnos	ses*							
31										
32 33			Surgery		Ra					
34		n	RO (95% CLs)	n						
35	Age at									
36 37	diagnosis									
38	(years):	01	1.00	70	1					
39	<50 (ref.) 50 – 59	91 210	1.00	79 118	1. 1.					
40	<u>60 - 69</u>	388	0.73 (0.42, 1.27)	188	2.					
41 42	70 - 79	570	0.50 (0.29, 0.85)	175	2.					
43	80+	416	0.48 (0.27, 0.85)	56	2.					
44	Sex:									
45 46	Male (ref.)	893	1.00	400	1.					
40	Female	782	0.79 (0.61, 1.04)	216	0.					
48	Socioeconomic:									
49	Low (ref.)	544	1.00	206	1.					
50 51	Low-med	388	1.37 (0.94, 2.01)	137	1.					
52	Med-high	345	1.06 (0.73, 1.55)	128	0.					
53	High	398	1.05 (0.71, 1.55)	145	1.					
54	Accessibility:	1252	1.00	175	1					
55 56	High (ref.)	1353	1.00	475	1.					
57	Med-High Poor	228 94	0.37 (0.18, 0.74) 0.40 (0.18, 0.89)	94 47	1. 1.					
58	Local Health		0.10 (0.10, 0.09)	, ,	1.					
59	Network:									
60										

estemic therapy: Predictors of time to systemic treatment start >60 days for cases treated by systemic erapy included: (a) older age at diagnosis – compared with under 50 years, RO of 1.72 (1.20, 2.47) or 60-69 years, 1.83 (1.27, 2.64) for 70-79 years and 2.08 (1.19, 3.63) for 80+ years; and (b) tumour ab-site – RO for rectum of 0.78 (0.63, 0.97); and (c) diagnostic period – RO higher at 1.65 (1.33, 03) for 2006-2010.

Any treatment (surgical cases): Predictors of time to start of any treatment >60 days included: (a) local health network of residence – RO at 0.56 (0.36, 0.86) for metropolitan central and 0.42 (0.26, 0.69) for metropolitan south compared with metropolitan north; (d) tumour site – RO for rectum at 1.82 (1.34, 2.46); (d) grade – RO of 0.43 (0.20, 0.93) for high compared with low grade; and (e) diagnostic period – RO of 1.59 (1.18, 2.15) for 2006-2010.

Supplementary analyses with tumour stage classified as stage D vs A-C: The RO for surgery start >60 days did not vary, with RO for stage D of 1.18 (0.84, 1.66) for surgery, 0.92 (0.61, 1.38) for radiotherapy, 0.83 (0.66, 1.31) for systemic therapy, and 1.10 (0.74, 1.64) for any treatment (surgical cases).

Table 3: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for colorectal cancer starting >60 days of diagnosis by treatment type, stage, and socio-demographic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

		Surgery		Radiotherapy	Sy	stemic therapy	Any treatment (surgical cases)		
	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	
Age at diagnosis (years):				C	4				
<50 (ref.)	91	1.00	79	1.00	189	1.00	91	1.00	
50 - 59	210	0.79 (0.94, 1.42)	118	1.54 (0.80, 2.99)	322	1.31 (0.89, 1.94)	210	1.00 (0.54, 2.27)	
60 - 69	388	0.73 (0.42, 1.27)	188	2.22 (1.20, 4.09)	498	1.72 (1.20, 2.47)	388	1.11 (0.54, 2.27)	
70 – 79	570	0.50 (0.29, 0.85)	175	2.00 (1.08, 3.71)	469	1.83 (1.27, 2.64)	570	1.10 (0.55, 2.22)	
80+	416	0.48 (0.27, 0.85)	56	2.30 (1.04, 5.08)	78	2.08 (1.18, 3.63)	416	1.25 (0.61, 2.56)	
Sex:									
Male (ref.)	893	1.00	400	1.00	910	1.00	893	1.00	
Female	782	0.79 (0.61, 1.04)	216	0.93 (0.64, 1.35)	646	0.93 (0.75, 1.15)	782	0.89 (0.66, 1.20)	
Socioeconomic:									
Low (ref.)	544	1.00	206	1.00	507	1.00	544	1.00	
Low-med	388	1.37 (0.94, 2.01)	137	1.01 (0.61, 1.68)	374	0.74 (0.55, 1.00)	388	1.30 (0.84, 2.01)	
Med-high	345	1.06 (0.73, 1.55)	128	0.95 (0.57, 1.57)	320	0.90 (0.67, 1.22)	345	1.17 (0.77, 1.78)	
High	398	1.05 (0.71, 1.55)	145	1.21 (0.72, 2.01)	355	0.94 (0.69, 1.27)	398	1.07 (0.68, 1.68)	
Accessibility:									
High (ref.)	1353	1.00	475	1.00	1223	1.00	1353	1.00	
Med-High	228	0.37 (0.18, 0.74)	94	1.36 (0.54, 3.39)	228	1.23 (0.71, 2.12)	228	0.47 (0.21, 1.06)	
Poor	94	0.40 (0.18, 0.89)	47	1.50 (0.57, 3.95)	105	0.92 (0.50, 1.69)	94	0.55 (0.23, 1.35)	
Local Health Network:									

2									
3 4 5	Northern metro (ref.)	242	1.00	106	1.00	248	1.00	242	1.00
5 6	Central metro	618	0.58 (0.39, 0.86)	202	0.84 (0.49, 1.44)	495	1.24 (0.89, 1.74)	618	0.56 (0.36, 0.86)
7	Southern metro	417	0.51 (0.33, 0.78)	134	0.56 (0.31, 1.00)	426	0.95 (0.67, 1.34)	417	0.42 (0.26, 0.69)
8	Country South	155	0.80 (0.44, 1.48)	74	0.43 (0.18, 1.02)	159	1.16 (0.66, 2.04)	155	0.80 (0.40, 1.59)
9	Country North	241	1.24 (0.59, 2.59)	100	0.56 (0.21, 1.50)	228	1.02 (0.56, 1.86)	241	0.97 (0.42, 2.25)
10	Tumour site:								
11 12	Colon (ref.)	1098	1.00	86	1.00	898	1.00	1098	1.00
13 14	Rectum (incl. Rectosig.)	577	3.39 (2.59, 4.42)	530	0.18 (0.11, 0.32)	658	0.78 (0.63, 0.97)	577	1.82 (1.34, 2.46)
15	ACPS stage:								
16	A (ref.)	280	1.00	50	1.00	47	1.00	280	1.00
17 18	В	654	1.21 (0.80, 1.82)	147	1.28 (0.62, 2.64)	249	1.24 (0.64, 2.40)	654	0.88 (0.56, 1.39)
10 19	С	412	2.32 (1.54, 3.50)	231	1.73 (0.87, 3.43)	696	1.21 (0.65, 2.26)	412	1.39 (0.88, 2.19)
20	D	279	1.76 (1.11, 2.78)	162	1.37 (0.67, 2.82)	516	1.01 (0.53, 1.90)	279	1.19 (0.71, 1.99)
21	(UK)	(50)	(1.43 (0.59, 3.51))	(26)	(0.38 (0.10, 1.54))	(48)	(0.97 (0.35, 2.68))	(50)	(1.46 (0.63, 3.37))
22	Grade:								
23	Well diff. (ref.)	58	1.00	25	1.00	37	1.00	58	1.00
24 25	Mod diff.	1212	0.51 (0.27, 0.98)	429	0.98 (0.40, 2.42)	1054	1.08 (0.54, 2.19)	1212	0.52 (0.23, 1.03)
26	Poorly/undiff.	285	0.38 (0.18, 0.79)	99	1.18 (0.44, 3.14)	309	1.10 (0.53, 2.29)	285	0.43 (0.20, 0.93)
27	(UK)	(120)	(1.09 (0.51, 2.37)	(63)	(0.66 (0.23, 1.87))	(156)	(0.58 (0.27, 1.27))	(120)	(0.99 (0.44, 2.25))
28 29	Diagnostic year:								
30	2000 - 2005	869	1.00	335	1.00	782	1.00	869	1.00
31 32	2006 - 2010	806	1.56 (1.20, 2.03)	281	0.91 (0.64, 1.30)	774	1.65 (1.33, 2.03)	806	1.59 (1.18, 2.15)

*Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods")

RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated.

B. <u>Time from diagnosis to treatment start by sub-site (colon and rectum)</u>

Colon (Supplementary Tables s1 & s2)

- Predictors of time to treatment start >30 days in adjusted analysis included: (a) *For surgery:* age 60-69 years compared with <50 years; northern metropolitan compared with central metropolitan and southern metropolitan; stage A compared with stages B and D; and diagnosis in 2006-2010;
 (b) *For radiotherapy:* no significant predictors (small numbers); (c) *For systemic therapy:* diagnosis in 2006-2010; (d) *For any treatment (surgical cases)*: northern metropolitan compared with central metropolitan and southern metropolitan areas; stage A compared with stages B and C; and diagnosis in 2006-2010.
- Predictors of time to treatment start of >60 days in adjusted analysis included: (a) *For surgery:* northern metropolitan compared with central and southern metropolitan areas; and more advanced stages C and D compared with stage A; (b) *For radiotherapy:* no significant predictors (small

numbers); (c) *For systemic therapy*: diagnosis in 2006-2010; and (d) *For any treatment (surgical cases)*: northern metropolitan compared with central and southern metropolitan areas. Rectum (Supplementary Tables s3 & s4)

- Predictors of time to treatment start of >30 days in adjusted analysis included: (a) *For surgery:* age 70+ compared with <50 years; northern metropolitan compared with central and southern metropolitan areas; and diagnosis in 2006-2010; (b) *For radiotherapy:* low compared with medium-high socioeconomic status; and diagnosis in 2006-2010; (c) *For systemic therapy*: stage C; and (d) *For any treatment (surgical cases)*: diagnosis in 2006-2010.
- Predictors of time to treatment start of >60 days in adjusted analysis included: (a) *For surgery:* younger age <50 compared with 70+ years; high service accessibility; northern metropolitan compared with central and southern metropolitan areas; and stage C compared with stage A; better differentiation; and 2006-2010; (b) *For radiotherapy:* aged over 50 years; (c) *For systemic therapy*: aged over 50 years; central metropolitan compared with northern metropolitan area; and stage C; and (d) *For any treatment (surgical cases)*: low grade lesions; and diagnosis in 2006-2010.

C. Survival by time from diagnosis to treatment start

Unadjusted analysis (Table 4)

Surgical treatment: Compared with time to initial surgery >30 days, survival was lowest in the first two years from diagnosis when time to initial surgery was \leq 30 days, but changed with further follow-up, such that by 10 years from diagnosis, survival was lower when time to initial surgery was >90 days compared with \leq 30 days (p=0.017).

Radiotherapy: Survival was lowest in the first year when time to radiotherapy start was \leq 30 days and reached statistical significance compared with a time of 61-90 days (p=0.009), but not with 31-60 days (p=0.295) or >90 days (p=0.280). After the first year of follow-up, survival was lowest for >90 days.

Systemic therapy: The survival pattern varied, with time to treatment \leq 30 days having the lowest survival at each follow-up time.

Any treatment (surgical cases): Compared with time to initial treatment >30 days, survival was lowest in the first two years from diagnosis when time to initial surgery was \leq 30 days, but changed with further follow-up, such that by 10 years from diagnosis, survival was lower when time to initial surgery was >90 days compared with \leq 30 days (p=0.021).

			Follow-up time from diagnosis (years)									
Specified treatment	Time (days)	Numbers of cases	1	2	3	4	5	10				
	≤30	988	85.4 ± 1.2	78.2 ± 1.5	72.9 ± 1.5	69.8 ± 1.6	67.5 ± 1.7	63.3 ± 2.0				
Surgical	31 - 60	355	93.1 ± 1.6	89.9 ± 1.9	84.7 ± 2.2	81.9 ± 2.4	79.7 ± 2.5	75.9 ± 2.9				
treatment	61 – 90	100	92.9 ± 3.7	84.1 ± 4.6	77.5 ± 5.3	74.6 ± 5.5	72.6 ± 5.8	57.7 ± 9.0				
	>90	232	92.6 ± 2.2	82.4 ± 2.9	73.9 ± 3.2	67.4 ± 3.5	67.8 ± 3.7	50.4 ± 5.0				
	≤30	129	82.0 ± 4.0	70.0 ± 4.5	62.4 ± 4.7	58.0 ± 4.7	53.1 ± 4.8	44.4 ± 5.5				
Dadiotherany	31-60	233	87.0 ± 2.6	77.8 ± 3.0	68.2 ± 3.4	64.4 ± 3.5	61.3 ± 3.6	55.2 ± 4.4				
Radiotherapy	61 – 90	107	95.3 ± 3.2	87.5 ± 4.1	79.4 ± 4.7	73.8 ± 5.1	64.8 ± 5.5	49.0 ± 6.9				
	>90	147	87.6 ± 3.3	62.6 ± 4.3	53.1 ± 4.4	42.8 ± 4.3	39.2 ± 4.3	27.3 ± 4.3				
	<u>≤</u> 30	238	68.0 ± 3.3	52.8 ± 3.4	43.4 ± 3.3	40.7 ± 3.3	38.4 ± 3.3	33.1 ± 3.4				
Systemic	31 - 60	633	87.2 ± 3.4	73.8 ± 1.8	67.9 ± 2.0	62.8 ± 2.0	59.4 ± 2.1	49.5 ± 2.5				
therapy	61 – 90	382	92.3 ± 1.6	78.8 ± 2.3	68.9 ± 2.6	64.5 ± 2.7	59.8 ± 2.8	56.1 ± 3.0				
	>90	303	94.4 ± 1.7	78.1 ± 2.6	68.6 ± 2.9	63.2 ± 3.0	56.8 ± 3.1	45.1 ± 3.9				
	<u>≤</u> 30	1030	85.5 ±1.1	78.1 ± 1.3	72.6 ± 1.4	69.4 ± 1.5	67.2 ± 1.6	63.1 ± 1.8				
Any treatment (surgical cases	31 - 60	428	93.4 ± 1.2	88.8 ± 1.5	83.8 ± 1.8	80.5 ± 2.0	78.0 ± 2.2	71.5 ± 2.9				
(surgical cases only)	61 – 90	118	94.0 ± 2.2	85.9 ± 3.3	79.6 ± 3.9	74.8 ± 4.4	71.7 ± 4.7	56.6 ± 7.8				
	>90	99	91.7 ± 2.8	82.2 ± 3.9	71.9 ± 4.7	63.9 ± 5.2	57.1 ± 5.6	43.8 ± 8.2				

Table 4: Percentage survival (± standard error) from colorectal cancer by time from diagnosis (days) to commitment of specified treatment: South Australian major public hospitals, diagnoses 2000-2010*

* Kaplan-Meier product-limit estimate; date of censoring of live cases: Dec 31, 2012

Adjusted analysis (Table 5)

Because visual examination and interaction terms indicated a lack of proportionality of survival with time to treatment, results are split in Table 5 for follow-up of ≤ 2 and 3-10 years as mutually exclusive periods. Irrespective of treatment type, lower hazard ratios applied for periods ≤ 2 years with times to treatment of >30 days, after adjusting for age, sex, socioeconomic status, service accessibility, local health network of residence, tumour sub-site, stage, grade and diagnostic period. Hazard ratios similarly adjusted generally did not decrease across the 3-10 follow-up, suggesting no significant differences in conditional survival after two years for cases treated ≤ 30 days of diagnosis and >30 days. While there were higher hazard ratios for times of 61-90 and >90 days for 3-10-year follow-up from surgical treatment and radiotherapy respectively, statistical significance was only achieved for any treatment (surgical cases) when comparing time to treatment >90 compared with ≤ 30 days (p=0.022).

Table 5: Hazard ratios (95% confider	nce limits) of deaths from colorectal cancer by time from
diagnosis (days) to commencement o	f specified treatment: South Australians major public
hospitals, diagnoses 2000-2010*	

		Follow-up time from diagnoses				
			≤2 years	3	-10 years	
Treatment	Time	Number of cases	Hazard ratios	Number of cases	Hazard ratios	
	≤30	988	1.00	714	1.00	
Surgical	31 - 60	355	0.57 (0.40, 0.82)	302	0.92 (0.62, 1.36)	
treatment	61 – 90	100	0.59 (0.35, 1.02)	76	1.13 (0.60, 2.10)	
	>90	232	0.59 (0.41, 0.84)	186	1.24 (0.85, 1.83)	
	<u>≤</u> 30	129	1.00	87	1.00	
Dedicthemany	31 - 60	233	0.85 (0.54, 1.32)	173	1.00 (0.59, 1.72)	
Radiotherapy	61 - 90	107	0.44 (0.23, 0.84)	89	1.26 (0.70, 2.27)	
	>90	147	0.62 (0.40, 0.98)	89	1.60 (0.90, 2.85)	
	≤30	238	1.00	120	1.00	
Systemic	31 - 60	633	0.71 (0.55, 0.92)	459	0.98 (0.66, 1.47)	
therapy	61 – 90	382	0.51 (0.38, 0.70)	289	1.01 (0.65, 1.55)	
	>90	303	0.40 (0.30, 0.55)	233	1.04 (0.68, 1.59)	
	<u>≤</u> 30	1030	1.00	744	1.00	
Any treatment (surgical cases only)	31 - 60	428	0.59 (0.43, 0.81)	361	0.94 (0.66, 1.33)	
	61 – 90	118	0.48 (0.43, 0.81)	95	1.11 (0.66, 1.89)	
	>90	99	0.62 (0.37, 1.02)	78	1.83 (1.12, 2.98)	

*4 Cox proportional hazards regression analyses (1 per treatment category), adjusting for age, sex, socioeconomic status, service accessibility, local health network, sub-site,

stage, grade and diagnostic period (see tables 2 and 3); date of censoring of live cases: Dec 31, 2012.

Discussion

The proportion of surgical patients receiving any treatment for their cancer ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 87%, with 80% receiving surgical treatment within 60 days of diagnosis. This broadly accords with targets set by Cancer UK.⁹ The proportion receiving radiotherapy who started this therapy ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 59%, whereas the corresponding percentage having systemic therapies who started this therapy ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 56%. The longer delay for radiotherapy and systemic therapy is consistent with their common use as adjuvant therapies following surgery.⁵

Longer time to surgery applied for cancers of the rectum than colon potentially reflecting the increased use of MRI for rectal cancers, ²⁵ and multimodal therapies,⁵ which may have led to surgery delays through more multidisciplinary consultation and in some instances, neoadjuvant care.²⁶

The longer time to surgery in 2006-2010 may also have been influenced by increasing use of multimodal therapies and more advanced diagnostics (e.g., MRI), increasing the need for multidisciplinary consultation.^{5, 26} While the introduction of population-based screening may have contributed, the screening program was still at an early phase of development, being phased in from 2006 to 2020. Following more complete implementation of bowel screening, there may be increased pressure on services which may increase times to surgery.^{7, 8} The higher proportion with a time to surgery >60 days for stages C and D compared with stage A may reflect time taken for symptom control, multidisciplinary team consultation, and provision of neoadjuvant therapies.^{27, 28} The proportion with a time to surgery >60 days was lower for higher grade tumours, potentially due to a greater perceived urgency of surgical intervention for more aggressive tumours.

The proportion receiving surgery, who did so >60 days from diagnosis, tended to be lower among those aged 70+ years, central and southern compared with northern metropolitan areas, those diagnosed in 2000-2005 compared with 2006-2010, and unexpectedly, those residing closer to metropolitan services. The reasons are unclear but may reflect differences in service busyness and patterns of patient and service demand.

Of those receiving radiotherapy, the proportion starting this therapy >60 days from diagnosis tended to be higher for ages \geq 60 years than the <50 years. A similar pattern applied for systemic therapy. The reasons are not known. Perhaps a longer recovery time post-surgery has been allowed for older cases post-surgery before commencing adjuvant therapies, or longer delays occurring due to higher levels of frailty and comorbidity, and more common complications of surgery.

BMJ Open

Radiotherapy was relatively uncommon for colon cancers, as recommended in clinical guidelines and optimal care pathways, ^{27, 28} but when it was provided, it tended to start later than for rectal cases. Similarly, systemic therapies tended to commence later for colon than rectal cancers. Further research is needed to determine the reasons for these patterns. Systemic therapies were less likely to commence >30 days from diagnosis for 2006-2010 diagnoses. Conversely systemic therapies were more inclined to occur >60 days from diagnosis in 2006-2010. Again, further research is needed to explain these patterns.

Where the time from diagnosis to treatment was >30 days, the risk of death occurring \leq 2 years of diagnosis was lower. This was evident by therapy type after adjusting for stage and grade, and sociodemographic factors. It may reflect the triaging for priority treatment \leq 30 days for cases with elevated comorbidity or other risk factors not recorded by the registry. While a statistically significant U-shaped relationship of survival with time to treatment start was usually not apparent for specific therapies, as indicated in some other studies, ^{6, 17} the hazard ratio for 3-10 years was elevated when the time to first treatment was >90 days for surgical cases (p=0.022).

The present study has limitations. An opportunistic approach was taken in selecting cases where evidence was available on size of the gap between recorded diagnosis date and start of treatment. This raises questions about the representativeness of results. Nonetheless, results are similar to those of other recent studies in showing poorer short-term survival for cases receiving surgical treatment soon after diagnosis, and with a similar pattern applying for early treatment by radiotherapy and systemic therapies.^{12, 14, 15, 17}

Results should not be construed as indicating a lack of benefit from early treatment, given likely confounding effects of patient selection in treatment scheduling. A positive feature was the approximate 87% of surgical cases receiving their first treatment (any treatment) \leq 60 days and 80% treated surgically within this period (note: 83% for 2000-2005 and 78% for 2006-2010).⁹ The indication of a temporal decline in this percentage warrants continued monitoring and investigation, particularly for patient groups where a higher proportion was not receiving surgical care \leq 60 days of diagnosis (e.g., patients aged under 50 years, those with advanced disease, those with rectal cancer, and residents of the northern metropolitan rather than central or southern metropolitan areas).

The study highlights the benefit of linking diagnostic data to treatment data. Population-wide data linkage of population-based cancer registry, hospital, radiotherapy-centre, Medicare insurance and screening data, and potentially in the future, electronic medical record data and selected research databases will further strengthen the data infrastructure available for describing clinical management pathways and associations with survival across the population. Clinical registries will still be important for more detailed investigations for the sub-groups they cover, and for validating results of population-wide registry and administrative sources.

Conclusions

- Australia has a high incidence but a greatly reducing mortality from colorectal cancer due to survival gains. Equivalent survival gains have been found for major public hospitals in South Australia.
- Scientific evidence of effects of treatment delays on survival is mixed. Some recent studies show lower survival with shorter delays, attributing this to triaging of more aggressive and complicated cases for early treatment.
- Baseline data for major public hospitals in South Australia 2000-2010 indicate that for cases where the clinical registry recorded a diagnosis in advance of the surgery date, approximately 87% of surgical cases receiving any treatment and 80% of cases received their surgical treatment ≤60 days of diagnosis. This is broadly consistent with timeline targets of Cancer UK.
- Radiotherapy and systemic therapies generally started later, potentially reflecting their use as adjuvant therapies.
- Adjusted analyses indicated lower survival up to two years from diagnosis when treatment commenced ≤30 days of diagnosis, potentially reflecting triaging for early care of cases with aggressive cancers and higher clinical complexity. By comparison, adjusted analyses did not show differences in survival for follow-up periods from diagnosis of 3-10 years where longer times to treatment applied, except for time to any treatment (surgical cases) of >90 days when survival was lower.
- These results should not be interpreted as evidence of the importance or unimportance of delays, given selection factors in scheduling patient care. Further research is needed to assess effects of treatment delays on patients' anxiety.
- Treatment commencement was generally later in 2006-2010 than 2000-2005, possibly reflecting increased use of adjuvant therapies, MDTs, and more advanced diagnostics (e.g., MRIs). Increased demand may be placed on timeliness of clinical services with extensions in population screening.
- Further research is needed to optimize patient scheduling for care to reduce anxiety and mortality.

Funding statement

Undertaken with the financial support of Cancer Council's Beast Cancer Project on behalf of its donors and the State Government through the Department of Health.

Ethics

Research ethics approval from the South Australian Human Research Ethics Committee HREC/14/SAH/145.

Informed consent

Waiver of consent for use of de-identified data collected under authorisation of Part 7 of the South Australian Health Care Act. Note: large numbers of patients are deceased and many are in the terminal stages of their cancer. Consent processes would be intrusive and would invalidate the database as an unbiased data source.

Author contributions

Study concept: DR, TP; Study design: DR TP, CK, RP, JM; Data acquisition: DB, KP; Quality control of data: DB, KP, KF; Data analysis: DR, KF; Data interpretation: DR, CK, IO, DK, RP, JM, RJ, DW, DLW, TP; Report writing: DR, KF; Review of report: DR, CK, IO, DK, RP, JM, RJ, DW, DLW, TP, CM, CH, EB. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Data sharing

The data for this study are available through the South Australian Cancer Service and SA Cancer Registry. Restrictions to data use apply as conditions of legal authorization and data custodian and ethics approval.

Competing interests

D Roder reports grants from Cancer Council SA, during the conduct of the study.

References

- 1. Ferlay J, Ervik M, Lam F, et al. Global Cancer Observatory: Cancer Today. France: International Agency for Research on Cancer; 2018. <u>https://gco.iarc.fr/today</u> (accessed 28 September 2018).
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2018 Cancer Data in Australia; Australian Cancer Incidence and Mortality (ACIM) books: all cancers combined, Canberra: AIHW; 2018. <u>https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/cancer/cancer-data-in-australia/</u> (accessed 23 January 2019).
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW), Cancer data in Australia. Cat. no: CAN 122. Canberra: AIHW; 2018. <u>https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/cancer/cancer-data-in-australia/contents/summary</u> (accessed 23 January 2019).
- 4. Australian Government, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Cancer Australia, Australasian Association of Cancer Registries. Cancer survival and prevalence in Australia: cancers diagnosed from 1982 to 2004. Cancer Series no. 42. Cat. No. CAN 38. Canberra: AIHW; 2008.
- Roder D, Karapetis C, Wattchow D, et al. Colorectal cancer treatment and survival: the experience of major public hospitals in South Australia over three decades. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2015; 16(6): 2431-40.
- 6. Singh H, De Coster C, Shu E, et al. Wait times from presentation to treatment for colorectal cancer: A population-based study. *Canadian J Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 2010; 24(1): 33-9.

