

**Title:** Comparing cancer incidence, stage at diagnosis and outcomes of Manitoba First Nations living on-reserve and off-reserve: A Retrospective Analysis

**Authors (including degrees & affiliations):**

1. Tara C. Horrill, BN, PhD(c), RN, College of Nursing, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba (Corresponding Author). [Tara.horrill@umanitoba.ca](mailto:Tara.horrill@umanitoba.ca)
2. Lindsey Dahl, MSc, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba
3. Esther Sanderson, University College of the North
4. Garry Munro, Executive Director, Cree Nation Tribal Health Centre
5. Cindy Garson, Director of Health, Interlake Reserves Tribal Council
6. Randy Fransoo, PhD, Manitoba Centre for Health Policy, University of Manitoba
7. Genevieve Thompson, PhD, RN, College of Nursing, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba
8. Catherine Cook, MD, MSc, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba
9. Janice Linton, MLS, Indigenous Health Librarian, University of Manitoba
10. Annette S. H. Schultz, PhD, RN, College of Nursing, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba

**Funding Statement:**

This research was funded by a University Indigenous Research Program grant from the University of Manitoba (UM#47075). Ms. Horrill is supported by a University of Manitoba Graduate Fellowship and a Research Manitoba doctoral fellowship. The funders had no role in the study design, collection, analysis and interpretation of data, or in the writing of this manuscript.

**Declaration of Interest:**

None.

**Disclaimer:**

The results and conclusions are those of the authors and no official endorsement by the Manitoba Centre for Health Policy, Manitoba Health, or other data providers is intended or should be inferred.

## Abstract

**Background:** Significant cancer-related disparities exist between First Nations (FN) and non-Indigenous Canadians, however, no study has investigated differences between status FN living on-reserve and off-reserve. The objectives of this study were to compare cancer incidence, stage at diagnosis and mortality outcomes in status FN people living on-reserve and off-reserve.

**Methods:** A retrospective analysis of population-level administrative health databases in Manitoba was conducted. Cancers diagnosed between April 1, 2004 and March 31, 2011 were linked with the Indian Registry System and five provincial databases. Differences in baseline characteristics, cancer incidence, site and stage at diagnosis were compared between status FN living on and off reserve. Linear regression models examined trends in annual cancer incidence. Cox proportional hazard regression models examined mortality.

**Results:** FN living on-reserve were significantly older, with higher Charlson comorbidity scores. A lower proportion of on-reserve patients were diagnosed with Stage I cancers than off-reserve patients (21.7% vs. 26.9%,  $p = 0.196$ ). There were no differences in annual cancer incidence between groups. Adjusted incidence of cancer over the combined study years was higher in the off-reserve group (287.9 vs. 247.9 per 100,000,  $p = 0.0243$ ). No significant differences in mortality were found.

**Interpretation:** The lower proportion of on-reserve patients diagnosed with cancer at Stage I is concerning, suggesting less access to screening services or potential delays in diagnosis. Further research is needed to understand patterns in diagnosis, differences in cancer site, and overall cancer incidence between status FN living on and off-reserve.

### Key Words:

Indigenous  
Aboriginal health  
First Nation  
oncology  
cancer  
epidemiology  
diagnosis  
incidence  
mortality  
survival analysis

## Introduction

Cancer and other chronic diseases are now leading causes of morbidity and mortality among First Nations (FN) people in Canada, and addressing cancer is a growing health priority among FN people (1–4). Compared to non-FN Canadians, FN peoples experience higher incidence of cancers of the kidney (2,5–9), liver (2,7,10), gallbladder (6,9,10), cervix (2,5,7–12), and colon and rectum (2,7,8,10,13). Emerging evidence also indicates that FN peoples are more likely to be diagnosed with cancers at later stages than non-FN Canadians (13–16), and experience significantly lower survival (8,10,17–19). Multiple factors contribute to these disparities, including individual patient factors, environmental exposures, socioeconomic factors (particularly income), and access to healthcare services (2,8,20,21).

Approximately 11% of Manitoba residents self-identify as FN people; of these, nearly 10% are “registered” or “status” FN (22). Status FN people are those individuals registered under the *Indian Act*, which entitles them to live on designated tracts of land known as reserves (23). In 2016, 52% of all registered FN people lived in one of the 63 FN communities (‘reserves’) in Manitoba (22). The provision of healthcare services is not entirely similar between status FN people living on-reserve and those living off-reserve. In general, healthcare services in Canada are publically funded, providing universal coverage for medically necessary hospital, physician and specialist services to all residents. In addition, Status FN people are eligible for the federal non-insured health benefits (NIHB) program, which provides a range of services not covered by other insurance programs. The federal government also funds and/or delivers public health services and limited primary health care to those living on-reserve. Despite these additional services, many FN communities are located in remote areas of Manitoba with severely limited access to medically necessary services provided in hospitals and by physicians and specialists.