- 7. Hanna SJ, Muneer A, Khalil KH. The 2-week wait time for suspected cancer. Time to rethink? *Int J Clin Pract* 2005; 59(11):1334-39.
- 8. Roncoroni L, Pietra N, Violi V, et al. Delay in the diagnosis and outcome of colorectal cancer: a prospective study. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 1999; 25(2): 173-8.
- 9. Cancer Research UK. Cancer waiting times. London: Cancer Research UK; 2018. <u>https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/about-cancer/cancer-in-general/treatment/access-to-treatment/waiting-times-after-diagnosis (accessed 23 January 2019).</u>
- 10. Barillari P, de Angelis R, Valabrega S, et al. Relationship of symptom duration and survival in patients with colorectal carcinoma. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 1989; 15(5): 441-5.
- 11. Gonzalez-Hermoso F, Perez-Palma J, Marchena-Gomez J, et al. Can early diagnosis of symptomatic colorectal cancer improve diagnosis. *World J Surg* 2004; 28(7): 716-20.
- Rupassara KS, Ponnusamy S, Withanage N, et al. A paradox explained? Patients with delayed diagnosis of symptomatic colorectal cancer have good prognosis. *Colorectal Dis* 2006; 8(5): 423-9.
- 13. Jullumstrø E, Lydersen S, Møller B, et al. Duration of symptoms, stage at diagnosis and relative survival in colon and rectal cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 2009; 45(13): 2383-90.
- 14. Pruit SL, Harzke AJ, Davidson NO, et al. Do diagnostic and treatment delays for colorectal cancer increase risk of death? *Cancer Causes Control* 2013; 24(5): 961-77.
- 15. Amri R, Bordeianou LG, Sylla P, et al. Treatment delay in surgically-treated colon cancer: does it affect outcomes? *Ann surg Oncol* 2014; 21(12): 3909-16.
- 16. Young CG, Varghese R, Stephens JH, et al. Colorectal cancer survival is not affected by delay in diagnosis. *Clin Surg* 2016; 1: 1238.
- 17. Pita-Fernández S, González-Sáez L, López-Calviño B, et al. Effect of diagnostic delay on survival in patients with colorectal cancer: a retrospective cohort study. *BMC Cancer* 2016; 16(1): 664.
- 18. Wanis KN, Patel SV, Brackstone M. Do moderate surgical treatment delays influence survival in colon cancer? *Dis Colon Rectum* 2017; 60(12): 1241-9.
- 19. Okuyama A, Shibata A, Nishimoto H. Critical points for interpreting patients' survival rate using cancer registries: a literature review. *J Epidemiol* 2018; 28(2): 61-6.
- 20. Commission on Cancer. FORDS: Facility Oncology Registry Data Standards: Revised for 2016. Chicago, IL: American College of Surgeons, 2016.
- 21. Davis NC, Newland RC. Terminology and classification of colorectal adenocarcinoma: the Australian clinico-pathological staging system. *ANZ J Surg 1983*; 53(3): 211-21.
- 22. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Socio-Economic indexes for areas. Canberra: ABS, 2018.
- 23. Armitage P, Berry G. Statistical methods in medical research. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications, 1987.
- 24. Statistical Analysis System. The SAS platform: SAS Enterprise Guide 7.1. Cary NC: SAS, 2018.
- 25. Jhaveri KS, Hosseini-Nik H. MRI of rectal cancer: An overview and update of recent advances. *Am J Roentgenology* 2015; 205(1): W42-55.
- 26.Cancer Council NSW. Bowel cancer. Your health care team. Sydney: Cancer Council; 2017. https://www.cancercouncil.com.au/bowel-cancer/diagnosis/health-professionals/ (accessed 28 September 2018).
- 27. Cancer Council Australia Colorectal Cancer Guidelines Working Party. Clinical practice guidelines for the prevention, early detection and management of colorectal cancer. Sydney: Cancer Council Australia. <u>https://wiki.cancer.org.au/australia/Guidelines:Colorectal_cancer</u> (accessed 1 January 2018).
- 28.National Cancer Expert Reference Group (NCERG). Optimal care pathway for people with colorectal cancer. Sydney: Cancer Council Australia; 2016. <u>https://www.cancer.org.au/health-professionals/optimal-cancer-care-pathways.html</u> (accessed 28 September 2018).

3

4

Supplementary tables

Table S1: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for colon cancer starting >30 days of diagnosis by treatment type,

stage, and socioeconomic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

5 6	Surgery		Surgery Radiotherapy		Systemic therapy		Any treatment (surgical cases)		
7 8	n=1098	RO (95% CLs)	n=86	RO (95% CLs)	n=898	RO (95% CLs)	n=1098	RO (95% CLs)	
9Age at 1 d iagnosis 1(years):									
1550 (ref.)	53	1.00	13	1.00	109	1.00	53	1.00	
1 3 0 - 59	116	1.61 (0.75, 3.46)	14	1.03 (0.05, 21.46)	176	0.84 (0.40, 1.76)	116	1.28 (0.59, 2.78)	
1 6 0 - 69	226	2.10 (1.03, 4.28)	20	2.82 (0.20, 40.71)	273	0.91 (0.45, 1.83)	226	1.86 (0.92, 3.80)	
1 7 0 - 79	396	1.65 (0.83, 3.28)	28	3.49 (0.27, 45.20)	292	1.37 (0.68, 2.79)	396	1.55 (0.78, 3.09)	
16 17 ⁰⁺	307	1.50 (0.74, 3.03)	11	NA	48	2.52 (0.78, 8.17)	307	1.43 (0.71, 2.88)	
1Sex:									
1 Male (ref.)	562	1.00	56	1.00	491	1.00	562	1.00	
2 B emale	536	0.87 (0.67, 1.13)	30	2.65 (0.27, 1.64)	407	1.23 (0.79, 1.91)	536	0.89 (0.68, 1.16)	
² Socioeconomic:									
22 Low (ref.)	336	1.00	25	1.00	287	1.00	336	1.00	
23 ₂ Jow-Med	273	1.69 (0.99, 2.12)	19	1.69 (0.09, 30.68)	229	0.71 (0.39, 1.27)	273	1.46 (1.00, 2.14)	
<u>24</u> ₂Med-High	224	1.31 (0.90, 1.90)	20	7.01 (0.22, 223.56)	185	0.93 (0.49, 1.78)	224	1.28 (0.88, 1.88)	
2 H igh	265	1.12 (0.76, 1.67)	22	1.37 (0.07, 27.36)	197	0.85 (0.45, 1.62)	265	1.09 (0.73, 1.62)	
² Accessibility:									
²⁸ High (ref.)	899	1.00	66	1.00	716	1.00	899	1.00	
29 Med-High	141	0.57 (0.28, 1.15)	9	NA 🧹	127	0.41 (0.09, 1.97)	141	0.57 (0.28, 1.16)	
30	58	0.71 (0.33, 1.57)	11	NA	55	0.25 (0.05, 1.21)	58	0.63 (0.28, 1.38)	
3Docal Health 3Detwork:				2					
³ Northern metro 3(ref.)	149	1.00	12	1.00	141	1.00	149	1.00	
³⁶ Central metro	421	0.49 (0.32, 0.75)	33	0.31 (0.01, 6.39)	291	0.85 (0.41, 1.76)	421	0.48 (0.31, 0.73)	
3Southern metro	281	0.39 (0.25, 0.63)	16	0.58 (0.03, 11.80)	252	0.83 (0.39, 1.78)	281	0.37 (0.24, 0.60)	
3 G ountry South	88	0.69 (0.36, 1.33)	10	NA	83	3.94 (0.70, 22.22)	88	0.69 (0.36, 1.34)	
4 C ountry North	159	0.78 (0.37, 1.66)	15	NA	131	2.42 (0.47, 12.36)	159	0.76 (0.35, 1.63)	
⁴ ACPS stage:						3			
42 A (ref.)	169	1.00	3	1.00	12	1.00	169	1.00	
42 (ref.) 43 44 44 45	471	0.67 (0.46, 0.98)	20	43.60 (0.38, 49.56)	130	1.60 (0.16, 16.54)	471	0.65 (0.45, 0.95)	
49	252	0.69 (0.46, 1.06)	21	24.12 (0.22, 26.91)	409	1.76 (0.19, 16.48)	252	0.66 (0.43, 1.00)	
4 D	180	0.54 (0.33, 0.86)	39	4.39 (0.07, 27.89)	320	0.24 (0.03, 2.17)	180	0.44 (0.27, 0.72)	
4⁄UK)	(26)	(0.64 (0.26, 1.57))	(3)	NA	(27)	(0.41 (0.04, 4.48))	(26)	(0.58 (0.23, 1.43))	
⁴ Grade:									
49 Well diff. (ref.)	38	1.00	5	1.00	18	1.00	38	1.00	
50 5¥10d diff.	770	0.85 (0.43, 1.68)	53	1.49 (0.11, 19.97)	581	0.58 (0.07, 4.81)	770	0.82 (0.41, 1.62)	
5Doorly/undiff.	209	0.57 (0.27, 1.21)	19	1.11 (0.06, 21.24)	213	0.46 (0.05, 3.89)	209	0.54 (0.26, 1.15)	
5¢UK)	(81)	(1.87 (0.82, 4.26))	(9)	NA	(86)	(0.13 (0.02, 1.11))	(81)	(1.62 (0.71, 3.69))	
⁵ Diagnosis year:									
5 <u>5</u> 2000 - 2005	541	1.00	52	1.00	451	1.00	541	1.00	
56 5 2 006 - 2010	557	1.41 (1.09, 1.83)	34	0.21 (0.03, 1.64)	447	1.59 (1.02, 2.48)	557	1.39 (1.07, 2.88)	

58*Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods")

59

RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; NA – not applicable; ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated.

Table S2: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for colon cancer starting >60 days of diagnosis by treatment type, stage, and socio-demographic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

4 5 6	Surgery		Radio	therapy	System	ic therapy	Any treatment (surgical cases only)	
7	n=1098	RO (95% CLs)	n=86	RO (95% CLs)	n=898	RO (95% CLs)	n=1098	RO (95% CLs)
8Age at 9diagnosis 1(years):								
1≹50 (ref.)	53	1.00	13	1.00	109	1.00	53	1.00
1 3 0 - 59	116	1.34 (0.51, 3.51)	14	0.06 (0.00, 1.37)	176	0.94 (0.57, 1.55)	116	0.75 (0.25, 2.21)
¹ 80 - 69	226	1.28 (0.51, 3.20)	20	0.17 (0.01, 3.57)	273	1.16 (0.73, 1.84)	226	1.10 (0.41, 2.93)
1 <u>4</u> 170 - 79	396	1.10 (0.45, 2.66)	28	0.35 (0.02, 7.07)	292	1.26 (0.80, 2.01)	396	0.99 (0.38, 2.53)
18 ⁰⁺	307	1.00 (0.40, 2.47)	11	0.30 (0.01, 7.36)	48	1.60 (0.78, 3.29)	307	1.01 (0.38, 2.65)
1\$ex:								
18/1ale (ref.)	562	1.00	56	1.00	491	1.00	562	1.00
1pemale	536	0.83 (0.57, 1.20)	30	1.01 (0.23, 4.35)	407	0.84 (0.64, 1.14)	536	0.94 (0.62, 1.41)
²⁰ Socioeconomic:						· · · /		
Low (ref.)	336	1.00	25	1.00	287	1.00	336	1.00
jbow-med	273	1.58 (0.93, 2.71)	19	0.40 (0.06, 2.51)	229	0.75 (0.51, 1.10)	273	1.65 (0.92, 2.98)
2¥41ed-high	224	1.14 (0.68, 1.94)	20	1.78 (0.26, 12.39)	185	0.86 (0.58, 1.28)	224	1.14 (0.64, 2.04)
2p _{ligh}	265	1.19 (0.67, 2.10)	22	1.04 (0.15, 7.27)	197	1.18 (0.78, 1.77)	265	1.41 (0.75, 2.63)
²⁶ Accessibility:								
27. High (ref.)	899	1.00	66	1.00	716	1.00	899	1.00
28 2 28 Jed-high	141	0.54 (0.20, 1.42)	9	8.99 (0.24, 331.28)	127	1.57 (0.75, 3.30)	141	0.45 (0.16, 1.25)
3 B oor	58	0.65 (0.21, 1.97)	11	3.90 (0.11, 141.05)	55	0.83 (0.36, 1.93)	58	0.41 (0.12, 1.44)
³ Local Health ³ Network:				Ċ,				
33 34 34 35 35	149	1.00	12	1.00	141	1.00	149	1.00
36entral metro	421	0.56 (0.32, 0.98)	33	0.16 (0.01, 1.98)	291	0.91 (0.58, 1.43)	421	0.44 (0.24, 0.79)
393 Southern metro	281	0.46 (0.25, 0.87)	16	0.17 (0.01, 2.26)	252	0.96 (0.61, 1.52)	281	0.29 (0.14, 0.58)
3&ountry South	88	0.87 (0.36, 2.14)	10	0.08 (0.00, 2.02)	83	0.93 (0.43, 2.01)	88	0.87 (0.34, 2.21)
Country North	157	1.04 (0.38, 2.90)	15	0.03 (0.00, 1.61)	131	0.74 (0.33, 1.76)	157	1.23 (0.43, 3.57)
⁴⁰ ₄ ACPS stage:								
42 (ref.)	169	1.00	3	1.00	12	1.00	169	1.00
4 B	471	1.02 (0.54, 1.91)	20	0.79 (0.03, 23.99)	130	0.43 (0.10, 1.74)	471	0.80 (0.42, 1.53)
4 Æ	252	2.34 (1.25, 4.40)	21	0.57 (0.02, 18.97)	409	0.29 (0.07, 1.15)	252	1.54 (0.80, 2.96)
4Ð	180	2.25 (1.16, 4.35)	39	0.94 (0.03, 26.42)	320	0.26 (0.07, 1.03)	180	1.49 (0.74, 2.98)
46 UK)	(26)	(1.65 (0.51, 5.33))	(3)	NA	(27)	(0.67 (0.14, 3.26))	(26)	1.35 (0.38, 4.76))
⁴⁷ ₄ Grade:								
49Vell diff. (ref.)	38	1.00	5	1.00	18	1.00	38	1.00
5 M od diff.	770	0.85 (0.31, 2.29)	53	2.29 (0.31, 16.79)	581	0.97 (0.35, 2.67)	770	0.71 (0.26, 1.92)
5poorly/undiff.	209	0.60 (0.20, 1.78)	19	1.11 (0.12, 10.68)	213	0.94 (0.33, 2.65)	209	0.52 (0.17, 1.58)
52UK)	(81)	(1.84 (0.60, 5.62))	(9)	NA	(86)	(0.40 (0.13, 1.20))	(81)	(1.24 (0.39, 3.93))
53 ₅ Diagnosis year:			1					
5 <u>4 9 5</u> 5 2 000 - 2005	541	1.00	52	1.00	451	1.00	541	1.00
5 8 006 - 2010	557	1.26 (0.87, 1.82)	34	0.31 (0.08, 1.25)	447	1.96 (1.48, 2.59)	557	1.29 (0.86, 1.94)

5≯Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods") 58

1

2

59 RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; NA – not applicable; ACPS- Australian Clinico-

60 Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated.

2

BMJ Open

Table S3: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for **rectal cancer** starting >30 days of diagnosis by treatment type, stage, and socioeconomic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

3 4 5		Surgery		Surgery Radiotherapy		Sy	stemic therapy		All treatment gical cases only)
5	n=577	RO (95% CLs)	n=530	RO (95% CLs)	n=658	RO (95% CLs)	n=577	RO (95% CLs)	
Age at diagnosis (years):									
0 <50 (ref.)	38	1.00	66	1.00	80	1.00	38	1.00	
<mark>2</mark> 50 - 59	94	0.71 (0.31,1.62)	104	1.30 (0.62,2.71)	146	1.73 (0.86,3.48)	94	1.03 (0.46, 2.29)	
3 60 - 69	162	0.57 (0.26,1.24)	168	1.41 (0.71,2.79)	225	1.57 (0.83,2.99)	162	0.78 (0.37, 1.66)	
470 - 79	174	0.44 (0.20,0.95)	147	1.35 (0.67,2.71)	177	1.79 (0.90,3.54)	174	0.83 (0.40, 1.76)	
680+	109	0.38 (0.17,0.85)	45	1.40 (0.52,3.77)	30	2.01 (0.58,6.97)	109	0.70 (0.32, 1.55)	
7 Sex:									
⁸ Male (ref.)	331	1.00	344	1.00	419	1.00	331	1.00	
Female	246	0.74 (0.52,1.07)	186	0.68 (0.43,1.07)	239	0.94 (0.61,1.45)	246	0.79 (0.55, 1.14)	
Socioeconomic:								·	
22 Low (ref.)	208	1.00	181	1.00	220	1.00	208	1.00	
Low-med	115	0.86 (0.50,1.45)	118	0.80 (0.42,1.51)	145	1.13 (0.62,2.07)	115	0.81 (0.48, 1.37)	
5 Med-high	121	0.72 (0.44,1.19)	108	0.50 (0.26,0.94)	135	0.78 (0.43,1.42)	121	0.63 (0.38, 1.03)	
26 High	133	1.06 (0.64,1.77)	123	0.88 (0.45,1.70)	158	1.00 (0.55,1.83)	133	1.03 (0.62, 1.72)	
Accessibility:								·	
High (ref.)	454	1.00	409	1.00	507	1.00	454	1.00	
0 Med-high	87	0.74 (0.29,1.88)	85	1.49 (0.50,4.44)	101	1.00 (0.30,3.36)	87	1.27 (0.49, 3.26)	
Poor	36	1.00 (0.36,2.76)	36	1.25 (0.37,4.20)	50	0.88 (0.25,3.05)	36	1.58 (0.58, 4.33)	
32 33 Local Health 34 Network:				. 4.					
35 Northern metro 36 (ref.)	93	1.00	94	1.00	107	1.00	93	1.00	
37 Central metro	197	0.55 (0.31,0.97)	169	0.86 (0.44,1.70)	204	1.19 (0.64,2.23)	197	0.61 (0.35, 1.06)	
⁸ Southern metro	136	0.40 (0.22,0.73)	118	0.61 (0.30,1.23)	174	0.89 (0.47,1.69)	136	0.44 (0.24, 0.80)	
Country South	67	0.89 (0.37,2.10)	64	0.45 (0.17,1.25)	76	1.99 (0.62,6.41)	67	0.70 (0.30, 1.63)	
Country North	84	0.67 (0.24,1.89)	85	1.48 (0.44,5.02)	97	2.61 (0.73,9.25)	84	0.57 (0.20, 1.62)	
ACPS stage:									
$^{B}_{A}$ A (ref.)	111	1.00	47	1.00	35	1.00	111	1.00	
5 B	183	1.31 (0.79,2.18)	127	0.90 (0.39,2.06)	119	1.35 (0.57,3.21)	183	1.18 (0.71, 1.95)	
бC	160	1.65 (0.98,2.79)	210	1.39 (0.63,3.10)	287	3.81 (1.64,8.86)	160	1.43 (0.85, 2.40)	
D B	99	0.83 (0.46,1.51)	123	0.67 (0.30,1.51)	196	1.30 (0.58,2.95)	99	0.79 (0.43, 1.44)	
g(UK)	24	(0.76 (0.28,2.06))	23	(0.74 (0.23,2.39))	21	(1.72 (0.44,6.71))	24	(0.83 (0.30,2.28))	
0 Grade:								·	
Well diff. (ref.)	20	1.00	20	1.00	19	1.00	20	1.00	
B Mod diff.	442	0.60 (0.21,1.68)	376	1.59 (0.57,4.44)	473	1.43 (0.43,4.70)	442	0.78 (0.29, 2.08)	
4 Poorly/undiff.	76	0.52 (0.17,1.61)	80	2.63 (0.81,8.52)	96	2.14 (0.57,8.10)	76	0.71 (0.24, 2.08)	
5 (UK)	39	(1.38 (0.39,4.91))	54	(1.31 (0.40,4.29))	70	(0.72 (0.20,2.63))	39	(1.57 (0.47,5.27))	
Diagnosis year:									
8 2000 - 2005	328	1.00	283	1.00	331	1.00	328	1.00	
9 2006 - 2010	249	2.86 (1.98,4.12)	247	1.76 (1.12,2.76)	327	1.34 (0.88,2.04)	249	3.09 (2.15, 4.43)	

⁶⁰ *Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods")

RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated. For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml Table S4: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for rectal cancer starting >60 days of diagnosis by treatment type,

stage, and socio-demographic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

1

2 3

		Surgery		Surgery Radiotherapy		Radiotherapy	Sy	stemic therapy		ll treatment gical cases only)
	n=577	RO (95% CLs)	n=530	RO (95% CLs)	n=658	RO (95% CLs)	n=577	RO (95% CLs)		
Age at diagnosis (years):								,		
50 (ref.)	38	1.00	66	1.00	80	1.00	38	1.00		
2 \$0 - 59	94	0.53 (0.23, 1.19)	104	2.41 (1.12, 5.17)	146	2.45 (1.26, 4.74)	94	1.28 (0.42, 3.93)		
4 50 - 69	162	0.49 (0.23, 1.05)	168	3.28 (1.60, 6.71)	225	3.46 (1.85, 6.49)	162	1.17 (0.40, 3.38)		
570 - 79	174	0.25 (0.12, 0.55)	147	2.69 (1.30, 5.56)	177	3.47 (1.82, 6.60)	174	1.21 (0.42, 3.48)		
6 ₈₀₊	109	0.26 (0.11, 0.59)	45	3.05 (1.24, 7.51)	30	3.95 (1.54, 10.17)	109	1.62 (0.55, 4.80)		
7 Sex:								· · ·		
a Male (ref.)	331	1.00	344	1.00	419	1.00	331	1.00		
Female	246	0.77 (0.52, 1.13)	186	0.91 (0.61, 1.36)	239	1.04 (0.73, 1.46)	246	0.89 (0.56, 1.42)		
Socioeconomic:			4					· · ·		
Low (ref.)	208	1.00	181	1.00	220	1.00	208	1.00		
Low-med	115	1.29 (0.73, 2.27)	118	1.11 (0.65, 1.92)	145	0.61 (0.38, 0.98)	115	1.05 (0.53, 2.02)		
4 Med-high	121	1.04 (0.61, 1.78)	108	0.95 (0.55, 1.62)	135	0.94 (0.59, 1.50)	121	1.25 (0.67, 2.33)		
dHigh	133	1.03 (0.60, 1.77)	123	1.28 (0.74, 2.22)	158	0.71 (0.44, 1.14)	133	0.81 (0.41, 1.58)		
7Accessibility:								. , ,		
High (ref.)	454	1.00	409	1.00	507	1.00	454	1.00		
Med-high	87	0.26 (0.09, 0.73)	85	1.12 (0.41, 3.01)	101	0.98 (0.42, 2.25)	87	0.49 (0.13, 1.86)		
Poor	36	0.30 (0.10, 0.89)	36	1.53 (0.55, 4.31)	50	1.08 (0.45, 2.62)	36	0.83 (0.22, 2.67)		
Local Health Network:				2.						
Northern metro 5(ref.)	93	1.00	94	1.00	107	1.00	93	1.00		
Central metro	197	0.53 (0.30, 0.95)	169	0.88 (0.50, 1.55)	204	1.70 (1.00, 2.89)	197	0.71 (0.36, 1.38)		
Southern metro	136	0.49 (0.26, 0.91)	118	0.55 (0.30, 1.03)	174	0.84 (0.48, 1.44)	136	0.63 (0.30, 1.30)		
Country South	67	0.69 (0.29, 1.61)	64	0.45 (0.18, 1.14)	76	1.36 (0.59, 3.17)	67	0.71 (0.25, 2.05)		
Country North	84	1.25 (0.42, 3.74)	85	0.70 (0.24, 2.01)	97	1.10 (0.44, 2.72)	84	0.67 (0.17, 2.71)		
ACPS stage:						~				
² A (ref.)	111	1.00	47	1.00	35	1.00	111	1.00		
Ĵβ	183	1.46 (0.82, 2.58)	127	1.26 (0.59, 2.67)	119	1.64 (0.69, 3.91)	183	1.04 (0.53, 2.02)		
÷ ¢	160	2.30 (1.30, 4.05)	210	1.76 (0.86, 3.58)	287	2.70 (1.19, 6.12)	160	1.15 (0.60, 2.24)		
3 β 4 ζ C Ø	99	1.34 (0.69, 1.61)	123	1.25 (0.59, 2.67)	196	1.95 (0.85, 4.51)	99	0.83 (0.37, 1.86)		
7(UK)	24	(1.65 (0.58, 4.67))	23	(0.35 (0.09, 1.43))	21	(1.33 (0.38, 4.68))	24	(1.45 (0.46,4.58		
⁸ Grade:								`		
Well diff. (ref.)	20	1.00	20	1.00	19	1.00	20	1.00		
Mod diff.	442	0.30 (0.11, 0.82)	376	1.25 (0.45,3.44)	473	1.39 (0.50, 3.88)	442	0.35 (0.13, 0.95)		
Poorly/un-diff.	76	0.26 (0.09, 0.79)	80	1.70 (0.57,5.09)	96	1.51 (0.50, 4.52)	76	0.35 (0.11, 1.12)		
3 (UK)	39	(0.64 (0.19, 2.18))	54	(0.88 (0.28,2.84))	70	(0.83 (0.27, 2.59))	39	(0.76 (0.23,2.59		
Diagnosis year:										
52000 - 2005	328	1.00	283	1.00	331	1.00	328	1.00		
2006 - 2010	249	1.98 (1.35, 2.91)	247	1.02 (0.70,1.50)	327	1.21 (0.87, 1.69)	249	2.01 (1.26, 3.18)		

*Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods")

⁵⁹
 ⁶⁰ RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated.

Reporting checklist for cohort study.

Based on the STROBE cohort guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the STROBE cohort reporting guidelines, and cite them as:

von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies.

31 32				Page
33			Reporting Item	Number
34 35 36 37 38	Title	#1a	Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
39 40 41 42	Abstract	#1b	Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
43 44 45	Background / rationale	#2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3
46 47 48 49	Objectives	#3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4
50 51	Study design	#4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	4
52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	Setting	#5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	4
60		For pee	er review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1 2 3	Eligibility criteria	#6a	Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up.	4
4 5 6 7		#6b	For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	n/a
8 9 10 11 12 13	Variables	#7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	4,5
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Data sources / measurement	#8	For each variable of interest give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group. Give information separately for for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.	4
22 23	Bias	#9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	10, 12
24 25	Study size	#10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	4
26 27 28 29 30 31	Quantitative variables	#11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen, and why	4,5
32 33 34 35	Statistical methods	#12a	Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	4,5
36 37 38		#12b	Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	4,5
39 40 41		#12c	Explain how missing data were addressed	4
42 43		#12d	If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	n/a
44 45		#12e	Describe any sensitivity analyses	4,5
46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54	Participants	#13a	Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow- up, and analysed. Give information separately for for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.	tables 1- 5
55 56		#13b	Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	n/a
57 58		#13c	Consider use of a flow diagram	n/a
59 60		For pee	r review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1 2 3 4 5 6	Descriptive data	#14a	Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders. Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.	5-14
7 8 9 10		#14b	Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	n/a
11 12		#14c	Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	n/a
13 14 15 16 17 18	Outcome data	#15	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time. Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.	5-14
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Main results	#16a	Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder- adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	5-14
26 27 28		#16b	Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	5-14
29 30 31 32		#16c	If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	n/a
33 34 35 36	Other analyses	#17	Report other analyses done—e.g., analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	n/a
37 38	Key results	#18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	14-15
 39 40 41 42 43 44 	Limitations	#19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias.	15
45 46 47 48 49	Interpretation	#20	Give a cautious overall interpretation considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence.	14-16
50 51 52 53	Generalisability	#21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	16
54 55 56 57 58	Funding	#22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	17
59 60		For pee	er review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

The STROBE checklist is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY. This checklist was completed on 10. April 2019 using <u>https://www.goodreports.org/</u>, a tool made by the <u>EQUATOR Network</u> in collaboration with <u>Penelope.ai</u>

totocet terien ont

BMJ Open

Time from diagnosis to treatment of colorectal cancer in a South Australian clinical registry cohort: how it varies and relates to survival

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031421.R1
Article Type:	
Date Submitted by the Author:	22-Jul-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Roder, David; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Karapetis, Christos; Flinders University, Medical Oncology Olver, Ian; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Keefe, Dorothy; South Australia Department of Health, South Australian Cancer Service; The University of Adelaide, Adelaide Medical School Padbury, Robert; Flinders University, Medical Oncology Moore, James; Royal Adelaide Hospital, Colorectal Surgery; The University of Adelaide, Adelaide Medical School Joshi, Rohit; The University of Adelaide, Adelaide Medical School; Adelaide Oncology and Haematology, Cancer Research and Clinical Trials Wattchow, David; Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Surgery and Perioperative Medicine; Flinders University, Medical Oncology Worthley, Dan; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Gastrointestinal Cancer Biology Miller, Caroline; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Population Health; The University of Adelaide, School of Public Health Holden, Carol; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Population Health Buckley, Elizabeth; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Powell, Kate; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Population Health Buranyi-Trevarton, Dianne; South Australia Department of Health, South Australian Cancer Service Fusco, Kellie; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Price, Timothy ; The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Clinical Cancer Research; The University of Adelaide Medical School
Primary Subject Heading :	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health, Epidemiology
Keywords:	Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Epidemiology < ONCOLOGY, PUBLIC HEALTH, Colorectal surgery < SURGERY

1	
2	
3 4	
5	SCHOLAR ONE [™]
6	Manuacrinta
7	Manuscripts
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14 15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32 33	
33 34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40 41	
41	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48 49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56 57	
57	
59	
60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Time from diagnosis to treatment of colorectal cancer in a South Australian clinical registry cohort: how it varies and relates to survival

Roder D*1, Karapetis C², Olver I¹, Keefe D^{3, 5}, Padbury R², Moore J^{5, 6}, Joshi R^{5,7}, Wattchow D^{2, 4}, Worthley DL⁸, Miller C^{9,10}, Holden C⁹, Buckley E¹, Powell K⁹, Buranyi-Trevarton D³, Fusco K¹, Price T^{5, 11}

¹ Cancer Research Institute, University of South Australia, Adelaide, SA, Australia

² Medical Oncology, Flinders University, Bedford Park, SA, Australia

³ South Australian Cancer Service, South Australia Department of Health, Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁴ Surgery and Perioperative Medicine, Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Bedford Park, SA, Australia

⁵ Adelaide Medical School, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁶ Colorectal Surgery, Royal Adelaide Hospital, Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁷ Adelaide Oncology and Haematology, Cancer Research and Clinical Trials, North Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁸ Gastrointestinal Cancer Biology, South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁹ Population Health, South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Adelaide, SA, Australia

¹⁰ School of Public Health, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA, Australia

¹¹ Clinical Cancer Research, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Woodville, SA, Australia

* Corresponding author

Email: david.roder@unisa.edu.au

Phone: +61 8 8302 2640

Word count: 4,318

Abstract

Objectives

investigated.

Participants

Outcome measures

Four major public hospitals in South Australia.

Cox proportional hazards regression, respectively.

Setting

Results

Conclusions

Key words

Strengths and limitations of this study

surgery

Strengths:

1

Some early studies indicated lower survival with longer time from diagnosis to cancer treatment, but others showed the reverse. Time to treatment of colorectal cancer and associations with survival were

Clinical registry data for a cohort of colorectal cancer cases diagnosed in 2000-2010 and treated by

Time to treatment and survival from colorectal cancer were analysed by rank-order tests and adjusted

Treatment (any type) commenced for 87% of surgical cases \leq 60 days of diagnosis, with 80% having surgery within this period. Of those receiving radiotherapy, 59% began this treatment \leq 60 days, and

showed treatment delay >60 days was more likely for rectal cancers, 2006-2010 diagnoses, residents

sociodemographic factors, and diagnostic year, better survival occurred in ≤ 2 years from diagnosis for time to treatment >30 days. Survival in the 3-10 years post-diagnosis generally did not differ by

of those receiving systemic therapy, the corresponding proportion was 56%. Adjusted analyses

of northern than other metropolitan regions, and for surgery, younger ages <50 years, and

time to treatment, except for lower survival for any treatment >90 days for surgical cases.

results attributed to preferencing more complicated cases for earlier care.

1. Lower survival ≤ 2 years from diagnosis for cancers treated ≤ 30 days from diagnosis (i.e., a

negative association of survival with shorter duration to treatment) is consistent with other study

2. Lower 3-10-year survival for treatment of surgical cases for cancers first treated > 90 days from

diagnosis is consistent with the U-shaped relationship reported in some other studies.

Oncology epidemiology, protocols & guidelines, quality in health care, public health, colorectal

unexpectedly, those residing closer to metropolitan services. Adjusting for clinical and

surgery (n=1675), radiotherapy (n=616) and/or systemic therapy (n=1556).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	
23 24 25 26 27 28 29	
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 27	
37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	
44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51	
52 53 54 55 56 57 58	
59 60	

Where data were available, they were high-quality clinical registry data on diagnosis, treatment, and sociodemographic covariables.

Access to clinical service providers to assist with data interpretation.

Limitations:

Precise diagnostic and treatment data were limited to 65% of cases.

The study was observational and vulnerable to bias from practitioner choice and self-selection by patients into comparison groups. The ability to adjust for potential confounding was limited by the range of data available.

Introduction

Australia has a high age-standardised incidence of colorectal cancer about 87% above the world average.¹ The corresponding colorectal cancer mortality rate is lower although still about 22% above the world average.¹ Colorectal cancer is second only to prostate cancer in numbers reported annually by Australian cancer registries and second only to lung cancer in numbers of cancer deaths.² Age-standardised incidence has been stable, with the 2012-2014 rate being within 1-2% of the rate for 1982-1984. By comparison, the age-standardized colorectal cancer mortality rate approximately halved between these periods.² This difference was accompanied by increases in 5-year relative survival from 52% in 1982-1986 to 70% in 2011-2015.^{3, 4}

South Australian clinical registry data for colorectal cancer covering four major public hospitals showed equivalent survival and survival increases to national figures during 1980-2010, with fiveyear disease-specific survival increasing from 48% to 63% for all stages combined.⁵ Stage distributions were largely unchanged, with survival increases mostly attributed to gains in stage-specific survival.⁵ Increases were particularly pronounced for regional stage.⁵ Survival increases followed increased use of adjuvant chemotherapies, particularly for regional disease.⁵ For rectal cancers, a significant increase in use of adjuvant radiotherapy was reported. The increases in adjuvant therapy were consistent with clinical practice guidelines.⁵ Chemotherapies evolved from common use of single-agent 5-FU (5-Fluorouracil) to 5-FU and leucovorin. FOLFOX (leucovorin calcium, 5-FU and oxaliplatin) ± bevacizumab and capecitabine (± oxaliplatin) also became more common, along with protracted infusion of 5-FU for colon cancer, and with radiotherapy for rectal cancers.⁵

While survival increases were attributed to changes in use of chemotherapy and radiotherapy, and increased surgical specialization,⁵ other influences were possible. One was a change in time from diagnosis to surgical treatment.⁶ In the United Kingdom, treatment delays were regarded as negatively related to survival and concerns were expressed that delays may be increasing due to increased demands for colonoscopy from population screening.^{7, 8} While there is limited evidence of effects of treatment delays on survival, early evidence points to a possible negative effect.^{6, 7, 8} Delays were also

BMJ Open

viewed negatively as a likely source of psychosocial stress.^{6, 8} Cancer UK has indicated that ideally treatment would commence within one month of diagnosis but has recommended commencement within two months as a realistic target.⁹

Evidence of effects of time to treatment on survival has been mixed.¹⁰⁻¹⁸ Early studies generally pointed to lower survival with longer delay, but later studies varied with some showing better survival for longer delay, and some showing a U-shaped relationship with lower survival at both ends of the follow-up period.^{6-8, 10-18} This has raised questions of whether the relationship varies with the clinical environment, with lower survival for short delays potentially reflected triaging of more aggressive cancers for early treatment in some settings.^{12, 13, 15, 17}

In this study we explore times from diagnosis to treatment, trends in these times, variations across the patient population, and associations with survival. To establish a historic baseline, we analysed colorectal cancer data (2000-2010 diagnoses) from South Australian clinical registry data. Analyses indicated times to treatment and outcomes across the patient population at these hospitals by cancer stage, patient age, sex, socioeconomic status, service access, local health network of residence (as applying in the study period) and diagnostic epoch. We investigated whether a U-shaped relationship existed between time to treatment and survival, as reported elsewhere.^{6, 17}

The study was restricted to cancers where the registry had enough diagnostic detail from biopsies and other clinical sources to record a diagnosis date in advance of treatment, thereby providing an intervening period for analysis (65% of cases). This is analogous to the common registry practice of restricting survival analyses to cancers where diagnosis dates preceded dates of death.¹⁹

Methods

<u>Study design</u>: A historic cohort design was used, including colorectal cancer patients diagnosed in 2000-2010 at four major public hospitals in South Australia. <u>Ethics approval</u> was obtained from the South Australian Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC/14/SAH/145) and University of South Australia Research Ethics Committee. <u>Data sources and linkage</u>: Our data source was the South Australian clinical cancer registry, which is authorised under Section 64, Part 7 of the South Australian Health Care Act (2008) to support service monitoring and quality assurance.⁵ Dates and causes of death were obtained by linkage with official death records using full names, dates of birth, and sex, and for additional guidance, postcode of residence, for linkage purposes. <u>Outcome measures</u>: These were time in days from diagnosis to treatment start, and survival from diagnosis to death from colorectal cancer.

Dates of diagnosis and treatment were checked from available pathology and clinical reporting to optimize accuracy. Times to treatment start were calculated to treatment of 2,746 colorectal cancers.²⁰ Cases were excluded if presenting acutely with bowel obstruction or perforation and treated surgically on day one.

Analyses were undertaken for surgical, radiotherapy and chemotherapies respectively, and any of these treatments among surgical cases. Chemotherapies were most commonly 5-FU (Adrucil, 5-FU) given intravenously, capecitabine (Xeloda) given as a pill, oxaliplatin (Eloxatin) given intravenously, irinotecan (Camptosar) given intravenously, and raltitrexed (Tomudex) given intravenously (https://www.cancer. ca/en/cancer-information/cancer-type/colorectal/treatment/ chemotherapy/?region=on).

Cases were classified by: sub-site (colon or rectum), Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging (ACPS) as A, B, C, D or unknown (UK), and grade,²¹ age at diagnosis, sex, residential area socioeconomic status,²² geographic access to specialist radiotherapy and other specialist metropolitan services based on postcode address (coded as high, medium-high or poor), local health network of residence, as applying during the study period (i.e., northern metropolitan, central metropolitan, southern metropolitan, and for non-metropolitan areas to the south, country south, and for non-metropolitan areas to the north, country north), and diagnostic period (2000-2005 and 2006-2010) (see Tables 1-3). Operational definitions are available in previous publications.^{5, 21, 22}

Time from diagnosis to treatments start was categorised in days for cross-tabulations with clinical and sociodemographic variables. <u>Statistical analysis:</u> The Spearman rank test was used to analyse ordinal clinical and sociodemographic predictors; Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA for multinomial predictors, and Mann-Whitney U test for predictors measured on a binary scale.^{23, 24} For multiple logistic regression analyses of time as the outcome variable, time was reduced to a binary outcome of ">30 or \leq 30 days" and ">60 or \leq 60 days" respectively.^{23, 24} The results were expressed as relative odds (i.e., odds ratios) with 95% confidence ranges. Disease-specific survival was analysed by time to treatment using Kaplan-Meier product-limit estimates (unadjusted) and Cox proportional hazards regression (adjusted for co-variables shown in Tables 2 and 3).^{23, 24}

The decision to use disease-specific survival rather than relative survival was supported by evidence of similar results from these methods in South Australia at a population level.⁵ Also, there were not lifetables (as required for relative survival) for patients referred to specialist clinics at these hospitals who often had extensive comorbidity and other complications.⁵ Results are presented using conventional non-hierarchical analyses as they were similar by hospital setting without evidence of clustering.

Public and Patient Involvement

Registry development and workplans had substantial patient and consumer involvement through a formalized cancer planning and monitoring processes. Funders reviewing workplans included the Cancer Council South Australia through the Beat Cancer Project.

BMJ Open

Specialist clinics identify topics for review, of which some are based on/prompted by the questions raised by patients.

The ethics committees approving this study (Department of Health Research Ethics Committee and University of South Australia Ethics Committee) both had active consumer involvement, thereby providing another level of public and consumer input.

This study involved the use of routinely collected registry data specifically authorized under state law and planned by clinical experts and consumers. Participants all attended specialized gynaecological oncology clinics with whom we work. We work with these clinics in developing consumer messages for distribution to their patients and other relevant stakeholder groups.

Results

A. Time from diagnosis to treatment start (colorectal)

<u>Unadjusted analyses</u> – Time from diagnosis to treatment start

Surgery: The proportion of surgical cases receiving surgery ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 80% (59% ≤ 30 days) (Table 1). Time to first surgical treatment was associated with: (a) age at diagnosis (p< 0.001) - shorter time for older patients; (b) sex (p=0.003) – shorter time for females; (c) local health network of residence (p=0.026) – longer time for northern metropolitan; (d) tumour sub-site (p< 0.001) – longer time for rectum; and (e) diagnostic period (p< 0.001) – longer time for 2006-2010. Significant associations were not found for other characteristics (p ≥ 0.118).

Radiotherapy: The proportion receiving radiotherapy whose treatment started ≤ 60 days was 59% (21% ≤ 30 days). Time to radiotherapy was associated with: (a) age at diagnosis (p=0.042) – longer time for older patients; and (b) tumour sub-site (p<0.001) – shorter time for rectum (note: radiotherapy was uncommon for colon cancers). Significant associations were not found for other characteristics (p ≥ 0.114).

Chemotherapy: The proportion receiving chemotherapy whose treatment started ≤ 60 days was 56% (15% \leq 30 days). Time to chemotherapy was associated with: (a) age at diagnosis (p<0.001) – longer time for older patients; (b) local health network of residence (p=0.004) – shorter time for northern metropolitan; (c) tumour sub-site (p=0.018) – shorter time for rectum; (d) stage (p=0.003) – shorter time for stages A and D (note: chemotherapy was uncommon for stage A); and (e) diagnostic period (p<0.001) – longer time for 2006-2010. Significant associations were not found by other characteristics (p \geq 0.120).

Any treatment (surgical cases): The proportion receiving any treatment who did so starting ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 87% ($62\% \leq 30$ days). Time to any treatment was associated with: (a) age at diagnosis (p=0.048) – although a clear age gradient was not evident; (b) sex (p=0.017) – shorter time for females; (c) local health network of residence (p< 0.001) – longer time for the northern

metropolitan area; (d) tumour sub-site (p<0.001) – longer time for rectum; and (e) diagnostic period (p<0.001) – longer time for 2006-2010. Significant associations were not found for other characteristics (p>0.104).

Page 9 of 27

BMJ Open

Table 1: Unadjusted analysis of percentages of colorectal patients by treatment type and days from diagnosis to treatment start: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

	Surge	ry (surge	ry cases)				Radio	otherapy	(radioth	erapy ca	ases)		Chem	otherapy	(chemot	herapy ca	ases)		Any T	reatmen	t (surger	y cases)		
	n	≤30	31 - 60	61 - 90	≥90	P value	n	≤30	31 - 60	61- 90	≥90	P value	n	≤30	31 - 60	61 - 90	≥90	P value	n	≤30	31-60	61-90	≥90	P value
All cases	1675	59.0	21.2	6.0	13.9	-	616	20.9	37.8	17.4	23.9	-	1556	15.3	40.7	24.6	19.5	-	1675	61.7	25.6	7.1	5.6	-
Age at																								
diagnosis																								
(years):																								
<50	91	59.3	11.0	4.4	25.3	< 0.001	79	24.1	45.6	7.6	22.8	0.042	189	19.6	47.1	19.0	14.3	< 0.001	91	65.9	22.0	3.3	8.8	0.048
50 - 59	210	52.9	20.0	5.7	21.4		118	22.0	40.7	17.8	19.5		322	16.5	44.1	20.5	18.9		210	58.7	28.4	7.7	5.3	
60 - 69	388	52.3	22.9	5.9	18.8		188	20.7	35.6	12.3	22.3		498	16.1	38.0	26.7	19.3		388	57.1	29.1	6.8	7.0	
70 - 79	570	61.1	23.0	5.6	10.4		175	20.1	36.0	16.0	28.0		469	12.6	39.0	26.7	21.7		570	61.9	26.2	7.2	4.8	
80+	416	65.4	20.0	7.0	7.7		56	17.9	33.9	21.4	26.8		78	11.5	38.5	28.2	21.8		416	66.1	21.2	7.7	5.1	
Sex:																								
Males	893	56.0	21.9	5.9	16.1	0.003	400	19.8	38.5	18.0	23.8	0.567	910	16.3	39.0	23.8	20.9	0.649	893	59.2	27.3	7.1	6.4	0.017
Females	782	62.4	20.3	6.0	11.3		216	23.1	36.6	16.2	24.1		646	13.9	43.0	25.5	17.5		782	64.4	23.8	7.0	4.7	
Socioeconomic:																								
Low	544	56.3	22.8	5.9	15.1	0.118	206	16.0	43.2	18.9	21.8	0.826	507	13.4	39.4	26.4	20.7	0.664	544	58.8	28.0	6.6	6.6	0.104
Low-Med	388	60.3	19.8	6.7	13.1		137	24.8	36.5	16.8	21.9		374	16.6	44.9	21.9	16.6		388	62.7	24.9	7.0	5.4	
Med-High	345	58.6	21.4	5.5	14.5		128	24.2	35.2	18.8	21.9		320	16.3	40.0	27.5	16.3		345	61.9	24.1	8.1	5.8	
High	398	61.8	20.1	5.8	12.3		145	21.4	33.8	14.5	30.3		355	15.8	38.6	22.0	23.7		398	64.4	24.5	6.8	4.3	
Accessibility:																								
High	1353	58.9	20.4	6.4	14.3	0.584	475	22.1	36.4	16.8	24.6	0.764	1223	16.4	40.3	24.0	19.3	0.12	1353	61.8	25.1	7.3	5.9	0.992
Med-High	228	61.0	23.2	3.9	11.8		94	17.0	44.7	21.3	17.0		228	10.1	41.2	28.1	20.6		228	62.1	27.3	6.6	4.0	
Poor	94	55.3	27.7	4.3	12.8		47	17.0	38.3	14.9	29.8		105	13.3	43.8	23.8	19.0		94	58.5	29.8	5.3	6.4	
Local Health																								
Network:																								
Northern metro	242	45.9	24.4	12.0	17.8	0.026	106	18.9	34.9	19.8	26.4	0.12	248	16.1	41.5	24.2	7.3	0.004	242	49.6	30.4	12.1	7.9	< 0.001
Central metro	618	61.7	20.2	6.8	11.3		202	21.8	32.7	17.8	27.7		495	17.8	36.6	26.5	19.2		618	64.1	24.0	7.3	4.7	
Southern metro	417	64.3	17.7	3.4	14.6		134	25.4	40.3	14.2	20.1		426	16.7	42.7	20.7	20.0		417	66.8	23.0	4.8	5.3	
Country South	155	52.9	27.7	1.9	17.4		74	25.7	40.5	14.9	18.9		159	8.8	41.5	28.3	21.4		155	56.5	31.2	3.9	8.4	
Country North	241	60.2	22.0	5.0	12.9		100	11.2	46.9	19.4	22.4		228	11.0	44.5	25.1	19.4		241	61.9	26.2	7.4	4.5	
Sub-site:																								
Colon	1098	65.0	22.1	4.9	7.9	< 0.001	86	11.6	12.8	14.0	61.6	< 0.001	898	13.1	40.2	27.4	19.3	0.018	1098	66.2	23.4	6.0	4.5	< 0.001
Rectum	577	47.5	19.4	8.0	25.1		530	22.5	41.9	17.9	17.7		658	18.2	41.3	20.7	19.8		577	53.1	29.9	9.2	7.8	
ACPS stage:	1	İ																						
A	280	53.9	30.4	7.9	7.9	0.460	50	24.0	44.0	14.0	18.0	0.114	47	25.5	36.2	21.3	17.0	0.003	280	55.4	32.5	7.9	4.3	0.114
В	654	61.5	23.9	4.7	9.9	(A-D)	147	21.1	38.8	21.8	18.4		249	13.3	40.2	27.7	18.9		654	63.3	26.7	5.7	4.3	
C	412	55.6	17.2	6.8	20.4	(231	16.0	40.7	21.0	22.1		696	6.6	47.3	27.6	18.5		412	58.9	25.6	8.8	6.8	<u> </u>
D	279	63.8	12.5	5.0	18.6		162	25.9	29.0	10.5	34.6		516	26.6	33.1	19.6	20.7		279	68.6	17.3	6.5	7.6	
(UK)	(50)	(51.5)	(18.2)	(12.1)	(18.2)		(26)	(27.3)	(59.1)	(4.5)	(9.1)		(48)	(26.9)	(34.6)	(15.4)	(23.1)		(50)	(59.2)	(20.4)	(10.2)	(10.2)	
Diagnosis		(51.5)	(10.2)	(12.1)	(10.2)		(20)	(2,)	(57.1)	()	(7.1)		(10)	(20.7)	(3 1.0)	(15.7)	(23.1)		(30)	(3).2)	(20.7)	(10.2)	(10.2)	
vears:																								
2000 - 2005	869	65.0	17.5	5.4	12.1	< 0.001	335	23.9	34.0	15.8	26.3	0.898	782	17.4	44.2	21.2	17.1	< 0.001	869	68.0	21.4	6.2	4.4	< 0.00
2006 - 2010	805	52.5	25.2	6.6	12.1	-0.001	281	17.4	42.3	19.2	20.3	0.070	774	13.2	37.1	27.9	21.8	\$0.001	805	54.8	30.3	8.0	7.0	~0.001
*Excludes case						0.1	-				21.0		//4	13.2	57.1	21.7	21.0	1	000	J 1 .0	50.5	0.0	/.0	L

 $\frac{39}{39}$ *Excludes cases where insufficient data on date of diagnosis (see "Methods")

ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK - unknown

Page 8 of 19

<u>Adjusted analyses</u> – Predictors of treatment start >30 days from diagnosis.

Surgery: Significant predictors of time of surgical cases to surgical treatment >30 days included: (a) local health

network of residence – relative odds (RO) of 0.55 (0.39, 0.76) for metropolitan central and 0.44 (0.31, 0.63) for metropolitan southern compared with metropolitan northern; (b) tumour site – RO for rectum of 2.07 (1.66, 2.57); (c)

tumour stage – RO of 0.65 (0.45, 0.93) for stage D (distant metastasis) compared with stage A; (d) grade – RO for

high grade (poorly differentiated) at 0.47 (0.25, 0.87) compared with low grade; and (e) diagnostic period – RO of

1.82 (1.48, 2.24) for 2006-2010 (Table 2).

Radiotherapy: Only tumour site was predictive of time of radiotherapy cases to radiotherapy start >30 days - RO of

0.40 (0.19, 0.83) for rectum (note: radiotherapy was much less common for colon than rectal cancers⁵).

Chemotherapy: Significant predictors of time of chemotherapy cases to chemotherapy treatment start >30 days

included: (a) tumour site – RO for rectum of 0.65 (0.48, 0.89); (b) tumour stage – RO for stage C of 3.93 (1.85, 8.36); and (c) diagnostic period – RO of 0.65 (0.48, 0.89) for 2006-2010.

Any treatment (surgical cases): Significant predictors of time to start of any treatment >30 days included: (a) local health network of residence – RO of 0.56 (0.40, 0.78) for metropolitan central and 0.44 (0.30, 0.63) for metropolitan southern compared with metropolitan northern; (b) tumour site – RO of 1.76 (1.41, 2.19) for rectum; (c) tumour stage – RO of 0.56 (0.38, 0.80) for stage D compared with stage A; (d) grade – RO of 0.52 (0.28, 0.95) for high compared with low grade; and (e) diagnostic period – RO of 1.86 (1.51, 2.29) for 2006-2010.

Supplementary analyses with tumour stage classified as stage D vs A-C: RO among surgical cases for surgery start >30 days was lower for stage D for surgery at 0.69 (0.51, 0.92); with corresponding RO for radiotherapy start at 0.56 (0.35, 0.88), chemotherapy start at 0.30 (0.22, 0.41), and any treatment (surgical cases) at 0.64 (0.47, 0.86). The RO for chemotherapy treatment start >30 days for stage D vs A-C was 0.45 (0.30, 0.67) for 2000-2005 compared with 0.16 (0.10, 0.27) for 2006-2010.

2

3

BMJ Open

Table 2: Adjusted analysis of relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for colorectal cancer starting >30 days of

diagnosis by treatment type, stage, and socioeconomic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

	Surg	gery (surgery cases)		Radiotherapy diotherapy cases)		Chemotherapy emotherapy cases)	Any treatment (surgery cases)		
	N	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	
Age at diagnosis (years):									
<50 (ref.)	91	1.00	79	1.00	189	1.00	91	1.00	
50 - 59	210	1.15 (0.68, 1.95)	118	1.06 (0.52, 2.15)	322	1.18 (0.71, 1.94)	210	1.20 (0.70, 2.05)	
60 - 69	388	1.16 (0.71, 1.90)	188	1.16 (0.60, 2.25)	498	1.25 (0.79, 2.00)	388	1.26 (0.76, 2.08)	
70 - 79	570	0.95 (0.59, 1.53)	175	1.13 (0.58, 2.22)	469	1.51 (0.93, 2.45)	570	1.20 (0.73, 1.95)	
80+	416	0.82 (0.50, 1.34)	56	1.09 (0.44, 2.73)	78	2.20 (0.95, 5.10)	416	1.04 (0.63, 1.72)	
Sex:									
Male (ref.)	893	1.00	400	1.00	910	1.00	893	1.00	
Female	782	0.85 (0.69, 1.05)	216	0.72 (0.47, 1.11)	646	1.08 (0.80, 1.47)	782	0.88 (0.72, 1.09)	
Socioeconomic:									
Low (ref.)	544	1.00	206	1.00	507	1.00	544	1.00	
Low-med	388	1.17 (0.87, 1.59)	137	0.73 (0.40, 1.33)	374	0.92 (0.61, 1.39)	388	1.14 (0.84, 1.54)	
Med-high	345	1.06 (0.78, 1.42)	128	0.55 (0.30, 1.01)	320	0.89 (0.58, 1.38)	345	0.98 (0.73, 1.32)	
High	398	1.05 (0.77, 1.42)	145	0.78 (0.42, 1.46)	355	0.94 (0.61, 1.45)	398	1.05 (0.77, 1.42)	
Accessibility:									
High (ref.)	1353	1.00	475	1.00	1223	1.00	1353	1.00	
Med-high	228	0.62 (0.36, 1.08)	94	1.28 (0.45, 3.65)	228	0.78 (0.30, 2.00)	228	0.75 (0.43, 1.31)	
Poor	94	0.83 (0.45, 1.52)	47	1.14 (0.36, 3.58)	105	0.60 (0.23, 1.57)	94	0.89 (0.49, 1.63)	
Local Health Network:					4				
Northern metro	242	1.00	106	1.00	248	1.00	242	1.00	
(ref.) Central metro	618	0.55 (0.39, 0.76)	202	0.90 (0.47, 1.72)	495	0.99 (0.62, 1.57)	618	0.56 (0.40, 0.78)	
Southern metro	417	0.44 (0.31, 0.63)	134	0.68 (0.35, 1.33)	426	0.84 (0.52, 1.35)	417	0.44 (0.30, 0.63)	
Country South	155	0.86 (0.51, 1.43)	74	0.52 (0.20, 1.38)	159	2.40 (0.90, 6.39)	155	0.78 (0.47, 1.30)	
Country North	241	0.78 (0.43, 1.43)	100	1.60 (0.49, 5.18)	228	2.03 (0.76, 5.39)	241	0.73 (0.40, 1.34)	
Tumour site:									
Colon (ref.)	1098	1.00	86	1.00	898	1.00	1098	1.00	
Rectum (incl. Rectosig.)	577	2.07 (1.66, 2.57)	530	0.40 (0.19, 0.83)	658	0.65 (0.48, 0.89)	577	1.76 (1.41, 2.19)	
ACPS stage:									
A (ref.)	280	1.00	50	1.00	47	1.00	280	1.00	
В	654	0.87 (0.64, 1.17)	147	1.03 (0.46, 2.28)	249	1.78 (0.81, 3.90)	654	0.80 (0.59, 1.08)	
C	412	0.99 (0.72, 1.37)	231	1.56 (0.72, 3.38)	696	3.93 (1.85, 8.36)	412	0.89 (0.65, 1.23)	
'D	279	0.65 (0.45, 0.93)	162	0.71 (0.33, 1.55)	516	0.83 (0.40, 1.71)	279	0.56 (0.38, 0.80)	
(UK)	(50)	(0.67, (0.31, 1.48))	(26)	(0.93 (0.28, 3.06))	(48)	(0.84 (0.27, 2.62))	(50)	(0.65 (0.33, 1.25)	
)Grade:									

1	Well diff. (ref.)	58	1.00	25	1.00	37	1.00	58	1.00
2	Mod diff.	1212	0.68 (0.39, 1.20)	429	1.34 (0.50, 3.58)	1054	1.18 (0.43, 3.22)	1212	0.72 (0.42, 1.25)
3 ⊿	Poorly undiff.	285	0.47 (0.25, 0.87)	99	0.87 (0.62, 5.67)	309	1.28 (0.45, 3.68)	285	0.52 (0.28, 0.95)
5	(UK)	(120)	(1.48 (0.75, 2.95))	(63)	(1.02 (0.33, 3.12))	(156)	(0.41, (0.14, 1.17))	(120)	(1.44 (0.74, 2.81))
6 7	Diagnosis year:								
8	2000 - 2005	869	1.00	335	1.00	782	1.00	869	1.00
9 16	2006 - 2010	806	1.82 (1.48, 2.24)	281	1.48 (0.97, 2.26)	774	0.65 (0.48, 0.89)	806	1.86 (1.51, 2.29)

*Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods")

RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff. – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated.

Adjusted analyses – Predictors of treatment start exceeding >60 days

Surgery: Predictors of time to surgery >60 days for surgical cases included: (a) age at diagnosis – RO of 0.50 (0.29, 0.85) for 70-79 and 0.48 (0.27, 0.85) for 80+ compared with <50 years ; (b) service accessibility – RO of 0.37 (0.18, 0.74) for medium-high and 0.40 (0.18, 0.89) for poor compared with high metropolitan service accessibility; (c) local health network of residence – RO of 0.58 (0.39, 0.86) for metropolitan central and 0.51 (0.33, 0.78) for metropolitan south compared with metropolitan north; (d) tumour site - RO for rectum of 3.39 (2.59, 4.42); (e) tumour stage - RO of 2.32 (1.54, 3.50) for stage C and 1.76 (1.11, 2.78) for stage D compared with stage A; (f) grade - RO of 0.51 (0.27, 0.98) for intermediate and 0.38 (0.18, 0.79) for high compared with low grade; and (g) diagnostic period – RO of 1.56 (1.20, 2.03) for 2006-2010 (Table 3).

Radiotherapy: Predictors of time to radiotherapy start >60 days for cases treated by radiotherapy included (a) older
 age at diagnosis – compared with age<50 years, RO of 2.22 (1.20, 4.09) for 60-69 years, 2.00 (1.08, 3.71) for 70-79
 years, and 2.30 (1.04, 5.08) for 80+ years; and (b) tumour site – RO lower at 0.18 (0.11, 0.32) for rectum (note:
 radiotherapy was uncommon for colon cases).

Chemotherapy: Predictors of time to chemotherapy treatment start >60 days for cases treated by chemotherapy
included: (a) older age at diagnosis – compared with under 50 years, RO of 1.72 (1.20, 2.47) for 60-69 years, 1.83
(1.27, 2.64) for 70-79 years and 2.08 (1.19, 3.63) for 80+ years; and (b) tumour sub-site – RO for rectum of 0.78
(0.63, 0.97); and (c) diagnostic period – RO higher at 1.65 (1.33, 2.03) for 2006-2010.

Any treatment (surgical cases): Predictors of time to start of any treatment >60 days included: (a) local health network
 of residence – RO at 0.56 (0.36, 0.86) for metropolitan central and 0.42 (0.26, 0.69) for metropolitan south compared
 with metropolitan north; (b) tumour site – RO for rectum at 1.82 (1.34, 2.46); (c) grade – RO of 0.43 (0.20, 0.93) for
 high compared with low grade; and (d) diagnostic period – RO of 1.59 (1.18, 2.15) for 2006-2010.

Supplementary analyses with tumour stage classified as stage D vs A-C: The RO for surgery start >60 days did not
 vary, with RO for stage D of 1.18 (0.84, 1.66) for surgery (surgery cases), 0.92 (0.61, 1.38) for radiotherapy
 (radiotherapy cases), 0.83 (0.66, 1.31) for chemotherapy (chemotherapy cases), and 1.10 (0.74, 1.64) for any treatment
 (surgical cases).

2

BMJ Open

Table 3: Adjusted analysis of relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for colorectal cancer starting >60 days of

diagnosis by treatment type, stage, and socio-demographic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-

5 2010 diagnoses*

6 7 8	Surge	ery (surgery cases)		Radiotherapy liotherapy cases)		Chemotherapy motherapy cases)		Any treatment Surgery cases)
9	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)
Age at diagnosis (years):								
f≰0 (ref.)	91	1.00	79	1.00	189	1.00	91	1.00
55) – 59	210	0.79 (0.94, 1.42)	118	1.54 (0.80, 2.99)	322	1.31 (0.89, 1.94)	210	1.00 (0.54, 2.27)
60 - 69	388	0.73 (0.42, 1.27)	188	2.22 (1.20, 4.09)	498	1.72 (1.20, 2.47)	388	1.11 (0.54, 2.27)
$\frac{10}{10} - 79$	570	0.50 (0.29, 0.85)	175	2.00 (1.08, 3.71)	469	1.83 (1.27, 2.64)	570	1.10 (0.55, 2.22)
18 80+ 19	416	0.48 (0.27, 0.85)	56	2.30 (1.04, 5.08)	78	2.08 (1.18, 3.63)	416	1.25 (0.61, 2.56)
Sex:								
Male (ref.)	893	1.00	400	1.00	910	1.00	893	1.00
F emale	782	0.79 (0.61, 1.04)	216	0.93 (0.64, 1.35)	646	0.93 (0.75, 1.15)	782	0.89 (0.66, 1.20)
Bocioeconomi								
Low (ref.)	544	1.00	206	1.00	507	1.00	544	1.00
Low-med	388	1.37 (0.94, 2.01)	137	1.01 (0.61, 1.68)	374	0.74 (0.55, 1.00)	388	1.30 (0.84, 2.01)
Med-high	345	1.06 (0.73, 1.55)	128	0.95 (0.57, 1.57)	320	0.90 (0.67, 1.22)	345	1.17 (0.77, 1.78)
18 igh	398	1.05 (0.71, 1.55)	145	1.21 (0.72, 2.01)	355	0.94 (0.69, 1.27)	398	1.07 (0.68, 1.68)
Accessibility:								
High (ref.)	1353	1.00	475	1.00	1223	1.00	1353	1.00
Med-High	228	0.37 (0.18, 0.74)	94	1.36 (0.54, 3.39)	228	1.23 (0.71, 2.12)	228	0.47 (0.21, 1.06)
Poor	94	0.40 (0.18, 0.89)	47	1.50 (0.57, 3.95)	105	0.92 (0.50, 1.69)	94	0.55 (0.23, 1.35)
1 40cal Health Metwork:								
移orthern 羽etro (ref.)	242	1.00	106	1.00	248	1.00	242	1.00
Central metro	618	0.58 (0.39, 0.86)	202	0.84 (0.49, 1.44)	495	1.24 (0.89, 1.74)	618	0.56 (0.36, 0.86)
Southern	417	0.51 (0.33, 0.78)	134	0.56 (0.31, 1.00)	426	0.95 (0.67, 1.34)	417	0.42 (0.26, 0.69)
Gountry South	155	0.80 (0.44, 1.48)	74	0.43 (0.18, 1.02)	159	1.16 (0.66, 2.04)	155	0.80 (0.40, 1.59)
Country North	241	1.24 (0.59, 2.59)	100	0.56 (0.21, 1.50)	228	1.02 (0.56, 1.86)	241	0.97 (0.42, 2.25)
4 Pumour site:								
Colon (ref.)	1098	1.00	86	1.00	898	1.00	1098	1.00
Rectum (incl. Rectosig.)	577	3.39 (2.59, 4.42)	530	0.18 (0.11, 0.32)	658	0.78 (0.63, 0.97)	577	1.82 (1.34, 2.46)
4 8CPS stage:								
49 (ref.)	280	1.00	50	1.00	47	1.00	280	1.00
B	654	1.21 (0.80, 1.82)	147	1.28 (0.62, 2.64)	249	1.24 (0.64, 2.40)	654	0.88 (0.56, 1.39)
된	412	2.32 (1.54, 3.50)	231	1.73 (0.87, 3.43)	696	1.21 (0.65, 2.26)	412	1.39 (0.88, 2.19)
57 52 53 13	279	1.76 (1.11, 2.78)	162	1.37 (0.67, 2.82)	516	1.01 (0.53, 1.90)	279	1.19 (0.71, 1.99)
ś ψK)	(50)	(1.43 (0.59, 3.51))	(26)	(0.38 (0.10, 1.54))	(48)	(0.97 (0.35, 2.68))	(50)	(1.46 (0.63, 3.37))
Grade:								
₩ell diff.	58	1.00	25	1.00	37	1.00	58	1.00
Mod diff.	1212	0.51 (0.27, 0.98)	429	0.98 (0.40, 2.42)	1054	1.08 (0.54, 2.19)	1212	0.52 (0.23, 1.03)
Poorly/undiff.	285	0.38 (0.18, 0.79)	99	1.18 (0.44, 3.14)	309	1.10 (0.53, 2.29)	285	0.43 (0.20, 0.93)
66 ^J K)	(120)	(1.09 (0.51, 2.37)	(63)	(0.66 (0.23, 1.87))	(156)	(0.58 (0.27, 1.27))	(120)	(0.99 (0.44, 2.25))

ignostic ir:								
0 - 2005	869	1.00	335	1.00	782	1.00	869	1.00
6 - 2010 *Derived	806 806	1.56 (1.20, 2.03) ltivariate logistic r		0.91 (0.64, 1.30)	774	1.65 (1.33, 2.03)	806	1.59 (1.18, 2.15
RO – Rel	lative odds	-	ce limits; re	ef. – reference; ACP	'S- Austra	lian Clinico-Patholo	ogical Sta	ging; UK –
B. <u>Tin</u>	ne from d	liagnosis to treatm	<u>nent start</u>	by sub-site (colon a	and rectu	<u>m)</u>		
Colon								
• Pre	dictors of	time to treatment	start >30 d	ays in adjusted anal	ysis inclu	ded: (a) For surgery	(surgery	v cases): age
60-	69 years c	compared with <50) years; noi	thern metropolitan	compared	with central metrop	olitan an	d southern
met	tropolitan;	, stage A compared	1 with stag	es B and D; and dia	gnosis in 2	2006-2010; (b) For	radiothei	rapy
(rai	diotherapy	<i>v cases):</i> no signifi	cant predie	ctors (small number	s); (c) <i>For</i>	r chemotherapy (che	emothera	py cases):
dia	gnosis in 2	2006-2010; (d) For	r any treati	ment (in surgical ca	ses): nort	hern metropolitan c	ompared	with central
met	tropolitan	and southern metr	opolitan ar	reas; stage A compa	red with s	tages B and D; and	diagnosis	s in 2006-2010
(Su	pplementa	ary Tables s1 & s2	.).					
• Pre	dictors of	time to treatment	start of >60) days in adjusted a	nalysis inc	cluded: (a) For surge	<i>ery:</i> nortl	nern
met	tropolitan	compared with cer	ntral and so	outhern metropolita	n areas; ar	nd more advanced st	ages C a	nd D
con	npared wit	th stage A; (b) For	• radiother	apy: no significant j	predictors	(small numbers); (c) For che	emotherapy:
dia	gnosis in 2	2006-2010; and (d)) For any t	reatment (surgical c	<i>cases)</i> : no	rthern metropolitan	compare	d with central
and	l southern	metropolitan areas	s (Supplem	nentary Tables s1 &	s2).			
Rectum	1							
• Pre	dictors of	time to treatment	start of >30) days in adjusted a	nalysis inc	cluded: (a) For surge	ery (surg	ery cases):
age	70+ com	pared with <50 years	ars; norther	m metropolitan com	pared wit	h central and southe	rn metro	politan areas;
	U U					: low compared with		e
soc	ioeconomi	ic status; and diag	nosis in 20	06-2010; (c) For ch	emothera	py (chemotherapy co	<i>ases)</i> : sta	ge C; and (d)
For	r any treat	ment (surgical cas	es): northe	rn metropolitan cor	npared wi	th southern metropo	olitan; an	d diagnosis in
200)6-2010 (S	Supplementary Tab	oles s3 & s4	4).				
• Pre	dictors of	time to treatment s	start of >60) days in adjusted an	nalysis inc	cluded: (a) For surge	<i>ery:</i> your	nger age <50
	•				•	itan compared with		
				C		iation; and 2006-20		
	1.	C				years; central metro	•	*
		-	-			gical cases): low co	mpared	with higher
grad	de lesions	; and diagnosis in	2006-2010	0 (Supplementary T	ables s3 &	¢ s4).		
C. <u>Sur</u>	<u>rvival by t</u>	<u>time from diagno</u>	<u>sis to trea</u> f	<u>tment start</u>				
	sted analy							
e		*				al was lowest in the		-
diagnos	sis when ti	me to initial surge	ry was ≤30) days, but changed	with furth	ner follow-up, such t	hat by 10) years from

diagnosis, survival was lower when time to initial surgery was >90 days compared with \leq 30 days (p=0.017) (Table 4).

Radiotherapy: Survival was lowest in the first year when time to radiotherapy start was ≤ 30 days and reached

statistical significance compared with a time of 61-90 days (p=0.009), but not with 31-60 days (p=0.295) or >90 days

(p=0.280). After the first year of follow-up, survival was lowest for >90 days.

Chemotherapy: The survival pattern varied, with time to treatment \leq 30 days having the lowest survival at each followup time.

Any treatment (surgical cases): Compared with time to initial treatment >30 days, survival was lowest in the first two years from diagnosis when time to initial surgery was \leq 30 days, but changed with further follow-up, such that by 10 years from diagnosis, survival was lower when time to initial surgery was >90 days compared with \leq 30 days (p=0.021).

Table 4: Unadjusted analysis of percentage survival (\pm standard error) from colorectal cancer by time from diagnosis (days) to commitment of specified treatment: South Australian major public hospitals, diagnoses 2000-2010*

		5	Follow-up	time fi	rom dia	gnosis	(years)	
Specified treatment	Time (days)	Numbers of cases	1	2	3	4	5	10
	<u><</u> 30	988	85.4 ± 1.2	78.2 ±1.5	72.9 ± 1.5	69.8 ± 1.6	67.5 ± 1.7	63.3 ± 2.0
Surgical treatment	31 - 60	355	93.1 ± 1.6	89.9 ±1.9	84.7 ± 2.2	81.9 ± 2.4	79.7 ± 2.5	75.9 ± 2.9
(surgery cases)	61 – 90	100	92.9 ± 3.7	84.1 ± 4.6	77.5 ± 5.3	74.6 ± 5.5	72.6 ± 5.8	57.7 ± 9.0
	>90	232	92.6 ± 2.2	82.4 ± 2.9	73.9 ± 3.2	67.4 ± 3.5	67.8 ± 3.7	50.4 ± 5.0
	<u>≤</u> 30	129	82.0 ± 4.0	70.0 ± 4.5	62.4 ± 4.7	58.0 ± 4.7	53.1 ± 4.8	44.4 ± 5.5
Radiotherapy	31-60	233	87.0 ± 2.6	77.8 ± 3.0	68.2 ± 3.4	64.4 ± 3.5	61.3 ± 3.6	55.2 ± 4.4
(radiotherapy cases)	61 – 90	107	95.3 ± 3.2	87.5 ± 4.1	79.4 ± 4.7	73.8 ± 5.1	64.8 ± 5.5	49.0 ± 6.9
	>90	147	87.6 ± 3.3	62.6 ± 4.3	53.1 ± 4.4	42.8 ± 4.3	39.2 ± 4.3	27.3 ± 4.3
	<u><</u> 30	238	68.0 ± 3.3	52.8 ± 3.4	43.4 ± 3.3	40.7 ± 3.3	38.4 ± 3.3	33.1 ± 3.4
Chemotherapy	31 - 60	633	87.2 ± 3.4	73.8 ± 1.8	67.9 ± 2.0	62.8 ± 2.0	59.4 ± 2.1	49.5 ± 2.5
(chemotherapy cases)	61 – 90	382	92.3 ± 1.6 94.4	78.8 ± 2.3 78.1	68.9 ± 2.6 68.6	64.5 ± 2.7	59.8 ± 2.8 56.8	56.1 ± 3.0
	>90	303	94.4 ± 1.7	± 2.6	± 2.9	63.2 ± 3.0	± 3.1	45.1 ± 3.9
	<u>≤</u> 30	1030	85.5 ±1.1 93.4	78.1 ± 1.3 88.8	72.6 ± 1.4 83.8	69.4 ± 1.5 80.5	67.2 ± 1.6 78.0	63.1 ± 1.8
Any treatment	31 - 60	428	± 1.2	± 1.5	± 1.8	± 2.0	± 2.2	71.5 ± 2.9
(surgery cases)	61 – 90	118	94.0 ± 2.2	85.9 ± 3.3	79.6 ± 3.9	74.8 ± 4.4	71.7 ± 4.7	56.6 ± 7.8
	>90	99	91.7 ± 2.8	82.2 ± 3.9	71.9 ± 4.7	63.9 ± 5.2	57.1 ± 5.6	43.8 ± 8.2

Page 14 of 19

* Kaplan-Meier product-limit estimate; date of censoring of live cases: Dec 31, 2012

<u>Adjusted analysis</u>

 Because visual examination and interaction terms indicated a lack of proportionality of survival with time to treatment, results are split in Table 5 for follow-up of ≤ 2 and 3-10 years as mutually exclusive periods. Irrespective of treatment type, lower hazard ratios applied for periods ≤ 2 years with times to treatment of >30 days, after adjusting for age, sex, socioeconomic status, service accessibility, local health network of residence, tumour sub-site, stage, grade and diagnostic period. Hazard ratios similarly adjusted generally did not decrease across the 3-10 follow-up, suggesting no significant differences in conditional survival after two years for cases treated ≤ 30 days of diagnosis and >30 days. While there were higher hazard ratios for times of 61-90 and >90 days for 3-10-year follow-up from surgical treatment and radiotherapy respectively, statistical significance was only achieved for any treatment (surgical cases) when comparing time to treatment >90 compared with ≤ 30 days (p=0.022).

Table 5: Adjusted analysis of hazard ratios (95% confidence limits) of deaths from colorectal cancer by time from diagnosis (days) to commencement of specified treatment: South Australians major public hospitals, diagnoses 2000-2010*

		Follow-up time from diagnoses										
		≤ 2 y	ears	3-10 y	years							
Treatment	Time	Number of cases	Hazard ratios	Number of cases	Hazard ratios							
Surgical treatment	<u><</u> 30	988	1.00	714	1.00							
(surgical cases)	31 - 60	355	0.57 (0.40, 0.82)	302	0.92 (0.62, 1.36							
	61 – 90	100	0.59 (0.35, 1.02)	76	1.13 (0.60, 2.10							
	>90	232	0.59 (0.41, 0.84)	186	1.24 (0.85, 1.83							
Radiotherapy	<u><</u> 30	129	1.00	87	1.00							
(radiotherapy cases)	31 - 60	233	0.85 (0.54, 1.32)	173	1.00 (0.59, 1.72							
	61 - 90	107	0.44 (0.23, 0.84)	89	1.26 (0.70, 2.27							
	>90	147	0.62 (0.40, 0.98)	89	1.60 (0.90, 2.85							
Chemotherapy	<u><</u> 30	238	1.00	120	1.00							
(chemotherapy cases)	31 - 60	633	0.71 (0.55, 0.92)	459	0.98 (0.66, 1.47							
	61 - 90	382	0.51 (0.38, 0.70)	289	1.01 (0.65, 1.55							
	>90	303	0.40 (0.30, 0.55)	233	1.04 (0.68, 1.59							
Any treatment	<u><</u> 30	1030	1.00	744	1.00							
(surgery cases)	31 - 60	428	0.59 (0.43, 0.81)	361	0.94 (0.66, 1.33							
	61 - 90	118	0.48 (0.43, 0.81)	95	1.11 (0.66, 1.89							
	>90	99	0.62 (0.37, 1.02)	78	1.83 (1.12, 2.98							

*4 Cox proportional hazards regression analyses (1 per treatment category), adjusting for age, sex, socioeconomic status, service accessibility, local health network, sub-site, stage, grade and diagnostic period (see tables 2 and 3); date of censoring of live cases: Dec 31, 2012.

Discussion

The proportion of surgical patients receiving any treatment for their cancer ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 87%, with 80% receiving surgical treatment within 60 days of diagnosis. This broadly accords with targets set by Cancer UK.⁹ The proportion receiving radiotherapy who started this therapy ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 59%, whereas the corresponding percentage having chemotherapies who started this therapy ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 56%. The longer delay for radiotherapy and chemotherapy is consistent with their common use as adjuvant therapies following surgery.⁵

Longer time to surgery applied for cancers of the rectum than colon potentially reflecting the increased use of magnetic resonance imaging for rectal cancers, ²⁵ and multimodal therapies,⁵ which may have led to surgery delays through more multidisciplinary consultation and in some instances, neoadjuvant care.²⁶

The longer time to surgery in 2006-2010 may also have been influenced by increasing use of multimodal therapies and more advanced diagnostics (e.g., magnetic resonance imaging), increasing the need for multidisciplinary consultation.^{5, 26} While the introduction of population-based screening may have contributed, the screening program was still at an early phase of development, being phased in from 2006 to 2020. Following more complete implementation of bowel screening, there may be increased pressure on services which may increase times to surgery.^{7, 8} The higher proportion with a time to surgery >60 days for stages C and D compared with stage A may reflect time taken for symptom control, multidisciplinary team consultation, and provision of neoadjuvant therapies.^{27, 28} The proportion with a time to surgery >60 days was lower for higher grade tumours, potentially due to a greater perceived urgency of surgical intervention for more aggressive tumours.

The proportion receiving surgery, who did so >60 days from diagnosis, tended to be lower among those aged 70+ years, central and southern compared with northern metropolitan residential areas, those diagnosed in 2000-2005 compared with 2006-2010, and unexpectedly, those residing closer to metropolitan services. The reasons are unclear but may reflect differences in service busyness and patterns of patient and service demand.

Of those receiving radiotherapy, the proportion starting this therapy >60 days from diagnosis tended to be higher for ages \geq 60 years than the <50 years. A similar pattern applied for chemotherapy. The reasons are not known. Perhaps a longer recovery time post-surgery has been allowed for older cases post-surgery before commencing adjuvant therapies, or longer delays occurring due to higher levels of frailty and comorbidity, and more common complications of surgery.

Radiotherapy was relatively uncommon for colon cancers, as recommended in clinical guidelines and optimal care pathways.^{27, 28} When it was provided, it tended to start later than for rectal cases. Similarly, chemotherapies tended to commence later for colon than rectal cancers. Further research is needed to determine the reasons for these patterns. Chemotherapies were less likely to commence >30 days from diagnosis for 2006-2010 diagnoses. Conversely chemotherapies were more inclined to occur >60 days from diagnosis in 2006-2010. Again, further research is needed to explain these patterns.

Where the time from diagnosis to treatment was >30 days, the risk of death occurring ≤ 2 years of diagnosis was lower. This was evident by therapy type after adjusting for stage and grade, and sociodemographic factors. It may reflect the triaging for priority treatment ≤ 30 days for cases with elevated comorbidity or other risk factors not recorded by the

registry. While a statistically significant U-shaped relationship of survival with time to treatment start was usually not apparent for specific therapies, as indicated in some other studies, $^{6, 17}$ the hazard ratio for 3-10 years was elevated when the time to first treatment was >90 days for surgical cases (p=0.022).

The present study has limitations. An opportunistic approach was taken in selecting cases where a gap presented between recorded diagnosis date and start of treatment. Also: (a) precise diagnostic and treatment data were limited to 65% of cases, which could have led to bias; (b) the study was observational and vulnerable to bias from practitioner choice and self-selection by patients into comparison groups; and (c) the ability to adjust for potential confounding influences was limited by the range of data available. Nonetheless, results are similar to those of other recent studies in showing poorer short-term survival for cases receiving surgical treatment soon after diagnosis, and with a similar pattern applying for early treatment by radiotherapy and chemotherapies.^{12, 14, 15, 17}

Results should not be construed as indicating a lack of benefit from early treatment, given likely confounding effects of patient selection in treatment scheduling. A positive feature was the approximate 87% of surgical cases receiving their first treatment (any treatment) \leq 60 days and 80% treated surgically within this period (note: 83% for 2000-2005 and 78% for 2006-2010).⁹ The indication of a temporal decline in this percentage warrants continued monitoring and investigation, particularly for patient groups where a higher proportion was not receiving surgical care \leq 60 days of diagnosis (e.g., patients aged under 50 years, those with advanced disease, those with rectal cancer, and residents of the northern metropolitan rather than central or southern metropolitan areas).

The study highlights the benefit of linking diagnostic data to treatment data. Population-wide data linkage of population-based cancer registry, hospital, radiotherapy-centre, Medicare insurance and screening data, and potentially in the future, electronic medical record data and selected research databases will further strengthen the data infrastructure available for describing clinical management pathways and associations with survival across the population. This is expected to enable finer sub-group analyses. Clinical registries will still be important for more detailed investigations for the sub-groups they cover, and for validating results of population-wide registry and administrative sources.

Conclusions

- Baseline data for major public hospitals in South Australia 2000-2010 indicate that for cases where the clinical registry recorded a diagnosis in advance of the surgery date, approximately 87% of surgical cases receiving some treatment and 80% of cases received their surgical treatment ≤60 days of diagnosis. This is broadly consistent with timeline targets of Cancer UK.
- 2. Radiotherapy and chemotherapies generally started later, potentially reflecting their use as adjuvant therapies.
- 3. Adjusted analyses indicated lower survival up to two years from diagnosis when treatment commenced ≤30 days of diagnosis, potentially reflecting triaging for early care of cases with aggressive cancers and higher clinical complexity. By comparison, adjusted analyses did not show differences in survival for follow-up periods from diagnosis of 3-10 years where longer times to treatment applied, except for time to any treatment type (surgical cases) of >90 days when survival was lower.

BMJ Open

- These results should not be interpreted as evidence of the importance or unimportance of delays, given selection factors in scheduling patient care.
 - 5. Treatment commencement was generally later in 2006-2010 than 2000-2005, possibly reflecting increased use of adjuvant therapies, increased use of multidisciplinary teams, and more advanced diagnostics (e.g., magnetic resonance imaging). Increased demand may be placed on timeliness of clinical services with extensions in population screening.
 - 6. Further research is needed to optimize patient scheduling for better outcomes.

Funding statement

Undertaken with the financial support of Cancer Council's Beast Cancer Project on behalf of its donors and the State Government through the Department of Health.

Informed consent

Waiver of consent for use of de-identified data collected under authorisation of Part 7 of the South Australian Health Care Act. Note: large numbers of patients had deceased, and many are in the terminal stages of their cancer. Consent processes would be intrusive and would invalidate the database as an unbiased data source.

Author contributions

Study concept: DR, TP; Study design: DR TP, CK, RP, JM; Data acquisition: DB, KP; Quality control of data: DB, KP, KF; Data analysis: DR, KF ; Data interpretation: DR, CK, IO, DK, RP, JM, RJ, DW, DLW, TP; Report writing: DR, KF; Review of report: DR, CK, IO, DK, RP, JM, RJ, DW, DLW, TP, CM, CH, EB. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Data sharing

The data for this study are available through the South Australian Cancer Service and SA Cancer Registry. Restrictions to data use apply as conditions of legal authorization and data custodian and ethics approval.

Competing interests

D Roder reports grants from Cancer Council SA, during the conduct of the study.

References

- Ferlay J, Ervik M, Lam F, et al. Global Cancer Observatory: Cancer Today. France: International Agency for Research on Cancer; 2018. <u>https://gco.iarc.fr/today</u> (accessed 28 September 2018).
- 2. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2018 Cancer Data in Australia; Australian Cancer Incidence and Mortality (ACIM) books: all cancers combined, Canberra: AIHW; 2018.
 - https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/cancer/cancer-data-in-australia/ (accessed 23 January 2019).
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW), Cancer data in Australia. Cat. no: CAN 122. Canberra:
 AIHW; 2018. <u>https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/cancer/cancer-data-in-australia/contents/summary</u> (accessed 23 January 2019).

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

4. Australian Government, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Cancer Australia, Australasian Association of Cancer Registries. Cancer survival and prevalence in Australia: cancers diagnosed from 1982 to 2004. Cancer Series no. 42. Cat. No. CAN 38. Canberra: AIHW; 2008. 5. Roder D, Karapetis C, Wattchow D, et al. Colorectal cancer treatment and survival: the experience of major public hospitals in South Australia over three decades. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2015; 16(6): 2431-40. 6. Singh H, De Coster C, Shu E, et al. Wait times from presentation to treatment for colorectal cancer: A populationbased study. Canadian J Gastroenterology & Hepatology 2010; 24(1): 33-9. 7. Hanna SJ, Muneer A, Khalil KH. The 2-week wait time for suspected cancer. Time to rethink? Int J Clin Pract 2005; 59(11):1334-39. 10 11 8. Roncoroni L, Pietra N, Violi V, et al. Delay in the diagnosis and outcome of colorectal cancer: a prospective study. 12 Eur J Surg Oncol 1999; 25(2): 173-8. 13 9. Cancer Research UK. Cancer waiting times. London: Cancer Research UK; 2018. 14 https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/about-cancer/cancer-in-general/treatment/access-to-treatment/waiting-times-15 16 after-diagnosis (accessed 23 January 2019). 17 10. Barillari P, de Angelis R, Valabrega S, et al. Relationship of symptom duration and survival in patients with 18 colorectal carcinoma. Eur J Surg Oncol 1989: 15(5): 441-5. 19 11. Gonzalez-Hermoso F, Perez-Palma J, Marchena-Gomez J, et al. Can early diagnosis of symptomatic colorectal 20 cancer improve diagnosis. World J Surg 2004; 28(7): 716-20. 21 22 12. Rupassara KS, Ponnusamy S, Withanage N, et al. A paradox explained? Patients with delayed diagnosis of 23 symptomatic colorectal cancer have good prognosis. Colorectal Dis 2006; 8(5): 423-9. 24 13. Jullumstrø E, Lydersen S, Møller B, et al. Duration of symptoms, stage at diagnosis and relative survival in colon 25 and rectal cancer. Eur J Cancer 2009; 45(13): 2383-90. 26 14. Pruit SL, Harzke AJ, Davidson NO, et al. Do diagnostic and treatment delays for colorectal cancer increase risk of 27 28 death? Cancer Causes Control 2013; 24(5): 961-77. 29 15. Amri R, Bordeianou LG, Sylla P, et al. Treatment delay in surgically-treated colon cancer: does it affect 30 outcomes? Ann surg Oncol 2014; 21(12): 3909-16. 31 16. Young CG, Varghese R, Stephens JH, et al. Colorectal cancer survival is not affected by delay in diagnosis. Clin 32 33 Surg 2016; 1: 1238. 34 17. Pita-Fernández S, González-Sáez L, López-Calviño B, et al. Effect of diagnostic delay on survival in patients with 35 colorectal cancer: a retrospective cohort study. BMC Cancer 2016; 16(1): 664. 36 18. Wanis KN, Patel SV, Brackstone M. Do moderate surgical treatment delays influence survival in colon cancer? 37 Dis Colon Rectum 2017; 60(12): 1241-9. 38 19. Okuyama A, Shibata A, Nishimoto H. Critical points for interpreting patients' survival rate using cancer registries: 39 40 a literature review. J Epidemiol 2018; 28(2): 61-6. 41 20. Commission on Cancer. FORDS: Facility Oncology Registry Data Standards: Revised for 2016. Chicago, IL: 42 American College of Surgeons, 2016. 43 21. Davis NC, Newland RC. Terminology and classification of colorectal adenocarcinoma: the Australian clinico-44 45 pathological staging system. ANZ J Surg 1983; 53(3): 211-21. 46 22. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Socio-Economic indexes for areas. Canberra: ABS, 2018. 47 23. Armitage P, Berry G. Statistical methods in medical research. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications, 1987. 48 24. Statistical Analysis System. The SAS platform: SAS Enterprise Guide 7.1. Cary NC: SAS, 2018. 49 25. Jhaveri KS, Hosseini-Nik H. MRI of rectal cancer: An overview and update of recent advances. Am J 50 Roentgenology 2015; 205(1): W42-55. 51 26.Cancer Council NSW. Bowel cancer. Your health care team. Sydney: Cancer Council; 2017. 52 https://www.cancercouncil.com.au/bowel-cancer/diagnosis/health-professionals/ (accessed 28 September 2018). 53 27. Cancer Council Australia Colorectal Cancer Guidelines Working Party. Clinical practice guidelines for the 54 prevention, early detection and management of colorectal cancer. Sydney: Cancer Council Australia. 55 https://wiki.cancer.org.au/australia/Guidelines:Colorectal cancer (accessed 1 January 2018). 56 57 28.National Cancer Expert Reference Group (NCERG). Optimal care pathway for people with colorectal cancer. 58 Sydney: Cancer Council Australia; 2016. https://www.cancer.org.au/health-professionals/optimal-cancer-care-59 pathways.html (accessed 28 September 2018). 60 Page 19 of 19

3

4

Supplementary tables

Table S1: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for colon cancer starting >30 days of diagnosis by treatment type,

stage, and socioeconomic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

5 6		Surgery		Radiotherapy	0	Chemotherapy	Any tr	eatment (surgical cases)
7	n=1098	RO (95% CLs)	n=86	RO (95% CLs)	n=898	RO (95% CLs)	n=1098	RO (95% CLs)
9 <mark>Age at</mark> 1 d iagnosis 1(years):								
12 ⁵⁰ (ref.)	53	1.00	13	1.00	109	1.00	53	1.00
1 3 0 - 59	116	1.61 (0.75, 3.46)	14	1.03 (0.05, 21.46)	176	0.84 (0.40, 1.76)	116	1.28 (0.59, 2.78)
1 6 0 - 69	226	2.10 (1.03, 4.28)	20	2.82 (0.20, 40.71)	273	0.91 (0.45, 1.83)	226	1.86 (0.92, 3.80)
1 7 0 - 79	396	1.65 (0.83, 3.28)	28	3.49 (0.27, 45.20)	292	1.37 (0.68, 2.79)	396	1.55 (0.78, 3.09)
16 17 ⁰⁺	307	1.50 (0.74, 3.03)	11	NA	48	2.52 (0.78, 8.17)	307	1.43 (0.71, 2.88)
1Sex:								
1 Male (ref.)	562	1.00	56	1.00	491	1.00	562	1.00
2 B emale	536	0.87 (0.67, 1.13)	30	2.65 (0.27, 1.64)	407	1.23 (0.79, 1.91)	536	0.89 (0.68, 1.16)
² socioeconomic:								
²² Low (ref.)	336	1.00	25	1.00	287	1.00	336	1.00
23 Jow-Med	273	1.69 (0.99, 2.12)	19	1.69 (0.09, 30.68)	229	0.71 (0.39, 1.27)	273	1.46 (1.00, 2.14)
<u>24</u> 2∦ded-High	224	1.31 (0.90, 1.90)	20	7.01 (0.22, 223.56)	185	0.93 (0.49, 1.78)	224	1.28 (0.88, 1.88)
2 H igh	265	1.12 (0.76, 1.67)	22	1.37 (0.07, 27.36)	197	0.85 (0.45, 1.62)	265	1.09 (0.73, 1.62)
² Accessibility:								
²⁸ High (ref.)	899	1.00	66	1.00	716	1.00	899	1.00
29 Med-High	141	0.57 (0.28, 1.15)	9	NA	127	0.41 (0.09, 1.97)	141	0.57 (0.28, 1.16)
30 3Foor	58	0.71 (0.33, 1.57)	11	NA	55	0.25 (0.05, 1.21)	58	0.63 (0.28, 1.38)
3Docal Health 3Detwork:				2				
³ Northern metro 3(ref.)	149	1.00	12	1.00	141	1.00	149	1.00
³⁶ Central metro	421	0.49 (0.32, 0.75)	33	0.31 (0.01, 6.39)	291	0.85 (0.41, 1.76)	421	0.48 (0.31, 0.73)
38 Southern metro	281	0.39 (0.25, 0.63)	16	0.58 (0.03, 11.80)	252	0.83 (0.39, 1.78)	281	0.37 (0.24, 0.60)
3 G ountry South	88	0.69 (0.36, 1.33)	10	NA	83	3.94 (0.70, 22.22)	88	0.69 (0.36, 1.34)
4 C ountry North	159	0.78 (0.37, 1.66)	15	NA	131	2.42 (0.47, 12.36)	159	0.76 (0.35, 1.63)
⁴ ACPS stage:						5		
42 (ref.) 43 44 44 45	169	1.00	3	1.00	12	1.00	169	1.00
43 4 3	471	0.67 (0.46, 0.98)	20	43.60 (0.38, 49.56)	130	1.60 (0.16, 16.54)	471	0.65 (0.45, 0.95)
4 4 4§	252	0.69 (0.46, 1.06)	21	24.12 (0.22, 26.91)	409	1.76 (0.19, 16.48)	252	0.66 (0.43, 1.00)
4 ð	180	0.54 (0.33, 0.86)	39	4.39 (0.07, 27.89)	320	0.24 (0.03, 2.17)	180	0.44 (0.27, 0.72)
4 / UK)	(26)	(0.64 (0.26, 1.57))	(3)	NA	(27)	(0.41 (0.04, 4.48))	(26)	(0.58 (0.23, 1.43))
⁴ Grade:								
49 Well diff. (ref.)	38	1.00	5	1.00	18	1.00	38	1.00
50 5¥10d diff.	770	0.85 (0.43, 1.68)	53	1.49 (0.11, 19.97)	581	0.58 (0.07, 4.81)	770	0.82 (0.41, 1.62)
5Doorly/undiff.	209	0.57 (0.27, 1.21)	19	1.11 (0.06, 21.24)	213	0.46 (0.05, 3.89)	209	0.54 (0.26, 1.15)
5¢UK)	(81)	(1.87 (0.82, 4.26))	(9)	NA	(86)	(0.13 (0.02, 1.11))	(81)	(1.62 (0.71, 3.69))
⁵ Diagnosis year:								
55000 - 2005	541	1.00	52	1.00	451	1.00	541	1.00
56 57006 - 2010	557	1.41 (1.09, 1.83)	34	0.21 (0.03, 1.64)	447	1.59 (1.02, 2.48)	557	1.39 (1.07, 2.88)

58 Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods")

59

RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; NA – not applicable; ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated.

Table S2: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for colon cancer starting >60 days of diagnosis by treatment type, stage, and socio-demographic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

3 4 5	Surgery		Radio	therapy	Chemo	therapy	Any trea cases on	ntment (surgical ly)
6 7	n=1098	RO (95% CLs)	n=86	RO (95% CLs)	n=898	RO (95% CLs)	n=1098	RO (95% CLs)
8Age at								
9diagnosis								
1(years):	53	1.00	12	1.00	100	1.00	53	1.00
1₹50 (ref.)		1.00	13	1.00	109	1.00		
1 <u>3</u> 0 - 59 130 - 69	116	1.34 (0.51, 3.51)	14	0.06 (0.00, 1.37)	176	0.94 (0.57, 1.55)	116	0.75 (0.25, 2.21)
	226	1.28 (0.51, 3.20)	20	0.17 (0.01, 3.57)	273	1.16 (0.73, 1.84)	226	1.10 (0.41, 2.93)
14 70 - 79 15	396	1.10 (0.45, 2.66)	28	0.35 (0.02, 7.07)	292	1.26 (0.80, 2.01)	396	0.99 (0.38, 2.53)
18 ⁰⁺	307	1.00 (0.40, 2.47)	11	0.30 (0.01, 7.36)	48	1.60 (0.78, 3.29)	307	1.01 (0.38, 2.65)
1\$ex:					10.1			4.00
18/1ale (ref.)	562	1.00	56	1.00	491	1.00	562	1.00
1pemale	536	0.83 (0.57, 1.20)	30	1.01 (0.23, 4.35)	407	0.84 (0.64, 1.14)	536	0.94 (0.62, 1.41)
20 Socioeconomic: 21								
2 ² ow (ref.)	336	1.00	25	1.00	287	1.00	336	1.00
2 b ow-med	273	1.58 (0.93, 2.71)	19	0.40 (0.06, 2.51)	229	0.75 (0.51, 1.10)	273	1.65 (0.92, 2.98)
2¥4fed-high	224	1.14 (0.68, 1.94)	20	1.78 (0.26, 12.39)	185	0.86 (0.58, 1.28)	224	1.14 (0.64, 2.04)
2p _{ligh}	265	1.19 (0.67, 2.10)	22	1.04 (0.15, 7.27)	197	1.18 (0.78, 1.77)	265	1.41 (0.75, 2.63)
² Accessibility:								
High (ref.)	899	1.00	66	1.00	716	1.00	899	1.00
2 Med-high	141	0.54 (0.20, 1.42)	9	8.99 (0.24, 331.28)	127	1.57 (0.75, 3.30)	141	0.45 (0.16, 1.25)
3Door	58	0.65 (0.21, 1.97)	11	3.90 (0.11, 141.05)	55	0.83 (0.36, 1.93)	58	0.41 (0.12, 1.44)
³ Local Health ³ Network:				0				
33 34 orthern metro 35 st.)	149	1.00	12	1.00	141	1.00	149	1.00
36 entral metro	421	0.56 (0.32, 0.98)	33	0.16 (0.01, 1.98)	291	0.91 (0.58, 1.43)	421	0.44 (0.24, 0.79)
3 S outhern metro	281	0.46 (0.25, 0.87)	16	0.17 (0.01, 2.26)	252	0.96 (0.61, 1.52)	281	0.29 (0.14, 0.58)
³ Country South	88	0.87 (0.36, 2.14)	10	0.08 (0.00, 2.02)	83	0.93 (0.43, 2.01)	88	0.87 (0.34, 2.21)
³⁹ Country North	157	1.04 (0.38, 2.90)	15	0.03 (0.00, 1.61)	131	0.74 (0.33, 1.76)	157	1.23 (0.43, 3.57)
40 ⊿ACPS stage:								
41 (ref.)	169	1.00	3	1.00	12	1.00	169	1.00
4 <u>2</u> (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4)	471	1.02 (0.54, 1.91)	20	0.79 (0.03, 23.99)	130	0.43 (0.10, 1.74)	471	0.80 (0.42, 1.53)
4 @	252	2.34 (1.25, 4.40)	21	0.57 (0.02, 18.97)	409	0.29 (0.07, 1.15)	252	1.54 (0.80, 2.96)
4 <u>5</u>	180	2.25 (1.16, 4.35)	39	0.94 (0.03, 26.42)	320	0.26 (0.07, 1.03)	180	1.49 (0.74, 2.98)
46 (UK)	(26)	(1.65 (0.51, 5.33))	(3)	NA	(27)	(0.67 (0.14, 3.26))	(26)	1.35 (0.38, 4.76))
47 4 G rade:	<u>`</u>		. /					<u> </u>
49Vell diff. (ref.)	38	1.00	5	1.00	18	1.00	38	1.00
5 M od diff.	770	0.85 (0.31, 2.29)	53	2.29 (0.31, 16.79)	581	0.97 (0.35, 2.67)	770	0.71 (0.26, 1.92)
5 ⁴ Poorly/undiff.	209	0.60 (0.20, 1.78)	19	1.11 (0.12, 10.68)	213	0.94 (0.33, 2.65)	209	0.52 (0.17, 1.58)
52 -(UK)	(81)	(1.84 (0.60, 5.62))	(9)	NA	(86)	$(0.40\ (0.13,\ 1.20))$	(81)	$(1.24\ (0.39,\ 3.93))$
53 57 2 Diagnosis year:	(~1)	(1.0. (0.00, 0.02))	(7)	- ***		(3.10 (0.10, 1.20))	(01)	(1.2. (0.07, 0.75))
5 2 000 - 2005	541	1.00	52	1.00	451	1.00	541	1.00
5 3 006 - 2005	557	1.26 (0.87, 1.82)	34	0.31 (0.08, 1.25)	447	1.96 (1.48, 2.59)	557	1.29 (0.86, 1.94)
		ate logistic regression			44 /	1.70 (1.40, 2.39)	557	1.27 (0.00, 1.94)

58

1

2

59 RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; NA – not applicable; ACPS- Australian Clinico-

60 Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated.

2

BMJ Open

Table S3: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for **rectal cancer** starting >30 days of diagnosis by treatment type, stage, and socioeconomic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

3 4 5		Surgery	F	Radiotherapy	C	hemotherapy	All treatment (surgical cases only)		
5	n=577	RO (95% CLs)	n=530	RO (95% CLs)	n=658	RO (95% CLs)	n=577	RO (95% CLs)	
7 Age at 3 diagnosis 9 (years):									
$^{0}_{1}$ <50 (ref.)	38	1.00	66	1.00	80	1.00	38	1.00	
2 50 - 59	94	0.71 (0.31,1.62)	104	1.30 (0.62,2.71)	146	1.73 (0.86,3.48)	94	1.03 (0.46, 2.29)	
3 60 - 69	162	0.57 (0.26,1.24)	168	1.41 (0.71,2.79)	225	1.57 (0.83,2.99)	162	0.78 (0.37, 1.66)	
4 70 - 79	174	0.44 (0.20,0.95)	147	1.35 (0.67,2.71)	177	1.79 (0.90,3.54)	174	0.83 (0.40, 1.76)	
6 ⁸⁰⁺	109	0.38 (0.17,0.85)	45	1.40 (0.52,3.77)	30	2.01 (0.58,6.97)	109	0.70 (0.32, 1.55)	
7 Sex:									
⁸ Male (ref.)	331	1.00	344	1.00	419	1.00	331	1.00	
o Female	246	0.74 (0.52,1.07)	186	0.68 (0.43,1.07)	239	0.94 (0.61,1.45)	246	0.79 (0.55, 1.14)	
1 Socioeconomic:									
2 Low (ref.)	208	1.00	181	1.00	220	1.00	208	1.00	
Low-med	115	0.86 (0.50,1.45)	118	0.80 (0.42,1.51)	145	1.13 (0.62,2.07)	115	0.81 (0.48, 1.37)	
5 Med-high	121	0.72 (0.44,1.19)	108	0.50 (0.26,0.94)	135	0.78 (0.43,1.42)	121	0.63 (0.38, 1.03)	
бHigh	133	1.06 (0.64,1.77)	123	0.88 (0.45,1.70)	158	1.00 (0.55,1.83)	133	1.03 (0.62, 1.72)	
Accessibility:									
High (ref.)	454	1.00	409	1.00	507	1.00	454	1.00	
0 Med-high	87	0.74 (0.29,1.88)	85	1.49 (0.50,4.44)	101	1.00 (0.30,3.36)	87	1.27 (0.49, 3.26)	
Poor	36	1.00 (0.36,2.76)	36	1.25 (0.37,4.20)	50	0.88 (0.25,3.05)	36	1.58 (0.58, 4.33)	
B Local Health Network:				· L					
5 Northern metro 6 (ref.)	93	1.00	94	1.00	107	1.00	93	1.00	
7 Central metro	197	0.55 (0.31,0.97)	169	0.86 (0.44,1.70)	204	1.19 (0.64,2.23)	197	0.61 (0.35, 1.06)	
⁸ Southern metro	136	0.40 (0.22,0.73)	118	0.61 (0.30,1.23)	174	0.89 (0.47,1.69)	136	0.44 (0.24, 0.80)	
9 OCountry South	67	0.89 (0.37,2.10)	64	0.45 (0.17,1.25)	76	1.99 (0.62,6.41)	67	0.70 (0.30, 1.63)	
1 Country North	84	0.67 (0.24,1.89)	85	1.48 (0.44,5.02)	97	2.61 (0.73,9.25)	84	0.57 (0.20, 1.62)	
² ACPS stage:									
A (ref.)	111	1.00	47	1.00	35	1.00	111	1.00	
5 В	183	1.31 (0.79,2.18)	127	0.90 (0.39,2.06)	119	1.35 (0.57,3.21)	183	1.18 (0.71, 1.95)	
¢C	160	1.65 (0.98,2.79)	210	1.39 (0.63,3.10)	287	3.81 (1.64,8.86)	160	1.43 (0.85, 2.40)	
D	99	0.83 (0.46,1.51)	123	0.67 (0.30,1.51)	196	1.30 (0.58,2.95)	99	0.79 (0.43, 1.44)	
g(UK)	24	(0.76 (0.28,2.06))	23	(0.74 (0.23,2.39))	21	(1.72 (0.44,6.71))	24	(0.83 (0.30,2.28))	
0 Grade:									
Well diff. (ref.)	20	1.00	20	1.00	19	1.00	20	1.00	
Mod diff.	442	0.60 (0.21,1.68)	376	1.59 (0.57,4.44)	473	1.43 (0.43,4.70)	442	0.78 (0.29, 2.08)	
4 Poorly/undiff.	76	0.52 (0.17,1.61)	80	2.63 (0.81,8.52)	96	2.14 (0.57,8.10)	76	0.71 (0.24, 2.08)	
5 (UK)	39	(1.38 (0.39,4.91))	54	(1.31 (0.40,4.29))	70	(0.72 (0.20,2.63))	39	(1.57 (0.47,5.27))	
Diagnosis year:									
<mark>8</mark> 2000 - 2005	328	1.00	283	1.00	331	1.00	328	1.00	
9 2006 - 2010	249	2.86 (1.98,4.12) ate logistic regress	247	1.76 (1.12,2.76)	327	1.34 (0.88,2.04)	249	3.09 (2.15, 4.43)	

⁶⁰ *Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods")

RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated. For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml Table S4: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for rectal cancer starting >60 days of diagnosis by treatment type,

stage, and socio-demographic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

		Surgery	נ	Radiotherapy	C	Chemotherapy	All treatment (surgical cases only)		
	n=577	RO (95% CLs)	n=530	RO (95% CLs)	n=658	RO (95% CLs)	n=577	RO (95% CLs)	
Age at diagnosis (years):									
≤50 (ref.)	38	1.00	66	1.00	80	1.00	38	1.00	
2 \$0 - 59	94	0.53 (0.23, 1.19)	104	2.41 (1.12, 5.17)	146	2.45 (1.26, 4.74)	94	1.28 (0.42, 3.93)	
4 50 - 69	162	0.49 (0.23, 1.05)	168	3.28 (1.60, 6.71)	225	3.46 (1.85, 6.49)	162	1.17 (0.40, 3.38)	
570 - 79	174	0.25 (0.12, 0.55)	147	2.69 (1.30, 5.56)	177	3.47 (1.82, 6.60)	174	1.21 (0.42, 3.48)	
6 ₈₀₊	109	0.26 (0.11, 0.59)	45	3.05 (1.24, 7.51)	30	3.95 (1.54, 10.17)	109	1.62 (0.55, 4.80)	
7 Sex:								· · ·	
Male (ref.)	331	1.00	344	1.00	419	1.00	331	1.00	
Female	246	0.77 (0.52, 1.13)	186	0.91 (0.61, 1.36)	239	1.04 (0.73, 1.46)	246	0.89 (0.56, 1.42)	
Socioeconomic:			4					. , ,	
Low (ref.)	208	1.00	181	1.00	220	1.00	208	1.00	
Low-med	115	1.29 (0.73, 2.27)	118	1.11 (0.65, 1.92)	145	0.61 (0.38, 0.98)	115	1.05 (0.53, 2.02)	
4 Med-high	121	1.04 (0.61, 1.78)	108	0.95 (0.55, 1.62)	135	0.94 (0.59, 1.50)	121	1.25 (0.67, 2.33)	
High	133	1.03 (0.60, 1.77)	123	1.28 (0.74, 2.22)	158	0.71 (0.44, 1.14)	133	0.81 (0.41, 1.58)	
Accessibility:								. , ,	
High (ref.)	454	1.00	409	1.00	507	1.00	454	1.00	
Med-high	87	0.26 (0.09, 0.73)	85	1.12 (0.41, 3.01)	101	0.98 (0.42, 2.25)	87	0.49 (0.13, 1.86)	
Poor	36	0.30 (0.10, 0.89)	36	1.53 (0.55, 4.31)	50	1.08 (0.45, 2.62)	36	0.83 (0.22, 2.67)	
Local Health Network:				2.					
4Northern metro 5(ref.)	93	1.00	94	1.00	107	1.00	93	1.00	
Central metro	197	0.53 (0.30, 0.95)	169	0.88 (0.50, 1.55)	204	1.70 (1.00, 2.89)	197	0.71 (0.36, 1.38)	
Southern metro	136	0.49 (0.26, 0.91)	118	0.55 (0.30, 1.03)	174	0.84 (0.48, 1.44)	136	0.63 (0.30, 1.30)	
Country South	67	0.69 (0.29, 1.61)	64	0.45 (0.18, 1.14)	76	1.36 (0.59, 3.17)	67	0.71 (0.25, 2.05)	
Country North	84	1.25 (0.42, 3.74)	85	0.70 (0.24, 2.01)	97	1.10 (0.44, 2.72)	84	0.67 (0.17, 2.71)	
ACPS stage:						~			
² A (ref.)	111	1.00	47	1.00	35	1.00	111	1.00	
β β	183	1.46 (0.82, 2.58)	127	1.26 (0.59, 2.67)	119	1.64 (0.69, 3.91)	183	1.04 (0.53, 2.02)	
3 β 4 4 6 θ	160	2.30 (1.30, 4.05)	210	1.76 (0.86, 3.58)	287	2.70 (1.19, 6.12)	160	1.15 (0.60, 2.24)	
Ð	99	1.34 (0.69, 1.61)	123	1.25 (0.59, 2.67)	196	1.95 (0.85, 4.51)	99	0.83 (0.37, 1.86)	
7(UK)	24	(1.65 (0.58, 4.67))	23	(0.35 (0.09, 1.43))	21	(1.33 (0.38, 4.68))	24	(1.45 (0.46,4.58)	
Grade:									
Well diff. (ref.)	20	1.00	20	1.00	19	1.00	20	1.00	
Mod diff.	442	0.30 (0.11, 0.82)	376	1.25 (0.45,3.44)	473	1.39 (0.50, 3.88)	442	0.35 (0.13, 0.95)	
Poorly/un-diff.	76	0.26 (0.09, 0.79)	80	1.70 (0.57,5.09)	96	1.51 (0.50, 4.52)	76	0.35 (0.11, 1.12)	
3 (UK)	39	(0.64 (0.19, 2.18))	54	(0.88 (0.28,2.84))	70	(0.83 (0.27, 2.59))	39	(0.76 (0.23,2.59	
Diagnosis year:									
52000 - 2005	328	1.00	283	1.00	331	1.00	328	1.00	
2006 - 2010	249	1.98 (1.35, 2.91)	247	1.02 (0.70,1.50)	327	1.21 (0.87, 1.69)	249	2.01 (1.26, 3.18)	

58

1

2 3

*Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods")

59 RO - Relative odds; CLs - confidence limits; ref. - reference; ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK -60 unknown; diff - differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated.

Reporting checklist for cohort study.

Based on the STROBE cohort guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the STROBE cohort reporting guidelines, and cite them as:

von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies.

31 32			4	Page
33			Reporting Item	Number
34 35 36 37 38	Title	#1a	Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
39 40 41 42	Abstract	#1b	Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
43 44 45	Background / rationale	#2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3
46 47 48 49	Objectives	#3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4
50 51	Study design	#4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	4
52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	Setting	#5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	4
60		For pee	er review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1 2 3	Eligibility criteria	#6a	Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up.	4
4 5 6 7		#6b	For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	n/a
8 9 10 11 12 13	Variables	#7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	4,5
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Data sources / measurement	#8	For each variable of interest give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group. Give information separately for for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.	4
22 23	Bias	#9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	10, 12
24 25	Study size	#10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	4
26 27 28 29 30 31	Quantitative variables	#11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen, and why	4,5
32 33 34 35	Statistical methods	#12a	Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	4,5
36 37 38		#12b	Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	4,5
39 40 41		#12c	Explain how missing data were addressed	4
42 43		#12d	If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	n/a
44 45 46		#12e	Describe any sensitivity analyses	4,5
46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54	Participants	#13a	Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow- up, and analysed. Give information separately for for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.	tables 1- 5
55 56		#13b	Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	n/a
57 58		#13c	Consider use of a flow diagram	n/a
59 60		For pee	er review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1 2 3 4 5 6	Descriptive data	#14a	Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders. Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.	5-14
7 8 9 10		#14b	Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	n/a
11 12		#14c	Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	n/a
13 14 15 16 17 18	Outcome data	#15	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time. Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.	5-14
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Main results	#16a	Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder- adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	5-14
26 27 28		#16b	Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	5-14
29 30 31 32		#16c	If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	n/a
33 34 35 36	Other analyses	#17	Report other analyses done—e.g., analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	n/a
37 38	Key results	#18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	14-15
 39 40 41 42 43 44 	Limitations	#19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias.	15
45 46 47 48 49	Interpretation	#20	Give a cautious overall interpretation considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence.	14-16
50 51 52 53	Generalisability	#21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	16
54 55 56 57 58	Funding	#22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	17
59 60		For pee	er review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

The STROBE checklist is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY. This checklist was completed on 10. April 2019 using <u>https://www.goodreports.org/</u>, a tool made by the <u>EQUATOR Network</u> in collaboration with <u>Penelope.ai</u>

totoeet eview only

BMJ Open

Time from diagnosis to treatment of colorectal cancer in a South Australian clinical registry cohort: how it varies and relates to survival

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031421.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Aug-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Roder, David; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Karapetis, Christos; Flinders University, Medical Oncology Olver, Ian; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Keefe, Dorothy; South Australia Department of Health, South Australian Cancer Service; The University of Adelaide, Adelaide Medical School Padbury, Robert; Flinders University, Medical Oncology Moore, James; Royal Adelaide Hospital, Colorectal Surgery; The University of Adelaide, Adelaide Medical School Joshi, Rohit; The University of Adelaide, Adelaide Medical School; Adelaide Oncology and Haematology, Cancer Research and Clinical Trials Wattchow, David; Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Surgery and Perioperative Medicine; Flinders University, Medical Oncology Worthley, Dan; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Gastrointestinal Cancer Biology Miller, Caroline; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Population Health; The University of Adelaide, School of Public Health Holden, Carol; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Population Health; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Powell, Kate; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Population Health Buckley, Elizabeth; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Powell, Kate; South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Population Health Buranyi-Trevarton, Dianne; South Australia Department of Health, South Australian Cancer Service Fusco, Kellie; University of South Australia, Cancer Research Institute Price, Timothy ; The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Clinical Cancer Research; The University of Adelaide, Adelaide Medical School
Primary Subject Heading :	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health, Epidemiology
Keywords:	Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Epidemiology < ONCOLOGY, PUBLIC HEALTH, Colorectal surgery < SURGERY

1	
2	
3 4	
5	SCHOLAR ONE [™]
6	Manuacrinta
7	Manuscripts
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14 15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32 33	
33 34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40 41	
41	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48 49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56 57	
57	
59	
60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Time from diagnosis to treatment of colorectal cancer in a South Australian clinical registry cohort: how it varies and relates to survival

Roder D*1, Karapetis C², Olver I¹, Keefe D^{3, 5}, Padbury R², Moore J^{5, 6}, Joshi R^{5,7}, Wattchow D^{2, 4}, Worthley DL⁸, Miller C^{9,10}, Holden C⁹, Buckley E¹, Powell K⁹, Buranyi-Trevarton D³, Fusco K¹, Price T^{5, 11}

¹ Cancer Research Institute, University of South Australia, Adelaide, SA, Australia

² Medical Oncology, Flinders University, Bedford Park, SA, Australia

³ South Australian Cancer Service, South Australia Department of Health, Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁴ Surgery and Perioperative Medicine, Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Bedford Park, SA, Australia

⁵ Adelaide Medical School, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁶ Colorectal Surgery, Royal Adelaide Hospital, Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁷ Adelaide Oncology and Haematology, Cancer Research and Clinical Trials, North Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁸ Gastrointestinal Cancer Biology, South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Adelaide, SA, Australia

⁹ Population Health, South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Adelaide, SA, Australia

¹⁰ School of Public Health, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA, Australia

¹¹ Clinical Cancer Research, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Woodville, SA, Australia

* Corresponding author

Email: david.roder@unisa.edu.au

Phone: +61 8 8302 2640

Word count: 4,546

Abstract

Objectives

Some early studies indicated lower survival with longer time from diagnosis to cancer treatment, but others showed the reverse. We investigated time to treatment of colorectal cancer and associations with survival.

Setting and participants

Clinical registry data for colorectal cancer cases diagnosed in 2000-2010 at four major public hospitals in South Australia and treated by surgery (n=1675), radiotherapy (n=616) and/or systemic therapy (n=1556).

Design

A historic cohort design, with rank-order tests for ordinal clinical and sociodemographic predictors and multiple logistic regression for comparing time from diagnosis to treatment. Unadjusted Kaplan-Meier estimates and adjusted Cox proportional hazards regression were used to investigate diseasespecific survival by time to treatment.

Outcome measures

Time to treatment and survival from diagnosis to death from colorectal cancer.

Results

Treatment (any type) commenced for 87% of surgical cases ≤ 60 days of diagnosis, with 80% having surgery within this period. Of those receiving radiotherapy, 59% began this treatment ≤ 60 days, and of those receiving systemic therapy, the corresponding proportion was 56%. Adjusted analyses showed treatment delay >60 days was more likely for rectal cancers, 2006-2010 diagnoses, residents of northern than other metropolitan regions, and for surgery, younger ages <50 years, and unexpectedly, those residing closer to metropolitan services. Adjusting for clinical and sociodemographic factors, and diagnostic year, better survival occurred in ≤ 2 years from diagnosis for time to treatment >30 days. Survival in the 3-10 years post-diagnosis generally did not differ by time to treatment, except for lower survival for any treatment >90 days for surgical cases.

Conclusions

The lower survival ≤ 2 years from diagnosis for treatment ≤ 30 days of diagnosis is consistent with other studies attributed to preferencing more complicated cases for earlier care. Lower 3-10-year survival for surgical cases first treated >90 days from diagnosis is consistent with previously reported U-shaped relationships.

Key words

Oncology epidemiology, protocols & guidelines, quality in health care, public health, colorectal surgery

Strengths and limitations of this study

Strengths:

Where data were available, they were high-quality clinical registry data on diagnosis, treatment, and sociodemographic covariables.

Access to clinical service providers to assist with data interpretation.

Limitations:

Precise diagnostic and treatment data were limited to 65% of cases.

The study was observational and vulnerable to bias from practitioner choice and self-selection by patients into comparison groups. The ability to adjust for potential confounding was limited by the range of data available.

Introduction

Australia has a high age-standardised incidence of colorectal cancer about 87% above the world average.¹ The corresponding colorectal cancer mortality rate is lower although still about 22% above the world average.¹ Colorectal cancer is second only to prostate cancer in numbers reported annually by Australian cancer registries and second only to lung cancer in numbers of cancer deaths.² Age-standardised incidence has been stable, with the 2012-2014 rate being within 1-2% of the rate for 1982-1984. By comparison, the age-standardised colorectal cancer mortality rate approximately halved between these periods.² This difference was accompanied by increases in 5-year relative survival from 52% in 1982-1986 to 70% in 2011-2015.^{3, 4}

South Australian clinical registry data for colorectal cancer covering four major public hospitals showed equivalent survival and survival increases to national figures during 1980-2010, with fiveyear disease-specific survival increasing from 48% to 63% for all stages combined.⁵ Stage distributions were largely unchanged, with survival increases mostly attributed to gains in stage-specific survival.⁵ Increases were particularly pronounced for regional stage.⁵ Survival increases followed increased use of adjuvant chemotherapies, particularly for regional disease.⁵ For rectal cancers, a significant increase in use of adjuvant radiotherapy was reported. The increases in adjuvant therapy were consistent with clinical practice guidelines.⁵ Chemotherapies evolved from common use of single-agent 5-FU (5-Fluorouracil) to 5-FU and leucovorin. FOLFOX (leucovorin calcium, 5-FU and oxaliplatin) ± bevacizumab and capecitabine (± oxaliplatin) also became more common, along with protracted infusion of 5-FU for colon cancer, and with radiotherapy for rectal cancers.⁵

While survival increases were attributed to changes in use of chemotherapy and radiotherapy, and increased surgical specialization,⁵ other influences were possible. One was a change in time from diagnosis to surgical treatment.⁶ In the United Kingdom, treatment delays were regarded as negatively related to survival and concerns were expressed that delays may be increasing due to increased demands for colonoscopy from population screening.^{7, 8} While there is limited evidence of effects of

treatment delays on survival, early evidence points to a possible negative effect.^{6, 7, 8} Delays were also viewed negatively as a likely source of psychosocial stress.^{6, 8} Cancer UK has indicated that ideally treatment would commence within one month of diagnosis but has recommended commencement within two months as a realistic target.⁹

Evidence of effects of time to treatment on survival has been mixed.¹⁰⁻¹⁸ Early studies generally pointed to lower survival with longer delay, but later studies varied with some showing better survival for longer delay, and some showing a U-shaped relationship with lower survival at both ends of the follow-up period.^{6-8, 10-18} This has raised questions of whether the relationship varies with the clinical environment, with lower survival for short delays potentially reflected triaging of more aggressive cancers for early treatment in some settings.^{12, 13, 15, 17}

In this study we explore times from diagnosis to treatment, trends in these times, variations across the patient population, and associations with survival. To establish a historic baseline, we analysed colorectal cancer data (2000-2010 diagnoses) from the South Australian registry data. Analyses indicated times to treatment and outcomes across the patient population at these hospitals by cancer stage, patient age, sex, socioeconomic status, service access, local health network of residence (as applying in the study period) and diagnostic epoch. We investigated whether a U-shaped relationship existed between time to treatment and survival, as reported elsewhere.^{6, 17}

The study was restricted to cancers where the registry had enough diagnostic detail from biopsies and other clinical sources to record a diagnosis date in advance of treatment, thereby providing an intervening period for analysis (65% of cases). This is analogous to common registry practice of restricting survival analyses to cancers where diagnosis dates preceded dates of death.¹⁹

Methods

A historic cohort design was used, including colorectal cancer patients diagnosed in 2000-2010 at four major public hospitals in South Australia Our data source was the South Australian clinical cancer registry, which is authorised under Section 64, Part 7 of the South Australian Health Care Act (2008) to support service monitoring and quality assurance.⁵ Ethics approval: Research ethics approval was obtained from the South Australian Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC/14/SAH/145) and University of South Australia Research Ethics Committee. Data sources and linkage: Data were extracted from the clinical registry and dates and causes of death by linkage with official death records using full names, dates of birth, and sex, and for additional guidance, postcode of residence, for linkage purposes. <u>Outcome measures</u>: These were time in days from diagnosis to treatment start, and survival from diagnosis to death from colorectal cancer.

Dates of diagnosis and treatment were checked from available pathology and clinical reporting to optimize accuracy. Times to treatment start were calculated to treatment of 2,746 colorectal cancers.²⁰

Cases were excluded if presenting acutely with bowel obstruction or perforation and treated surgically on day one.

Analyses were undertaken for surgical, radiotherapy and chemotherapies respectively, and any of these treatments among surgical cases. Chemotherapies were most commonly 5-FU (Adrucil, 5-FU) given intravenously, capecitabine (Xeloda) given as a pill, oxaliplatin (Eloxatin) given intravenously, irinotecan (Camptosar) given intravenously, and raltitrexed (Tomudex) given intravenously (<u>https://www.cancer. ca/en/cancer-information/cancer-type/colorectal/treatment/ chemotherapy/?region=on</u>).

Cases were classified by: sub-site (colon or rectum), Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging (ACPS) as A, B, C, D or unknown (UK), and grade,²¹ age at diagnosis, sex, area socioeconomic status,²² geographic access to specialist radiotherapy and other specialist metropolitan services based on postcode address (coded as high, medium-high or poor), local health network of residence, as applying during the study period (i.e., northern metropolitan, central metropolitan, southern metropolitan, and for non-metropolitan areas to the south, country south, and FOR non-metropolitan areas to the north, country north), and diagnostic period (2000-2005 and 2006-2010) (see Tables 1-3). Operational definitions are available in previous publications.^{5, 21, 22}

Time from diagnosis to treatments start was categorised in days for cross-tabulations with clinical and sociodemographic variables. <u>Statistical analysis:</u> The Spearman rank test was used to analyse ordinal clinical and sociodemographic predictors; Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA for multinomial predictors, and Whitney U test for predictors measured on a binary scale.^{23, 24} For multiple logistic regression analyses of time as the outcome variable, time was reduced to a binary outcome of ">30 or \leq 30 days" and ">60 or \leq 60 days" respectively.^{23, 24} The results were expressed as relative odds (i.e., odds ratios) with 95% confidence ranges. Disease-specific survival was analysed by time to treatment using Kaplan-Meier product-limit estimates (unadjusted) and Cox proportional hazards regression (adjusted for co-variables shown in Tables 2 and 3).^{23, 24}

The decision to use disease-specific survival rather than relative survival was supported by evidence of similar results from these methods in South Australia at a population level.⁵ Also, there were not lifetables (as required for relative survival) for patients referred to specialist clinics at these hospitals who often had extensive comorbidity and other complications.⁵ Results are presented using conventional non-hierarchical analyses as they were similar by hospital setting without evidence of clustering.

Public and Patient Involvement

BMJ Open

Registry development and workplans had substantial patient and consumer involvement through a formalized cancer planning and monitoring processes. Funders reviewing workplans included the Cancer Council South Australia through the Beat Cancer Project. Specialist clinics identify topics for review, of which some are based on/prompted by the questions raised by patients.

The use of the registry was approved by the Department of Health Research Ethics Committee and University of South Australia, both with active consumer involvement, thereby providing another level of public and consumer input.

This study involved the use of routinely collected registry data specifically authorized under state law and planned by clinical experts and consumers.

Participants all attended specialized gynaecological oncology clinics with whom we work. We work with these clinics in developing consumer messages for distribution to their patients and other relevant stakeholder groups.

Results

A. Time from diagnosis to treatment start (colorectal)

<u>Unadjusted analyses</u> – Time from diagnosis to treatment start.

Results are presented in Table 1 by treatment type.

Surgery: The proportion of surgical cases receiving surgery ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 80% (59% ≤ 30 days). Time to first surgical treatment was associated with: (a) age at diagnosis (p< 0.001) - shorter time for older patients; (b) sex (p=0.003) – shorter time for females; (c) local health network of residence (p=0.026) – longer time for northern metropolitan; (d) tumour sub-site (p< 0.001) – longer time for rectum; and (e) diagnostic period (p< 0.001) – longer time for 2006-2010. Significant associations were not found for other characteristics (p ≥ 0.118).

Radiotherapy: The proportion receiving radiotherapy whose treatment started ≤ 60 days was 59% (21% ≤ 30 days). Time to radiotherapy was associated with: (a) age at diagnosis (p=0.042) – longer time for older patients; and (b) tumour sub-site (p< 0.001) – shorter time for rectum (note: radiotherapy was uncommon for colonic cancers). Significant associations were not found for other characteristics (p ≥ 0.114).

Chemotherapy: The proportion receiving chemotherapy whose treatment started ≤ 60 days was 56% (15% ≤ 30 days). Time to chemotherapy was associated with: (a) age at diagnosis (p<0.001) – longer time for older patients; (b) local health network of residence (p=0.004) – shorter time for northern metropolitan; (c) tumour sub-site (p=0.018) – shorter time for rectum; (d) stage (p=0.003) – shorter time for stages A and D (note: chemotherapy was uncommon for stage A); and (e) diagnostic period (p<0.001) – longer time for 2006-2010. Significant associations were not found by other characteristics (p \geq 0.120).

Any treatment (surgical cases): The proportion receiving any treatment who did so starting ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 87% (62% \leq 30 days). Time to any treatment was associated with: (a) age at diagnosis (p=0.048) – although a clear age gradient was not evident; (b) sex (p=0.017) – shorter time for females; (c) local health network of residence (p<0.001) – longer time for the northern metropolitan area; (d) tumour sub-site (p < 0.001) – longer time for rectum; and (e) diagnostic period (p < 0.001) - longer time for 2006-2010. Significant associations were not found for other characteristics (p>0.104).

γ. .icint wi .idence (p<0.0; . (p<0.01) - longer .2010. Significant associat.

Page 9 of 27

BMJ Open

Table 1: Unadjusted analysis of percentages of colorectal patients by treatment type and days from diagnosis to treatment start: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

	Surgery					Radiotherapy				Chem	otherapy					Any Treatment								
	n	≤30	31 - 60	61 - 90	≥90	P value	n	≤30	31 - 60	61- 90	≥90	P value	n	≤30	31 - 60	61 - 90	≥90	P value	n	≤30	31-60	61-90	≥90	P valu
All cases	1675	59.0	21.2	6.0	13.9	-	616	20.9	37.8	17.4	23.9	-	1556	15.3	40.7	24.6	19.5	-	1675	61.7	25.6	7.1	5.6	-
Age at																								
diagnosis																								
(years):																								
<50	91	59.3	11.0	4.4	25.3	< 0.001	79	24.1	45.6	7.6	22.8	0.042	189	19.6	47.1	19.0	14.3	< 0.001	91	65.9	22.0	3.3	8.8	0.048
50 - 59	210	52.9	20.0	5.7	21.4		118	22.0	40.7	17.8	19.5		322	16.5	44.1	20.5	18.9		210	58.7	28.4	7.7	5.3	
60 - 69	388	52.3	22.9	5.9	18.8		188	20.7	35.6	12.3	22.3		498	16.1	38.0	26.7	19.3		388	57.1	29.1	6.8	7.0	
70 - 79	570	61.1	23.0	5.6	10.4		175	20.1	36.0	16.0	28.0		469	12.6	39.0	26.7	21.7		570	61.9	26.2	7.2	4.8	
80+	416	65.4	20.0	7.0	7.7		56	17.9	33.9	21.4	26.8		78	11.5	38.5	28.2	21.8		416	66.1	21.2	7.7	5.1	
Sex:																								
Males	893	56.0	21.9	5.9	16.1	0.003	400	19.8	38.5	18.0	23.8	0.567	910	16.3	39.0	23.8	20.9	0.649	893	59.2	27.3	7.1	6.4	0.017
Females	782	62.4	20.3	6.0	11.3		216	23.1	36.6	16.2	24.1		646	13.9	43.0	25.5	17.5		782	64.4	23.8	7.0	4.7	
Socioeconomic:																								
Low	544	56.3	22.8	5.9	15.1	0.118	206	16.0	43.2	18.9	21.8	0.826	507	13.4	39.4	26.4	20.7	0.664	544	58.8	28.0	6.6	6.6	0.104
Low-Med	388	60.3	19.8	6.7	13.1		137	24.8	36.5	16.8	21.9		374	16.6	44.9	21.9	16.6		388	62.7	24.9	7.0	5.4	
Med-High	345	58.6	21.4	5.5	14.5		128	24.2	35.2	18.8	21.9		320	16.3	40.0	27.5	16.3		345	61.9	24.1	8.1	5.8	
High	398	61.8	20.1	5.8	12.3		145	21.4	33.8	14.5	30.3		355	15.8	38.6	22.0	23.7		398	64.4	24.5	6.8	4.3	
Accessibility:																								
High	1353	58.9	20.4	6.4	14.3	0.584	475	22.1	36.4	16.8	24.6	0.764	1223	16.4	40.3	24.0	19.3	0.12	1353	61.8	25.1	7.3	5.9	0.992
Med-High	228	61.0	23.2	3.9	11.8		94	17.0	44.7	21.3	17.0		228	10.1	41.2	28.1	20.6		228	62.1	27.3	6.6	4.0	
Poor	94	55.3	27.7	4.3	12.8		47	17.0	38.3	14.9	29.8		105	13.3	43.8	23.8	19.0		94	58.5	29.8	5.3	6.4	
Local Health		00.0	27.7		12.0		.,	17.0	00.0	1.1.2	27.0		100	10.0	.5.0	20.0	17.0			00.0		0.0	0.1	
Network:																								
Northern metro	242	45.9	24.4	12.0	17.8	0.026	106	18.9	34.9	19.8	26.4	0.12	248	16.1	41.5	24.2	7.3	0.004	242	49.6	30.4	12.1	7.9	< 0.00
Central metro	618	61.7	20.2	6.8	11.3	0.020	202	21.8	32.7	17.8	27.7	0.12	495	17.8	36.6	26.5	19.2	0.001	618	64.1	24.0	7.3	4.7	0.00
Southern metro	417	64.3	17.7	3.4	14.6		134	25.4	40.3	14.2	20.1		426	16.7	42.7	20.7	20.0		417	66.8	23.0	4.8	5.3	
Country South	155	52.9	27.7	1.9	17.4		74	25.7	40.5	14.9	18.9		159	8.8	41.5	28.3	21.4		155	56.5	31.2	3.9	8.4	
Country North	241	60.2	22.0	5.0	12.9		100	11.2	46.9	19.4	22.4		228	11.0	44.5	25.1	19.4		241	61.9	26.2	7.4	4.5	
Sub-site:	211	00.2	22.0	0.0	12.9		100	11.2	10.9	17.1	22.1		220	11.0	11.5	20.1	17.1		211	01.9	20.2	7.1	1.0	
Colon	1098	65.0	22.1	4.9	7.9	< 0.001	86	11.6	12.8	14.0	61.6	< 0.001	898	13.1	40.2	27.4	19.3	0.018	1098	66.2	23.4	6.0	4.5	< 0.00
Rectum	577	47.5	19.4	8.0	25.1	-0.001	530	22.5	41.9	17.9	17.7	-0.001	658	18.2	41.3	20.7	19.8	0.010	577	53.1	29.9	9.2	7.8	-0.00
ACPS stage:	511	47.5	17.4	0.0	23.1		550	22.5	41.7	17.7	17.7		0.50	10.2	41.5	20.7	17.0		511	55.1	29.9	7.2	7.0	
A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	280	53.9	30.4	7.9	7.9	0.460	50	24.0	44.0	14.0	18.0	0.114	47	25.5	36.2	21.3	17.0	0.003	280	55.4	32.5	7.9	4.3	0.114
B	654	61.5	23.9	4.7	9.9	(A-D)	147	24.0	38.8	21.8	18.4	0.114	249	13.3	40.2	27.7	17.0	0.003	654	63.3	26.7	5.7	4.3	0.114
C C	412	55.6	17.2	6.8	20.4	(A-D)	231	16.0	40.7	21.8	22.1		696	6.6	40.2	27.6	18.5		412	58.9	25.6	8.8	6.8	
D	279		17.2	5.0	18.6		162	25.9	29.0	10.5	34.6		516	26.6	33.1	19.6	20.7		279	68.6	17.3	6.5	7.6	-
U (UK)	(50)	63.8					-						(48)						(50)		(20.4)	(10.2)	(10.2)	
	(30)	(51.5)	(18.2)	(12.1)	(18.2)		(26)	(27.3)	(59.1)	(4.5)	(9.1)		(48)	(26.9)	(34.6)	(15.4)	(23.1)		(50)	(59.2)	(20.4)	(10.2)	(10.2)	
Diagnosis																								
years:	869	65.0	17.5	5 /	12.1	< 0.001	225	22.0	24.0	15.0	26.2	0 000	702	17.4	44.2	21.2	17.1	< 0.001	860	68.0	21.4	62	4.4	< 0.00
2000 - 2005	009	65.0 52.5	17.5	5.4 6.6	12.1	~0.001	335 281	23.9 17.4	34.0 42.3	15.8 19.2	26.3	0.898	782	17.4 13.2	44.2	21.2	17.1 21.8	~0.001	869 806	<u>54.8</u>	21.4	6.2 8.0	4.4	~0.00

 $\frac{39}{39}$ *Excludes cases where insufficient data on date of diagnosis (see "Methods")

ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK - unknown

Page 8 of 19

Adjusted analyses – Predictors of treatment start >30 days from diagnosis.

Results are presented in Table 2 by treatment type.

Surgery: Significant predictors of time to surgical treatment >30 days included: (a) local health network of residence – relative odds (RO) of 0.55 (0.39, 0.76) for metropolitan central and 0.44 (0.31, 0.63) for metropolitan southern

compared with metropolitan northern; (b) tumour site - RO for rectum of 2.07 (1.66, 2.57); (c) tumour stage - RO of

0.65 (0.45, 0.93) for stage D (distant metastasis) compared with stage A; (d) grade – RO for high grade (poorly differentiated) at 0.47 (0.25, 0.87) compared with low grade; and (e) diagnostic period - RO of 1.82 (1.48, 2.24) for 2006-2010.

Radiotherapy: Only tumour site was predictive of time to radiotherapy start >30 days – RO of 0.40 (0.19, 0.83) for rectum (note: radiotherapy was much less common for colonic than rectal cancers⁵).

Chemotherapy: Significant predictors of time to chemotherapy treatment start >30 days included: (a) tumour site – RO for rectum of 0.65 (0.48, 0.89); (b) tumour stage – RO for stage C of 3.93 (1.85, 8.36); and (c) diagnostic period – RO of 0.65 (0.48, 0.89) for 2006-2010.

Any treatment (surgical cases): Significant predictors of time to start of any treatment >30 days included: (a) local health network of residence – RO of 0.56 (0.40, 0.78) for metropolitan central and 0.44 (0.30, 0.63) for metropolitan southern compared with metropolitan northern; (b) tumour site - RO of 1.76 (1.41, 2.19) for rectum; (c) tumour stage - RO of 0.56 (0.38, 0.80) for stage D compared with stage A; (d) grade - RO of 0.52 (0.28, 0.95) for high compared with low grade; and (e) diagnostic period - RO of 1.86 (1.51, 2.29) for 2006-2010.

Supplementary analyses with tumour stage classified as stage D vs A-C: RO odds for surgery start >30 days was lower for stage D for surgery at 0.69 (0.51, 0.92), radiotherapy at 0.56 (0.35, 0.88), chemotherapy at 0.30 (0.22, 0.41), and any treatment (surgical cases) at 0.64 (0.47, 0.86). The RO for chemotherapy treatment start >30 days for stage D vs A-C was 0.45 (0.30, 0.67) for 2000-2005 compared with 0.16 (0.10, 0.27) for 2006-2010.

2

3

BMJ Open

Table 2: Adjusted analysis of relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for colorectal cancer starting >30 days of

diagnosis by treatment type, stage, and socioeconomic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

4 5		Surgery		Radiotherapy		Chemotherapy	Any treatment			
, ,	N	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)		
Age at diagnosis										
(years): 50 (ref.)	91	1.00	79	1.00	189	1.00	91	1.00		
<u>3</u> 0 - 59	210	1.15 (0.68, 1.95)	118	1.06 (0.52, 2.15)	322	1.18 (0.71, 1.94)	210	1.20 (0.70, 2.05)		
50 - 59 <u>2</u> §0 - 69	388	1.16 (0.71, 1.90)	188	1.16 (0.60, 2.25)	498	1.25 (0.79, 2.00)	388	1.26 (0.76, 2.08)		
19 0 - 09 1 4 0 - 79	570	0.95 (0.59, 1.53)	175	1.13 (0.58, 2.22)	498	1.51 (0.93, 2.45)	570	1.20 (0.73, 1.95)		
80+								,		
	416	0.82 (0.50, 1.34)	56	1.09 (0.44, 2.73)	78	2.20 (0.95, 5.10)	416	1.04 (0.63, 1.72)		
Sex:	000	1.00	400	1.00	010	1.00	000	1.00		
Male (ref.)	893	1.00	400	1.00	910	1.00	893	1.00		
Bemale	782	0.85 (0.69, 1.05)	216	0.72 (0.47, 1.11)	646	1.08 (0.80, 1.47)	782	0.88 (0.72, 1.09)		
Socioeconomic:										
bbow (ref.)	544	1.00	206	1.00	507	1.00	544	1.00		
Low-med	388	1.17 (0.87, 1.59)	137	0.73 (0.40, 1.33)	374	0.92 (0.61, 1.39)	388	1.14 (0.84, 1.54)		
Med-high	345	1.06 (0.78, 1.42)	128	0.55 (0.30, 1.01)	320	0.89 (0.58, 1.38)	345	0.98 (0.73, 1.32)		
Prigh	398	1.05 (0.77, 1.42)	145	0.78 (0.42, 1.46)	355	0.94 (0.61, 1.45)	398	1.05 (0.77, 1.42)		
Accessibility:										
high (ref.)	1353	1.00	475	1.00	1223	1.00	1353	1.00		
Med-high	228	0.62 (0.36, 1.08)	94	1.28 (0.45, 3.65)	228	0.78 (0.30, 2.00)	228	0.75 (0.43, 1.31)		
BBoor	94	0.83 (0.45, 1.52)	47	1.14 (0.36, 3.58)	105	0.60 (0.23, 1.57)	94	0.89 (0.49, 1.63)		
4 Local Health Network:				(
Northern metro (ref.)	242	1.00	106	1.00	248	1.00	242	1.00		
Central metro	618	0.55 (0.39, 0.76)	202	0.90 (0.47, 1.72)	495	0.99 (0.62, 1.57)	618	0.56 (0.40, 0.78)		
Southern metro	417	0.44 (0.31, 0.63)	134	0.68 (0.35, 1.33)	426	0.84 (0.52, 1.35)	417	0.44 (0.30, 0.63)		
Country South	155	0.86 (0.51, 1.43)	74	0.52 (0.20, 1.38)	159	2.40 (0.90, 6.39)	155	0.78 (0.47, 1.30)		
Gountry North	241	0.78 (0.43, 1.43)	100	1.60 (0.49, 5.18)	228	2.03 (0.76, 5.39)	241	0.73 (0.40, 1.34)		
Tumour site:										
15 Golon (ref.)	1098	1.00	86	1.00	898	1.00	1098	1.00		
Rectum (incl. Rectosig.)	577	2.07 (1.66, 2.57)	530	0.40 (0.19, 0.83)	658	0.65 (0.48, 0.89)	577	1.76 (1.41, 2.19)		
ACPS stage:										
A (ref.)	280	1.00	50	1.00	47	1.00	280	1.00		
58	654	0.87 (0.64, 1.17)	147	1.03 (0.46, 2.28)	249	1.78 (0.81, 3.90)	654	0.80 (0.59, 1.08)		
5 <u>4</u>	412	0.99 (0.72, 1.37)	231	1.56 (0.72, 3.38)	696	3.93 (1.85, 8.36)	412	0.89 (0.65, 1.23)		
Ð	279	0.65 (0.45, 0.93)	162	0.71 (0.33, 1.55)	516	0.83 (0.40, 1.71)	279	0.56 (0.38, 0.80)		
UK)	(50)	(0.67, (0.31, 1.48))	(26)	(0.93 (0.28, 3.06))	(48)	(0.84 (0.27, 2.62))	(50)	(0.65 (0.33, 1.25))		
Grade:										
Well diff. (ref.)	58	1.00	25	1.00	37	1.00	58	1.00		
Mod diff.	1212	0.68 (0.39, 1.20)	429	1.34 (0.50, 3.58)	1054	1.18 (0.43, 3.22)	1212	0.72 (0.42, 1.25)		
	1	I	1	1	1	1	1	Page 10 of 19		

Poorly undiff.	285	0.47 (0.25, 0.87)	99	0.87 (0.62, 5.67)	309	1.28 (0.45, 3.68)	285	0.52 (0.28, 0.95)
1 2(UK)	(120)	(1.48 (0.75, 2.95))	(63)	(1.02 (0.33, 3.12))	(156)	(0.41, (0.14, 1.17))	(120)	(1.44 (0.74, 2.81))
³ Diagnosis year:								
4	869	1.00	335	1.00	782	1.00	869	1.00
62006 - 2010	806	1.82 (1.48, 2.24)	281	1.48 (0.97, 2.26)	774	0.65 (0.48, 0.89)	806	1.86 (1.51, 2.29)
10 RO – Relative unknown; di 12 unknown; di 13 Adjusted and 14 15 16 Adjusted and 17 Results are p 19 Surgery: Presson 20 0.85) for 70- 21 0.74) for me 24 health network 25 south compation 26 0.98) for integration 27 of 2.32 (1.54) 28 0.98) for integration 30 (1.20, 2.03) 31 Radiotherap 32 age at diagnage 33 age at diagnage 34 years, and 2. 35 years, and 2. 36 radiotherapy 37 Chemotherad 38 Chemotherad 40 (1.27, 2.64) 41 (1.27, 2.64) 42 (0.63, 0.97); 44 Any treatme 45 of residence 47 with metrop 48 high compar 50 Supplement	ve odds; ff. – diff alyses – presented edictors of resented or of resented or of of resented or of of resented of resen	Ferentiated; undiff Predictors of treatm d in Table 3 by treatm of time to surgery >6 0.48 (0.27, 0.85) for gh and 0.40 (0.18, 0. sidence – RO of 0.58 metropolitan north; for stage C and 1.76 e and 0.38 (0.18, 0.7 -2010. ctors of time to radio impared with age<50 4, 5.08) for 80+ years common for colonic ictors of time to cher ge at diagnosis – con 9 years and 2.08 (1.1 diagnostic period – H <i>cal cases</i>): Predictor 0.56 (0.36, 0.86) for orth; (d) tumour site – low grade; and (e) di <i>vses with tumour stag</i>	nits; re undiffe ent stan nent ty 0 days 80+ co 89) for (0.39, (d) tur (1.11, 2 9) for therapy years, ; and (cases). mother pared 9, 3.63 RO hig s of tir metro - RO fo agnost ge clas. 1.66) fo	ef. – reference; ACP erentiated. rt exceeding >60 da pe. for surgical cases in mpared with <50ye poor compared with 0.86) for metropoli nour site – RO for r 2.78) for stage D co high compared with y start >60 days for RO of 2.22 (1.20, 4 b) tumour site – RC apy treatment start = with under 50 years B) for 80+ years; and her at 1.65 (1.33, 2. ne to start of any tree politan central and for rectum at 1.82 (1) sified as stage D vs or surgery, 0.92 (0.6)	ys. ncluded ars ; (b) h high 1 tan cen ectum c mpared low gr cases tr 4.09) fo lower >60 day s, RO of 1 (b) tur 03) for eatment 0.42 (0. .34, 2.4 .59 (1.1 A-C: TI 51, 1.38	tralian Clinico-Patho (a) age at diagnosis (a) service accessibility (b) service accessibility (c) service accessibility (a - RO o accessib (-78) for (e) tumo (e) tumo (e) tumo (e) tumo (e) tumo (e) tumo (f) tumo	f 0.50 (0.29, f 0.37 (0.18, iility; (c) local metropolitan ur stage $-$ RO o of 0.51 (0.27, d $-$ RO of 1.56 ed (a) older (1) for 70-79 m (note: therapy years, 1.83 m of 0.78 health network uth compared .20, 0.93) for lays did not

2 3

4

BMJ Open

Table 3: Adjusted analysis of relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for colorectal cancer starting >60 days of

diagnosis by treatment type, stage, and socio-demographic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-

2010 diagnoses*

		Surgery	1	Radiotherapy	C	hemotherapy	Any treatment (surgical cases)		
	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95% CLs)	n	RO (95%	
Age at diagnosis (years):									
<50 (ref.)	91	1.00	79	1.00	189	1.00	91	1.00	
50 - 59	210	0.79 (0.94, 1.42)	118	1.54 (0.80, 2.99)	322	1.31 (0.89, 1.94)	210	1.00 (0.54,	
60 - 69	388	0.73 (0.42, 1.27)	188	2.22 (1.20, 4.09)	498	1.72 (1.20, 2.47)	388	1.11 (0.54,	
70 – 79	570	0.50 (0.29, 0.85)	175	2.00 (1.08, 3.71)	469	1.83 (1.27, 2.64)	570	1.10 (0.55,	
80+	416	0.48 (0.27, 0.85)	56	2.30 (1.04, 5.08)	78	2.08 (1.18, 3.63)	416	1.25 (0.61,	
Sex:									
Male (ref.)	893	1.00	400	1.00	910	1.00	893	1.00	
Female	782	0.79 (0.61, 1.04)	216	0.93 (0.64, 1.35)	646	0.93 (0.75, 1.15)	782	0.89 (0.66,	
Socioeconomic:									
Low (ref.)	544	1.00	206	1.00	507	1.00	544	1.00	
Low-med	388	1.37 (0.94, 2.01)	137	1.01 (0.61, 1.68)	374	0.74 (0.55, 1.00)	388	1.30 (0.84,	
Med-high	345	1.06 (0.73, 1.55)	128	0.95 (0.57, 1.57)	320	0.90 (0.67, 1.22)	345	1.17 (0.77,	
High	398	1.05 (0.71, 1.55)	145	1.21 (0.72, 2.01)	355	0.94 (0.69, 1.27)	398	1.07 (0.68,	
Accessibility:				~					
High (ref.)	1353	1.00	475	1.00	1223	1.00	1353	1.00	
Med-High	228	0.37 (0.18, 0.74)	94	1.36 (0.54, 3.39)	228	1.23 (0.71, 2.12)	228	0.47 (0.21,	
Poor	94	0.40 (0.18, 0.89)	47	1.50 (0.57, 3.95)	105	0.92 (0.50, 1.69)	94	0.55 (0.23,	
Local Health Network:				· L.					
Northern metro (ref.)	242	1.00	106	1.00	248	1.00	242	1.00	
Central metro	618	0.58 (0.39, 0.86)	202	0.84 (0.49, 1.44)	495	1.24 (0.89, 1.74)	618	0.56 (0.36,	
Southern metro	417	0.51 (0.33, 0.78)	134	0.56 (0.31, 1.00)	426	0.95 (0.67, 1.34)	417	0.42 (0.26,	
Country South	155	0.80 (0.44, 1.48)	74	0.43 (0.18, 1.02)	159	1.16 (0.66, 2.04)	155	0.80 (0.40,	
Country North	241	1.24 (0.59, 2.59)	100	0.56 (0.21, 1.50)	228	1.02 (0.56, 1.86)	241	0.97 (0.42,	
Tumour site:									
Colon (ref.)	1098	1.00	86	1.00	898	1.00	1098	1.00	
Rectum (incl. Rectosig.)	577	3.39 (2.59, 4.42)	530	0.18 (0.11, 0.32)	658	0.78 (0.63, 0.97)	577	1.82 (1.34, 2.46)	
ACPS stage:									
A (ref.)	280	1.00	50	1.00	47	1.00	280	1.00	
В	654	1.21 (0.80, 1.82)	147	1.28 (0.62, 2.64)	249	1.24 (0.64, 2.40)	654	0.88 (0.56,	
С	412	2.32 (1.54, 3.50)	231	1.73 (0.87, 3.43)	696	1.21 (0.65, 2.26)	412	1.39 (0.88,	
D	279	1.76 (1.11, 2.78)	162	1.37 (0.67, 2.82)	516	1.01 (0.53, 1.90)	279	1.19 (0.71,	
(UK)	(50)	(1.43 (0.59,	(26)	(0.38 (0.10,	(48)	(0.97 (0.35,	(50)	(1.46 (0.63	
Grade:									
Well diff. (ref.)	58	1.00	25	1.00	37	1.00	58	1.00	
Mod diff.	1212	0.51 (0.27, 0.98)	429	0.98 (0.40, 2.42)	1054	1.08 (0.54, 2.19)	1212	0.52 (0.23,	
Poorly/undiff.	285	0.38 (0.18, 0.79)	99	1.18 (0.44, 3.14)	309	1.10 (0.53, 2.29)	285	0.43 (0.20,	
(UK)	(120)	(1.09 (0.51, 2.37)	(63)	(0.66 (0.23,	(156)	(0.58 (0.27,	(120)	(0.99 (0.44	
Diagnostic year:									

2000 -	- 2005	869	1.00	335	1.00	782	1.00	869	1.00
	- 2010	806	1.56 (1.20, 2.03)	281	0.91 (0.64, 1.30)	774	1.65 (1.33, 2.03)	806	1.59 (1.18
*Deri	ved from n	nultivari	ate logistic regression	on (see	"Methods")				
		,		-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ustralia	an Clinico-Pathologi	ical Stag	ging; UK –
unk	nown; diff	– differe	entiated; undiff un	differei	ntiated.				
B.	<u>Time fron</u>	<u>ı diagno</u>	osis to treatment sta	art by s	sub-site (colon and	rectum	<u>1)</u>		
Col	on								
Res	ults are pre	sented in	n supplementary Tal	oles s1	& s2.				
•	Predictors	of time t	to treatment start >3	0 days	in adjusted analysis	include	ed: (a) For surgery: a	age 60-6	59 years
	compared	with <50) years; northern me	tropoli	an compared with c	entral n	netropolitan and sou	thern m	etropolitan;
	stage A co	mpared	with stages B and D	; and d	iagnosis in 2006-201	10; (b) I	For radiotherapy: no	o signifi	cant
	predictors	(small n	umbers); (c) <i>For che</i>	emothe	rapy: diagnosis in 20	006-201	0; (d) For any treat	ment (si	urgical
	cases): no	rthern m	etropolitan compare	ed with	central metropolitar	n and so	outhern metropolitan	areas; s	stage A
	compared	with stag	ges B and D; and dia	ignosis	in 2006-2010.				
•	Predictors	of time t	to treatment start of	>60 da	ys in adjusted analys	sis inclu	uded: (a) For surger	<i>y:</i> north	ern
	metropolita	an comp	ared with central an	d south	ern metropolitan are	eas; and	more advanced stag	ges C an	d D
	compared	with stag	ge A; (b) For radiot	herapy.	no significant pred	ictors (s	small numbers); (c)	For che	motherapy:
	diagnosis i	n 2006-2	2010; and (d) For an	ıy treat	ment (surgical cases	s): north	nern metropolitan co	mpared	with centra
	and southe	rn metro	politan areas.				-	-	
Rec	tum		-						
Res	ults are pre	sented in	n supplementary Tal	oles s3	& s4.				
•	Predictors	of time t	to treatment start of	>30 da	ys in adjusted analys	sis inclu	uded: (a) For surger	v: age 7	0+ compare
							n metropolitan areas	•	
	-		-	-			peconomic status; an		•
				•			<i>l cases</i>): northern m	Ū.	
			opolitan; and diagno	, í	•		,	1	1
			-			sis inclu	ided: (a) For surger	v: vouns	ger age <50
							an compared with ce	-	
	•					•	tion; and 2006-2010		
		-	0 1		0		ears; central metropo		
			•				<i>ical cases)</i> : low com		
		•	diagnosis in 2006-2					.parea .	
	•	-	from diagnosis to ti		nt start				
	idjusted an			cutific					
	ults are pre	•	Table 4						
				initial	surgery >30 days s	urvival	was lowest in the fir	rst two v	years from
			*				r follow-up, such that	2	
uiag	JIOSIS WIICI		minual surgery was	<u></u>	ys, our changeu with	inunuit	i ionow-up, such the	11 Uy 10	years nom

diagnosis, survival was lower when time to initial surgery was >90 days compared with \leq 30 days (p=0.017).

Radiotherapy: Survival was lowest in the first year when time to radiotherapy start was ≤ 30 days and reached

statistical significance compared with a time of 61-90 days (p=0.009), but not with 31-60 days (p=0.295) or >90 days

(p=0.280). After the first year of follow-up, survival was lowest for >90 days.

Chemotherapy: The survival pattern varied, with time to treatment \leq 30 days having the lowest survival at each followup time.

Any treatment (surgical cases): Compared with time to initial treatment >30 days, survival was lowest in the first two years from diagnosis when time to initial surgery was \leq 30 days, but changed with further follow-up, such that by 10 years from diagnosis, survival was lower when time to initial surgery was >90 days compared with \leq 30 days (p=0.021).

Table 4: Unadjusted analysis of percentage survival (± standard error) from colorectal cancer by time from diagnosis (days) to commitment of specified treatment: South Australian major public hospitals, diagnoses 2000-2010*

	0		-	Follow-up	o time fro	m diagno	sis (years	5)
Specified treatment	Time (days)	Numbers of cases	1	2	3	4	5	10
	≤30	988	85.4 ±1.2	78.2 ± 1.5	72.9 ± 1.5	69.8 ± 1.6	67.5 ±1.7	63.3 ± 2.0
Surgical treatment	31 - 60	355	93.1 ± 1.6	89.9 ± 1.9	84.7 ± 2.2	81.9 ± 2.4	79.7 ± 2.5	75.9 ± 2.9
	61 - 90	100	92.9 ± 3.7	84.1 ± 4.6	77.5 ± 5.3	74.6 ± 5.5	72.6 ± 5.8	57.7 ± 9.0
	>90	232	92.6 ± 2.2	82.4 ± 2.9	73.9 ± 3.2	67.4 ± 3.5	67.8 ± 3.7	50.4 ± 5.0
	≤30	129	82.0 ± 4.0	70.0 ± 4.5	62.4 ± 4.7	58.0 ± 4.7	53.1 ± 4.8	44.4 ± 5.5
Radiotherapy	31-60	233	87.0 ± 2.6	77.8 ± 3.0	68.2 ± 3.4	64.4 ± 3.5	61.3 ± 3.6	55.2 ± 4.4
	61 – 90	107	95.3 ± 3.2	87.5 ± 4.1	79.4 ± 4.7	73.8 ± 5.1	64.8 ± 5.5	49.0 ± 6.9
	>90	147	87.6 ± 3.3	62.6 ± 4.3	53.1 ± 4.4	42.8 ± 4.3	39.2 ± 4.3	27.3 ± 4.3
	≤30	238	68.0 ± 3.3	52.8 ± 3.4	43.4 ± 3.3	40.7 ± 3.3	38.4 ± 3.3	33.1 ± 3.4
	31 - 60	633	87.2 ± 3.4	73.8 ± 1.8	67.9 ± 2.0	62.8 ± 2.0	59.4 ± 2.1	49.5 ± 2.5
Chemotherapy	61 - 90	382	92.3 ± 1.6	78.8 ± 2.3	68.9 ± 2.6	64.5 ± 2.7	59.8 ± 2.8	56.1 ± 3.0
	>90	303	94.4 ± 1.7	78.1 ± 2.6	68.6 ± 2.9	63.2 ± 3.0	56.8 ± 3.1	45.1 ± 3.9
Any treatment (surgical cases only)	≤30	1030	85.5 ±1.1	78.1 ± 1.3	72.6 ± 1.4	69.4 ± 1.5	67.2 ± 1.6	63.1 ± 1.8
	31 - 60	428	93.4 ± 1.2	88.8 ± 1.5	83.8 ± 1.8	80.5 ± 2.0	78.0 ± 2.2	71.5 ± 2.9
·····; /	61 – 90	118	94.0 ± 2.2	85.9 ± 3.3	79.6 ± 3.9	74.8 ± 4.4	71.7 ±4.7	56.6 ± 7.8

Page 14 of 19

		>90	99	91.7 ± 2.8	82.2 ± 3.9	71.9 ± 4.7	63.9 ± 5.2	57.1 ± 5.6	43.8 ± 8.2
* Kaplan-Me	eier product-lim	it estimate;	date of cense	oring of li	ve cases:	Dec 31, 2	012		

<u>Adjusted analysis</u>

Results are presented in Table 5.

Because visual examination and interaction terms indicated a lack of proportionality of survival with time to treatment, results are split in Table 5 for follow-up of ≤ 2 and 3-10 years as mutually exclusive periods. Irrespective of treatment type, lower hazard ratios applied for periods ≤ 2 years with times to treatment of >30 days, after adjusting for age, sex, socioeconomic status, service accessibility, local health network of residence, tumour sub-site, stage, grade and diagnostic period. Hazard ratios similarly adjusted generally did not decrease across the 3-10 follow-up, suggesting no significant differences in conditional survival after two years for cases treated ≤ 30 days of diagnosis and >30 days. While there were higher hazard ratios for times of 61-90 and >90 days for 3-10-year follow-up from surgical treatment and radiotherapy respectively, statistical significance was only achieved for any treatment (surgical cases) when comparing time to treatment >90 compared with ≤ 30 days (p=0.022).

Table 5: Adjusted analysis of hazard ratios (95% confidence limits) of deaths from colorectal cancer by time from diagnosis (days) to commencement of specified treatment: South Australians major public hospitals, diagnoses 2000-2010*

			Follow-up time	from diag	ioses
			≤2 years	3	-10 years
Treatment	Time	Number of cases	Hazard ratios	Number of cases	Hazard ratios
	≤30	988	1.00	714	1.00
Surgical treatment	31 - 60	355	0.57 (0.40, 0.82)	302	0.92 (0.62, 1.36)
	61 – 90	100	0.59 (0.35, 1.02)	76	1.13 (0.60, 2.10)
	>90	232	0.59 (0.41, 0.84)	186	1.24 (0.85, 1.83)
	≤30	129	1.00	87	1.00
Dedicathonomy	31 - 60	233	0.85 (0.54, 1.32)	173	1.00 (0.59, 1.72)
Radiotherapy	61 - 90	107	0.44 (0.23, 0.84)	89	1.26 (0.70, 2.27)
	>90	147	0.62 (0.40, 0.98)	89	1.60 (0.90, 2.85)
	≤30	238	1.00	120	1.00
Cham ath anomy	31 - 60	633	0.71 (0.55, 0.92)	459	0.98 (0.66, 1.47)
Chemotherapy	61 – 90	382	0.51 (0.38, 0.70)	289	1.01 (0.65, 1.55)
	>90	303	0.40 (0.30, 0.55)	233	1.04 (0.68, 1.59)
	≤30	1030	1.00	744	1.00
Any treatment	31 - 60	428	0.59 (0.43, 0.81)	361	0.94 (0.66, 1.33)
(surgical cases only)	61 – 90	118	0.48 (0.43, 0.81)	95	1.11 (0.66, 1.89)
	>90	99	0.62 (0.37, 1.02)	78	1.83 (1.12, 2.98)

*4 Cox proportional hazards regression analyses (1 per treatment category), adjusting for age, sex, socioeconomic status, service accessibility, local health network, sub-site, stage, grade and diagnostic period (see tables 2 and 3); date of censoring of live cases: Dec 31, 2012.

Discussion

The proportion of surgical patients receiving any treatment for their cancer ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 87%, with 80% receiving surgical treatment within 60 days of diagnosis. This broadly accords with targets set by Cancer UK.⁹ The proportion receiving radiotherapy who started this therapy ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 59%, whereas the corresponding percentage having chemotherapies who started this therapy ≤ 60 days of diagnosis was 56%. The longer delay for radiotherapy and chemotherapy is consistent with their common use as adjuvant therapies following surgery.⁵

Longer time to surgery applied for cancers of the rectum than colon potentially reflecting the increased use of magnetic resonance imaging for rectal cancers, ²⁵ and multimodal therapies,⁵ which may have led to surgery delays through more multidisciplinary consultation and in some instances, neoadjuvant care.²⁶

The longer time to surgery in 2006-2010 may also have been influenced by increasing use of multimodal therapies and more advanced diagnostics (e.g., magnetic resonance imaging), increasing the need for multidisciplinary consultation.^{5, 26} While the introduction of population-based screening may have contributed, the screening program was still at an early phase of development, being phased in from 2006 to 2020. Following more complete implementation of bowel screening, there may be increased pressure on services which may increase times to surgery.^{7, 8} The higher proportion with a time to surgery >60 days for stages C and D compared with stage A may reflect time taken for symptom control, multidisciplinary team consultation, and provision of neoadjuvant therapies.^{27, 28} The proportion with a time to surgery >60 days was lower for higher grade tumours, potentially due to a greater perceived urgency of surgical intervention for more aggressive tumours.

The proportion receiving surgery, who did so >60 days from diagnosis, tended to be lower among those aged 70+ years, central and southern compared with northern metropolitan areas, those diagnosed in 2000-2005 compared with 2006-2010, and unexpectedly, those residing closer to metropolitan services. The reasons are unclear but may reflect differences in service busyness and patterns of patient and service demand.

Of those receiving radiotherapy, the proportion starting this therapy >60 days from diagnosis tended to be higher for ages \geq 60 years than the <50 years. A similar pattern applied for chemotherapy. The reasons are not known. Perhaps a longer recovery time post-surgery has been allowed for older cases post-surgery before commencing adjuvant therapies, or longer delays occurring due to higher levels of frailty and comorbidity, and more common complications of surgery.

Radiotherapy was relatively uncommon for colon cancers, as recommended in clinical guidelines and optimal care pathways, ^{27, 28} but when it was provided, it tended to start later than for rectal cases. Similarly, chemotherapies tended to commence later for colon than rectal cancers. Further research is needed to determine the reasons for these patterns. Chemotherapies were less likely to commence >30 days from diagnosis for 2006-2010 diagnoses. Conversely chemotherapies were more inclined to occur >60 days from diagnosis in 2006-2010. Again, further research is needed to explain these patterns.

57 Where the time from diagnosis to treatment was >30 days, the risk of death occurring ≤ 2 years of diagnosis was lower. 58 This was evident by therapy type after adjusting for stage and grade, and sociodemographic factors. It may reflect the 60 triaging for priority treatment \leq 30 days for cases with elevated comorbidity or other risk factors not recorded by the

registry. While a statistically significant U-shaped relationship of survival with time to treatment start was usually not apparent for specific therapies, as indicated in some other studies, $^{6, 17}$ the hazard ratio for 3-10 years was elevated when the time to first treatment was >90 days for surgical cases (p=0.022).

The present study has limitations. An opportunistic approach was taken in selecting cases where evidence was available on size of the gap between recorded diagnosis date and start of treatment. This raises questions about the representativeness of results. Nonetheless, results are similar to those of other recent studies in showing poorer short-term survival for cases receiving surgical treatment soon after diagnosis, and with a similar pattern applying for early treatment by radiotherapy and chemotherapies.^{12, 14, 15, 17}

Results should not be construed as indicating a lack of benefit from early treatment, given likely confounding effects of patient selection in treatment scheduling. A positive feature was the approximate 87% of surgical cases receiving their first treatment (any treatment) \leq 60 days and 80% treated surgically within this period (note: 83% for 2000-2005 and 78% for 2006-2010).⁹ The indication of a temporal decline in this percentage warrants continued monitoring and investigation, particularly for patient groups where a higher proportion was not receiving surgical care \leq 60 days of diagnosis (e.g., patients aged under 50 years, those with advanced disease, those with rectal cancer, and residents of the northern metropolitan rather than central or southern metropolitan areas).

The study highlights the benefit of linking diagnostic data to treatment data. Population-wide data linkage of population-based cancer registry, hospital, radiotherapy-centre, Medicare insurance and screening data, and potentially in the future, electronic medical record data and selected research databases will further strengthen the data infrastructure available for describing clinical management pathways and associations with survival across the population. Clinical registries will still be important for more detailed investigations for the sub-groups they cover, and for validating results of population-wide registry and administrative sources.

Conclusions

Baseline data for major public hospitals in South Australia in 2000-2010 indicate that for cases where the clinical registry recorded a diagnosis in advance of the surgery date, approximately 87% of surgical cases receiving any treatment and 80% of cases received their surgical treatment \leq 60 days of diagnosis. This is broadly consistent with timeline targets of Cancer UK. Radiotherapy and chemotherapies generally started later, potentially reflecting their use as adjuvant therapies.

Adjusted analyses indicated lower survival up to two years from diagnosis when treatment commenced \leq 30 days of diagnosis, potentially reflecting triaging for early care of cases with aggressive cancers and higher clinical complexity. By comparison, adjusted analyses did not show differences in survival for follow-up periods from diagnosis of 3-10 years where longer times to treatment applied, except for time to any treatment (surgical cases) of >90 days when survival was lower.

These results should not be interpreted as evidence of the importance or unimportance of delays, given selection factors in scheduling patient care. Treatment commencement was generally later in 2006-2010 than 2000-2005, possibly reflecting increased use of adjuvant therapies, increased use of multidisciplinary teams, and more advanced diagnostics (e.g., magnetic resonance imaging). Increased demand may be placed on timeliness of clinical services with extensions in population screening.

BMJ Open

Further research is needed to optimize patient scheduling for better outcomes.

Funding statement

Undertaken with the financial support of Cancer Council's Beast Cancer Project on behalf of its donors and the State Government through the Department of Health.

Informed consent

Waiver of consent for use of de-identified data collected under authorisation of Part 7 of the South Australian Health Care Act. Note: large numbers of patients had deceased, and many are in the terminal stages of their cancer. Consent processes would be intrusive and would invalidate the database as an unbiased data source.

Author contributions

Study concept: DR, TP; Study design: DR TP, CK, RP, JM; Data acquisition: DB, KP; Quality control of data: DB, KP, KF; Data analysis: DR, KF ; Data interpretation: DR, CK, IO, DK, RP, JM, RJ, DW, DLW, TP; Report writing: DR, KF; Review of report: DR, CK, IO, DK, RP, JM, RJ, DW, DLW, TP, CM, CH, EB. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Data sharing

The data for this study are available through the South Australian Cancer Service and SA Cancer Registry.

Restrictions to data use apply as conditions of legal authorization and data custodian and ethics approval.

Competing interests

D Roder reports grants from Cancer Council SA, during the conduct of the study.

References

- Ferlay J, Ervik M, Lam F, et al. Global Cancer Observatory: Cancer Today. France: International Agency for Research on Cancer; 2018. <u>https://gco.iarc.fr/today</u> (accessed 28 September 2018).
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2018 Cancer Data in Australia; Australian Cancer Incidence and Mortality (ACIM) books: all cancers combined, Canberra: AIHW; 2018.
 - https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/cancer/cancer-data-in-australia/ (accessed 23 January 2019).
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW), Cancer data in Australia. Cat. no: CAN 122. Canberra: AIHW; 2018. <u>https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/cancer/cancer-data-in-australia/contents/summary</u> (accessed 23 January 2019).
- 4. Australian Government, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Cancer Australia, Australasian Association of Cancer Registries. Cancer survival and prevalence in Australia: cancers diagnosed from 1982 to 2004. Cancer Series no. 42. Cat. No. CAN 38. Canberra: AIHW; 2008.
- 5. Roder D, Karapetis C, Wattchow D, et al. Colorectal cancer treatment and survival: the experience of major public hospitals in South Australia over three decades. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2015; 16(6): 2431-40.
- 6. Singh H, De Coster C, Shu E, et al. Wait times from presentation to treatment for colorectal cancer: A population-based study. *Canadian J Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 2010; 24(1): 33-9.
- 7. Hanna SJ, Muneer A, Khalil KH. The 2-week wait time for suspected cancer. Time to rethink? *Int J Clin Pract* 2005; 59(11):1334-39.

- 8. Roncoroni L, Pietra N, Violi V, et al. Delay in the diagnosis and outcome of colorectal cancer: a prospective study. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 1999; 25(2): 173-8.
- Cancer Research UK. Cancer waiting times. London: Cancer Research UK; 2018. <u>https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/about-cancer/cancer-in-general/treatment/access-to-treatment/waiting-times-after-diagnosis (accessed 23 January 2019).</u>
- 10. Barillari P, de Angelis R, Valabrega S, et al. Relationship of symptom duration and survival in patients with colorectal carcinoma. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 1989; 15(5): 441-5.
- 11. Gonzalez-Hermoso F, Perez-Palma J, Marchena-Gomez J, et al. Can early diagnosis of symptomatic colorectal cancer improve diagnosis. *World J Surg* 2004; 28(7): 716-20.
- 11
 12. Rupassara KS, Ponnusamy S, Withanage N, et al. A paradox explained? Patients with delayed diagnosis of symptomatic colorectal cancer have good prognosis. *Colorectal Dis* 2006; 8(5): 423-9.
 - 13. Jullumstrø E, Lydersen S, Møller B, et al. Duration of symptoms, stage at diagnosis and relative survival in colon and rectal cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 2009; 45(13): 2383-90.
 - 14. Pruit SL, Harzke AJ, Davidson NO, et al. Do diagnostic and treatment delays for colorectal cancer increase risk of death? *Cancer Causes Control* 2013; 24(5): 961-77.
- 18
 15. Amri R, Bordeianou LG, Sylla P, et al. Treatment delay in surgically-treated colon cancer: does it affect outcomes? *Ann surg Oncol* 2014; 21(12): 3909-16.
- 16. Young CG, Varghese R, Stephens JH, et al. Colorectal cancer survival is not affected by delay in diagnosis. *Clin Surg* 2016; 1: 1238.
- 17. Pita-Fernández S, González-Sáez L, López-Calviño B, et al. Effect of diagnostic delay on survival in patients with colorectal cancer: a retrospective cohort study. *BMC Cancer* 2016; 16(1): 664.
 - Wanis KN, Patel SV, Brackstone M. Do moderate surgical treatment delays influence survival in colon cancer? *Dis Colon Rectum* 2017; 60(12): 1241-9.
 - 19. Okuyama A, Shibata A, Nishimoto H. Critical points for interpreting patients' survival rate using cancer registries: a literature review. *J Epidemiol* 2018; 28(2): 61-6.
 - 20. Commission on Cancer. FORDS: Facility Oncology Registry Data Standards: Revised for 2016. Chicago, IL: American College of Surgeons, 2016.
 - 21. Davis NC, Newland RC. Terminology and classification of colorectal adenocarcinoma: the Australian clinico pathological staging system. *ANZ J Surg* 1983; 53(3): 211-21.
 - 22. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Socio-Economic indexes for areas. Canberra: ABS, 2018.
 - 23. Armitage P, Berry G. Statistical methods in medical research. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications, 1987.
 - 24. Statistical Analysis System. The SAS platform: SAS Enterprise Guide 7.1. Cary NC: SAS, 2018.
 - 25. Jhaveri KS, Hosseini-Nik H. MRI of rectal cancer: An overview and update of recent advances. *Am J Roentgenology* 2015; 205(1): W42-55.
 - 26.Cancer Council NSW. Bowel cancer. Your health care team. Sydney: Cancer Council; 2017. https://www.cancercouncil.com.au/bowel-cancer/diagnosis/health-professionals/ (accessed 28 September 2018).
 - 27. Cancer Council Australia Colorectal Cancer Guidelines Working Party. Clinical practice guidelines for the
 prevention, early detection and management of colorectal cancer. Sydney: Cancer Council Australia.
 <u>https://wiki.cancer.org.au/australia/Guidelines:Colorectal cancer</u> (accessed 1 January 2018).
 - 28. National Cancer Expert Reference Group (NCERG). Optimal care pathway for people with colorectal cancer.
 - Sydney: Cancer Council Australia; 2016. <u>https://www.cancer.org.au/health-professionals/optimal-cancer-care-pathways.html</u> (accessed 28 September 2018).

3

4

Supplementary tables

Table S1: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for colon cancer starting >30 days of diagnosis by treatment type,

stage, and socioeconomic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

5 6		Surgery		Radiotherapy	0	Chemotherapy	Any tr	eatment (surgical cases)
7	n=1098	RO (95% CLs)	n=86	RO (95% CLs)	n=898	RO (95% CLs)	n=1098	RO (95% CLs)
9 <mark>Age at</mark> 1 d iagnosis 1(years):								
12 ⁵⁰ (ref.)	53	1.00	13	1.00	109	1.00	53	1.00
1 3 0 - 59	116	1.61 (0.75, 3.46)	14	1.03 (0.05, 21.46)	176	0.84 (0.40, 1.76)	116	1.28 (0.59, 2.78)
1 6 0 - 69	226	2.10 (1.03, 4.28)	20	2.82 (0.20, 40.71)	273	0.91 (0.45, 1.83)	226	1.86 (0.92, 3.80)
1 7 0 - 79	396	1.65 (0.83, 3.28)	28	3.49 (0.27, 45.20)	292	1.37 (0.68, 2.79)	396	1.55 (0.78, 3.09)
16 17 ⁰⁺	307	1.50 (0.74, 3.03)	11	NA	48	2.52 (0.78, 8.17)	307	1.43 (0.71, 2.88)
1Sex:								
1 Male (ref.)	562	1.00	56	1.00	491	1.00	562	1.00
2 B emale	536	0.87 (0.67, 1.13)	30	2.65 (0.27, 1.64)	407	1.23 (0.79, 1.91)	536	0.89 (0.68, 1.16)
² Socioeconomic:								
²² Low (ref.)	336	1.00	25	1.00	287	1.00	336	1.00
23 ₂ Jow-Med	273	1.69 (0.99, 2.12)	19	1.69 (0.09, 30.68)	229	0.71 (0.39, 1.27)	273	1.46 (1.00, 2.14)
<u>24</u> 2∦ded-High	224	1.31 (0.90, 1.90)	20	7.01 (0.22, 223.56)	185	0.93 (0.49, 1.78)	224	1.28 (0.88, 1.88)
2 H igh	265	1.12 (0.76, 1.67)	22	1.37 (0.07, 27.36)	197	0.85 (0.45, 1.62)	265	1.09 (0.73, 1.62)
² Accessibility:								
²⁸ High (ref.)	899	1.00	66	1.00	716	1.00	899	1.00
29 Med-High	141	0.57 (0.28, 1.15)	9	NA	127	0.41 (0.09, 1.97)	141	0.57 (0.28, 1.16)
30 3Foor	58	0.71 (0.33, 1.57)	11	NA	55	0.25 (0.05, 1.21)	58	0.63 (0.28, 1.38)
3Docal Health 3Detwork:				2				
³ Northern metro 3(ref.)	149	1.00	12	1.00	141	1.00	149	1.00
³⁶ Central metro	421	0.49 (0.32, 0.75)	33	0.31 (0.01, 6.39)	291	0.85 (0.41, 1.76)	421	0.48 (0.31, 0.73)
3Southern metro	281	0.39 (0.25, 0.63)	16	0.58 (0.03, 11.80)	252	0.83 (0.39, 1.78)	281	0.37 (0.24, 0.60)
3 G ountry South	88	0.69 (0.36, 1.33)	10	NA	83	3.94 (0.70, 22.22)	88	0.69 (0.36, 1.34)
4 C ountry North	159	0.78 (0.37, 1.66)	15	NA	131	2.42 (0.47, 12.36)	159	0.76 (0.35, 1.63)
⁴ ACPS stage:						5		
42 (ref.) 43 44 44 45	169	1.00	3	1.00	12	1.00	169	1.00
43 4 3	471	0.67 (0.46, 0.98)	20	43.60 (0.38, 49.56)	130	1.60 (0.16, 16.54)	471	0.65 (0.45, 0.95)
4 4 4§	252	0.69 (0.46, 1.06)	21	24.12 (0.22, 26.91)	409	1.76 (0.19, 16.48)	252	0.66 (0.43, 1.00)
4 ð	180	0.54 (0.33, 0.86)	39	4.39 (0.07, 27.89)	320	0.24 (0.03, 2.17)	180	0.44 (0.27, 0.72)
4 / UK)	(26)	(0.64 (0.26, 1.57))	(3)	NA	(27)	(0.41 (0.04, 4.48))	(26)	(0.58 (0.23, 1.43))
⁴ Grade:								
49 Well diff. (ref.)	38	1.00	5	1.00	18	1.00	38	1.00
50 5¥10d diff.	770	0.85 (0.43, 1.68)	53	1.49 (0.11, 19.97)	581	0.58 (0.07, 4.81)	770	0.82 (0.41, 1.62)
5Doorly/undiff.	209	0.57 (0.27, 1.21)	19	1.11 (0.06, 21.24)	213	0.46 (0.05, 3.89)	209	0.54 (0.26, 1.15)
5¢UK)	(81)	(1.87 (0.82, 4.26))	(9)	NA	(86)	(0.13 (0.02, 1.11))	(81)	(1.62 (0.71, 3.69))
⁵ Diagnosis year:								
55000 - 2005	541	1.00	52	1.00	451	1.00	541	1.00
56 57006 - 2010	557	1.41 (1.09, 1.83)	34	0.21 (0.03, 1.64)	447	1.59 (1.02, 2.48)	557	1.39 (1.07, 2.88)

58 Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods")

59

RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; NA – not applicable; ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated.

Table S2: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for colon cancer starting >60 days of diagnosis by treatment type, stage, and socio-demographic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

3 4 5	Surgery		Radio	therapy	Chemo	therapy	Any trea cases on	ntment (surgical ly)
6 7	n=1098	RO (95% CLs)	n=86	RO (95% CLs)	n=898	RO (95% CLs)	n=1098	RO (95% CLs)
8Age at								
9diagnosis								
1(years):	53	1.00	12	1.00	100	1.00	53	1.00
1₹50 (ref.)		1.00	13	1.00	109	1.00		
1 <u>3</u> 0 - 59 130 - 69	116	1.34 (0.51, 3.51)	14	0.06 (0.00, 1.37)	176	0.94 (0.57, 1.55)	116	0.75 (0.25, 2.21)
	226	1.28 (0.51, 3.20)	20	0.17 (0.01, 3.57)	273	1.16 (0.73, 1.84)	226	1.10 (0.41, 2.93)
14 70 - 79 15	396	1.10 (0.45, 2.66)	28	0.35 (0.02, 7.07)	292	1.26 (0.80, 2.01)	396	0.99 (0.38, 2.53)
18 ⁰⁺	307	1.00 (0.40, 2.47)	11	0.30 (0.01, 7.36)	48	1.60 (0.78, 3.29)	307	1.01 (0.38, 2.65)
1\$ex:					10.1			4.00
18/1ale (ref.)	562	1.00	56	1.00	491	1.00	562	1.00
1pemale	536	0.83 (0.57, 1.20)	30	1.01 (0.23, 4.35)	407	0.84 (0.64, 1.14)	536	0.94 (0.62, 1.41)
20 Socioeconomic: 21								
2 ² ow (ref.)	336	1.00	25	1.00	287	1.00	336	1.00
2 b ow-med	273	1.58 (0.93, 2.71)	19	0.40 (0.06, 2.51)	229	0.75 (0.51, 1.10)	273	1.65 (0.92, 2.98)
2¥4fed-high	224	1.14 (0.68, 1.94)	20	1.78 (0.26, 12.39)	185	0.86 (0.58, 1.28)	224	1.14 (0.64, 2.04)
2p _{ligh}	265	1.19 (0.67, 2.10)	22	1.04 (0.15, 7.27)	197	1.18 (0.78, 1.77)	265	1.41 (0.75, 2.63)
² Accessibility:								
High (ref.)	899	1.00	66	1.00	716	1.00	899	1.00
2 Med-high	141	0.54 (0.20, 1.42)	9	8.99 (0.24, 331.28)	127	1.57 (0.75, 3.30)	141	0.45 (0.16, 1.25)
3Door	58	0.65 (0.21, 1.97)	11	3.90 (0.11, 141.05)	55	0.83 (0.36, 1.93)	58	0.41 (0.12, 1.44)
³ Local Health ³ Network:				0				
33 34 orthern metro 35 st.)	149	1.00	12	1.00	141	1.00	149	1.00
36 entral metro	421	0.56 (0.32, 0.98)	33	0.16 (0.01, 1.98)	291	0.91 (0.58, 1.43)	421	0.44 (0.24, 0.79)
3 S outhern metro	281	0.46 (0.25, 0.87)	16	0.17 (0.01, 2.26)	252	0.96 (0.61, 1.52)	281	0.29 (0.14, 0.58)
³ Country South	88	0.87 (0.36, 2.14)	10	0.08 (0.00, 2.02)	83	0.93 (0.43, 2.01)	88	0.87 (0.34, 2.21)
³⁹ Country North	157	1.04 (0.38, 2.90)	15	0.03 (0.00, 1.61)	131	0.74 (0.33, 1.76)	157	1.23 (0.43, 3.57)
40 ⊿ACPS stage:								
41 (ref.)	169	1.00	3	1.00	12	1.00	169	1.00
4 <u>2</u> (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4)	471	1.02 (0.54, 1.91)	20	0.79 (0.03, 23.99)	130	0.43 (0.10, 1.74)	471	0.80 (0.42, 1.53)
4 @	252	2.34 (1.25, 4.40)	21	0.57 (0.02, 18.97)	409	0.29 (0.07, 1.15)	252	1.54 (0.80, 2.96)
4 <u>5</u>	180	2.25 (1.16, 4.35)	39	0.94 (0.03, 26.42)	320	0.26 (0.07, 1.03)	180	1.49 (0.74, 2.98)
46 (UK)	(26)	(1.65 (0.51, 5.33))	(3)	NA	(27)	(0.67 (0.14, 3.26))	(26)	1.35 (0.38, 4.76))
47 4 G rade:	<u>`</u>		. /					<u> </u>
49Vell diff. (ref.)	38	1.00	5	1.00	18	1.00	38	1.00
5 M od diff.	770	0.85 (0.31, 2.29)	53	2.29 (0.31, 16.79)	581	0.97 (0.35, 2.67)	770	0.71 (0.26, 1.92)
5 ⁴ Poorly/undiff.	209	0.60 (0.20, 1.78)	19	1.11 (0.12, 10.68)	213	0.94 (0.33, 2.65)	209	0.52 (0.17, 1.58)
52 -(UK)	(81)	(1.84 (0.60, 5.62))	(9)	NA	(86)	$(0.40\ (0.13,\ 1.20))$	(81)	$(1.24\ (0.39,\ 3.93))$
53 57 2 Diagnosis year:	(~1)	(1.0. (0.00, 0.02))	(7)	- ***		(3.10 (0.10, 1.20))	(01)	(1.2. (0.07, 0.75))
5 2 000 - 2005	541	1.00	52	1.00	451	1.00	541	1.00
5 3 006 - 2005	557	1.26 (0.87, 1.82)	34	0.31 (0.08, 1.25)	447	1.96 (1.48, 2.59)	557	1.29 (0.86, 1.94)
		ate logistic regression			44 /	1.70 (1.40, 2.39)	557	1.27 (0.00, 1.94)

58

1

2

59 RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; NA – not applicable; ACPS- Australian Clinico-

60 Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated.

2

BMJ Open

Table S3: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for **rectal cancer** starting >30 days of diagnosis by treatment type, stage, and socioeconomic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

3 4 5		Surgery	ŀ	Radiotherapy	C	hemotherapy		All treatment gical cases only)
5	n=577	RO (95% CLs)	n=530	RO (95% CLs)	n=658	RO (95% CLs)	n=577	RO (95% CLs)
7 Age at 3 diagnosis 9 (years):								
$^{0}_{1}$ <50 (ref.)	38	1.00	66	1.00	80	1.00	38	1.00
2 50 - 59	94	0.71 (0.31,1.62)	104	1.30 (0.62,2.71)	146	1.73 (0.86,3.48)	94	1.03 (0.46, 2.29)
3 60 - 69	162	0.57 (0.26,1.24)	168	1.41 (0.71,2.79)	225	1.57 (0.83,2.99)	162	0.78 (0.37, 1.66)
4 70 - 79	174	0.44 (0.20,0.95)	147	1.35 (0.67,2.71)	177	1.79 (0.90,3.54)	174	0.83 (0.40, 1.76)
6 ⁸⁰⁺	109	0.38 (0.17,0.85)	45	1.40 (0.52,3.77)	30	2.01 (0.58,6.97)	109	0.70 (0.32, 1.55)
7 Sex:								
⁸ Male (ref.)	331	1.00	344	1.00	419	1.00	331	1.00
o Female	246	0.74 (0.52,1.07)	186	0.68 (0.43,1.07)	239	0.94 (0.61,1.45)	246	0.79 (0.55, 1.14)
1 Socioeconomic:								
2 Low (ref.)	208	1.00	181	1.00	220	1.00	208	1.00
Low-med	115	0.86 (0.50,1.45)	118	0.80 (0.42,1.51)	145	1.13 (0.62,2.07)	115	0.81 (0.48, 1.37)
5 Med-high	121	0.72 (0.44,1.19)	108	0.50 (0.26,0.94)	135	0.78 (0.43,1.42)	121	0.63 (0.38, 1.03)
бHigh	133	1.06 (0.64,1.77)	123	0.88 (0.45,1.70)	158	1.00 (0.55,1.83)	133	1.03 (0.62, 1.72)
Accessibility:								
High (ref.)	454	1.00	409	1.00	507	1.00	454	1.00
0 Med-high	87	0.74 (0.29,1.88)	85	1.49 (0.50,4.44)	101	1.00 (0.30,3.36)	87	1.27 (0.49, 3.26)
Poor	36	1.00 (0.36,2.76)	36	1.25 (0.37,4.20)	50	0.88 (0.25,3.05)	36	1.58 (0.58, 4.33)
B Local Health Network:				· L				
5 Northern metro 6 (ref.)	93	1.00	94	1.00	107	1.00	93	1.00
7 Central metro	197	0.55 (0.31,0.97)	169	0.86 (0.44,1.70)	204	1.19 (0.64,2.23)	197	0.61 (0.35, 1.06)
⁸ Southern metro	136	0.40 (0.22,0.73)	118	0.61 (0.30,1.23)	174	0.89 (0.47,1.69)	136	0.44 (0.24, 0.80)
9 OCountry South	67	0.89 (0.37,2.10)	64	0.45 (0.17,1.25)	76	1.99 (0.62,6.41)	67	0.70 (0.30, 1.63)
1 Country North	84	0.67 (0.24,1.89)	85	1.48 (0.44,5.02)	97	2.61 (0.73,9.25)	84	0.57 (0.20, 1.62)
² ACPS stage:								
A (ref.)	111	1.00	47	1.00	35	1.00	111	1.00
5 В	183	1.31 (0.79,2.18)	127	0.90 (0.39,2.06)	119	1.35 (0.57,3.21)	183	1.18 (0.71, 1.95)
δC	160	1.65 (0.98,2.79)	210	1.39 (0.63,3.10)	287	3.81 (1.64,8.86)	160	1.43 (0.85, 2.40)
D	99	0.83 (0.46,1.51)	123	0.67 (0.30,1.51)	196	1.30 (0.58,2.95)	99	0.79 (0.43, 1.44)
g(UK)	24	(0.76 (0.28,2.06))	23	(0.74 (0.23,2.39))	21	(1.72 (0.44,6.71))	24	(0.83 (0.30,2.28))
0 Grade:								
Well diff. (ref.)	20	1.00	20	1.00	19	1.00	20	1.00
Mod diff.	442	0.60 (0.21,1.68)	376	1.59 (0.57,4.44)	473	1.43 (0.43,4.70)	442	0.78 (0.29, 2.08)
4 Poorly/undiff.	76	0.52 (0.17,1.61)	80	2.63 (0.81,8.52)	96	2.14 (0.57,8.10)	76	0.71 (0.24, 2.08)
5 (UK)	39	(1.38 (0.39,4.91))	54	(1.31 (0.40,4.29))	70	(0.72 (0.20,2.63))	39	(1.57 (0.47,5.27))
Diagnosis year:								
<mark>8</mark> 2000 - 2005	328	1.00	283	1.00	331	1.00	328	1.00
9 2006 - 2010	249	2.86 (1.98,4.12) ate logistic regress	247	1.76 (1.12,2.76)	327	1.34 (0.88,2.04)	249	3.09 (2.15, 4.43)

⁶⁰ *Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods")

RO – Relative odds; CLs – confidence limits; ref. – reference; ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK – unknown; diff – differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated. For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml Table S4: Relative odds (95% CLs) of treatment for rectal cancer starting >60 days of diagnosis by treatment type,

stage, and socio-demographic factors: South Australian major public hospitals, 2000-2010 diagnoses*

		Surgery	נ	Radiotherapy	C	Chemotherapy		ll treatment gical cases only)
	n=577	RO (95% CLs)	n=530	RO (95% CLs)	n=658	RO (95% CLs)	n=577	RO (95% CLs)
Age at diagnosis (years):								
≤50 (ref.)	38	1.00	66	1.00	80	1.00	38	1.00
2 \$0 - 59	94	0.53 (0.23, 1.19)	104	2.41 (1.12, 5.17)	146	2.45 (1.26, 4.74)	94	1.28 (0.42, 3.93)
4 50 - 69	162	0.49 (0.23, 1.05)	168	3.28 (1.60, 6.71)	225	3.46 (1.85, 6.49)	162	1.17 (0.40, 3.38)
570 - 79	174	0.25 (0.12, 0.55)	147	2.69 (1.30, 5.56)	177	3.47 (1.82, 6.60)	174	1.21 (0.42, 3.48)
6 ₈₀₊	109	0.26 (0.11, 0.59)	45	3.05 (1.24, 7.51)	30	3.95 (1.54, 10.17)	109	1.62 (0.55, 4.80)
7 Sex:								· · ·
Male (ref.)	331	1.00	344	1.00	419	1.00	331	1.00
Female	246	0.77 (0.52, 1.13)	186	0.91 (0.61, 1.36)	239	1.04 (0.73, 1.46)	246	0.89 (0.56, 1.42)
Socioeconomic:			4					. , ,
Low (ref.)	208	1.00	181	1.00	220	1.00	208	1.00
Low-med	115	1.29 (0.73, 2.27)	118	1.11 (0.65, 1.92)	145	0.61 (0.38, 0.98)	115	1.05 (0.53, 2.02)
4 Med-high	121	1.04 (0.61, 1.78)	108	0.95 (0.55, 1.62)	135	0.94 (0.59, 1.50)	121	1.25 (0.67, 2.33)
High	133	1.03 (0.60, 1.77)	123	1.28 (0.74, 2.22)	158	0.71 (0.44, 1.14)	133	0.81 (0.41, 1.58)
Accessibility:								. , ,
High (ref.)	454	1.00	409	1.00	507	1.00	454	1.00
Med-high	87	0.26 (0.09, 0.73)	85	1.12 (0.41, 3.01)	101	0.98 (0.42, 2.25)	87	0.49 (0.13, 1.86)
Poor	36	0.30 (0.10, 0.89)	36	1.53 (0.55, 4.31)	50	1.08 (0.45, 2.62)	36	0.83 (0.22, 2.67)
Local Health Network:				2.				
4Northern metro 5(ref.)	93	1.00	94	1.00	107	1.00	93	1.00
Central metro	197	0.53 (0.30, 0.95)	169	0.88 (0.50, 1.55)	204	1.70 (1.00, 2.89)	197	0.71 (0.36, 1.38)
Southern metro	136	0.49 (0.26, 0.91)	118	0.55 (0.30, 1.03)	174	0.84 (0.48, 1.44)	136	0.63 (0.30, 1.30)
Country South	67	0.69 (0.29, 1.61)	64	0.45 (0.18, 1.14)	76	1.36 (0.59, 3.17)	67	0.71 (0.25, 2.05)
Country North	84	1.25 (0.42, 3.74)	85	0.70 (0.24, 2.01)	97	1.10 (0.44, 2.72)	84	0.67 (0.17, 2.71)
ACPS stage:						~		
² A (ref.)	111	1.00	47	1.00	35	1.00	111	1.00
β β	183	1.46 (0.82, 2.58)	127	1.26 (0.59, 2.67)	119	1.64 (0.69, 3.91)	183	1.04 (0.53, 2.02)
3 β 4 4 6 θ	160	2.30 (1.30, 4.05)	210	1.76 (0.86, 3.58)	287	2.70 (1.19, 6.12)	160	1.15 (0.60, 2.24)
Ð	99	1.34 (0.69, 1.61)	123	1.25 (0.59, 2.67)	196	1.95 (0.85, 4.51)	99	0.83 (0.37, 1.86)
7(UK)	24	(1.65 (0.58, 4.67))	23	(0.35 (0.09, 1.43))	21	(1.33 (0.38, 4.68))	24	(1.45 (0.46,4.58)
Grade:								
Well diff. (ref.)	20	1.00	20	1.00	19	1.00	20	1.00
Mod diff.	442	0.30 (0.11, 0.82)	376	1.25 (0.45,3.44)	473	1.39 (0.50, 3.88)	442	0.35 (0.13, 0.95)
Poorly/un-diff.	76	0.26 (0.09, 0.79)	80	1.70 (0.57,5.09)	96	1.51 (0.50, 4.52)	76	0.35 (0.11, 1.12)
3 (UK)	39	(0.64 (0.19, 2.18))	54	(0.88 (0.28,2.84))	70	(0.83 (0.27, 2.59))	39	(0.76 (0.23,2.59
Diagnosis year:								
52000 - 2005	328	1.00	283	1.00	331	1.00	328	1.00
2006 - 2010	249	1.98 (1.35, 2.91)	247	1.02 (0.70,1.50)	327	1.21 (0.87, 1.69)	249	2.01 (1.26, 3.18)

58

1

2 3

*Derived from multivariate logistic regression (see "Methods")

59 RO - Relative odds; CLs - confidence limits; ref. - reference; ACPS- Australian Clinico-Pathological Staging; UK -60 unknown; diff - differentiated; undiff. - undifferentiated.

Reporting checklist for cohort study.

Based on the STROBE cohort guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the STROBE cohort reporting guidelines, and cite them as:

von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies.

31 32			4	Page
33			Reporting Item	Number
34 35 36 37 38	Title	#1a	Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
39 40 41 42	Abstract	#1b	Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
43 44 45	Background / rationale	#2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3
46 47 48 49	Objectives	#3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4
50 51	Study design	#4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	4
52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	Setting	#5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	4
60		For pee	er review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1 2 3	Eligibility criteria	#6a	Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up.	4
4 5 6 7		#6b	For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	n/a
8 9 10 11 12 13	Variables	#7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	4,5
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Data sources / measurement	#8	For each variable of interest give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group. Give information separately for for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.	4
22 23	Bias	#9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	10, 12
24 25	Study size	#10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	4
26 27 28 29 30 31	Quantitative variables	#11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen, and why	4,5
32 33 34 35	Statistical methods	#12a	Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	4,5
36 37 38		#12b	Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	4,5
39 40 41		#12c	Explain how missing data were addressed	4
42 43		#12d	If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	n/a
44 45 46		#12e	Describe any sensitivity analyses	4,5
46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54	Participants	#13a	Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow- up, and analysed. Give information separately for for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.	tables 1- 5
55 56		#13b	Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	n/a
57 58		#13c	Consider use of a flow diagram	n/a
59 60		For pee	er review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1 2 3 4 5 6	Descriptive data	#14a	Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders. Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.	5-14
7 8 9 10		#14b	Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	n/a
11 12		#14c	Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	n/a
13 14 15 16 17 18	Outcome data	#15	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time. Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups if applicable.	5-14
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Main results	#16a	Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder- adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	5-14
26 27 28		#16b	Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	5-14
29 30 31 32		#16c	If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	n/a
33 34 35 36	Other analyses	#17	Report other analyses done—e.g., analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	n/a
37 38	Key results	#18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	14-15
 39 40 41 42 43 44 	Limitations	#19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias.	15
45 46 47 48 49	Interpretation	#20	Give a cautious overall interpretation considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence.	14-16
50 51 52 53	Generalisability	#21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	16
54 55 56 57 58	Funding	#22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	17
59 60		For pee	r review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

The STROBE checklist is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY. This checklist was completed on 10. April 2019 using <u>https://www.goodreports.org/</u>, a tool made by the <u>EQUATOR Network</u> in collaboration with <u>Penelope.ai</u>

totocet terien ont