1  
2  
3 The health outcome effects of limited access to some healthcare services for FN peoples living  
4 on-reserve are not clear.  
5  
6

7  
8 Health and social policies, including the differences in funding and delivery healthcare  
9 services to FN on and off-reserve can have important impacts on individual and population  
10 health. While there is evidence of significant differences in cancer stage at diagnosis and survival  
11 outcomes between FN and non-FN Canadians, both in Manitoba and elsewhere, to our  
12 knowledge, differences between status FN living on-reserve compared to those living off-reserve  
13 have not yet been investigated. This article reports on the findings from a larger study of  
14 provincial health administrative data (16) to address three objectives: a) to describe the  
15 demographics, comorbidities, site and stage of cancer at diagnosis in status FN people living on-  
16 reserve and status FN people living off-reserve who received a cancer diagnosis between April 1,  
17 2004 and March 31, 2011; b) to compare annual cancer incidence rates for each cohort; and c) to  
18 investigate mortality outcomes for each cohort.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

## 33 **Methods**

### 34 **Study Design and Data Sources**

35  
36 We conducted a retrospective study of cancer incidence and five-year mortality among  
37 status FN people living on and off-reserve using administrative health data housed in the  
38 Manitoba Centre for Health Policy (MCHP) Population Research Data Repository. Data files in  
39 the repository do not contain names or other identifying information; an encrypted identifier  
40 allows linkage across files at the individual level, while protecting privacy. We identified and  
41 included all status FN people with any newly diagnosed cancer (excluding “non-melanoma skin  
42 & in situ skin” cancers) between April 1, 2004 and March 31, 2011 in Manitoba. Seven data sets  
43 within the MCHP repository were used (Table 1). The linkage of the Manitoba Health Insurance  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Registry and the Indian Registry System (IRS) was used to create a file of FN patients, and was  
4  
5 approved through the research protocols of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs prior to 2014 and  
6  
7 Nanaandawewigamig First Nations Health and Social Secretariat of Manitoba thereafter. The FN  
8  
9 file was linked to the Manitoba Cancer Registry (MCR) to identify all newly diagnosed cancers  
10  
11 among status FN. This file was then linked to hospital abstracts, medical claims, 2006 Canada  
12  
13 Census, and Vital Statistics Mortality Registry files. Approval for this study was obtained from  
14  
15 the University of Manitoba Education & Nursing Research Ethics Board, the Manitoba Health  
16  
17 Information Privacy Committee, CancerCare Manitoba, and the Health Information Research  
18  
19 Governance Committee at Nanaandawewigamig.  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **Table 1**

### 25 **Outcomes**

26  
27 The primary outcome examined was all-cause mortality. Patients were followed for five  
28  
29 years from the date of cancer diagnosis. Five year cancer-specific mortality was explored as a  
30  
31 secondary outcome.  
32  
33  
34

### 35 **Variable Definitions**

36  
37 Variables measured at the time of diagnosis included: age, sex, region of residence, area-  
38  
39 level income, Charlson Comorbidity Index score, and cancer stage and site. Two measures of  
40  
41 region of residence were used: 1) Regional Health Authority (RHA), and 2) on/off reserve.  
42  
43 Manitoba is divided geographically into five RHA regions; each RHA is responsible for the  
44  
45 delivery of health services within their area. Patient residential postal code within the IRS data  
46  
47 file identified residence as on or off-reserve. Patients were categorized into area-level income  
48  
49 quintiles based on average household incomes calculated for each Census dissemination areas.  
50  
51 Separate income quintiles were calculated for urban and rural residents from the 2006 Census.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 For income quintiles, urban residents referred to those living in one of Manitoba's two largest  
4 cities (Winnipeg and Brandon), while rural residents referred to those living in all other areas.  
5  
6 Both the Urban/Rural, and the RHA methods are based on patient residential postal codes and  
7  
8 municipal codes. Charlson Comorbidity Index determined each patient's health status at time of  
9  
10 diagnosis (24). Each comorbidity category has specific ICD-9-CM and ICD-10-CA codes (25),  
11  
12 which were found in the hospital discharge abstract and medical claims databases during the one  
13  
14 year period prior to cancer diagnosis. Cancer stage was categorized using the American Joint  
15  
16 Committee on Cancer Staging system (26), ranging from stage I (least severe) to IV (most  
17  
18 severe) based on characteristics of the tumor. A fifth category was also used to categorize  
19  
20 patients with cancers that could not be assessed. Cancer site was determined from the MCR,  
21  
22 based on the International Classification of Diseases for Oncology Third Edition.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **Statistical Analyses**

29  
30  
31 Descriptive analysis and comparisons of characteristics at time of cancer diagnosis  
32  
33 between on and off-reserve status FN groups were conducted. Chi-squared tests were used to test  
34  
35 for significant differences in sex, urban/rural residency, RHA residency, income quintile, cancer  
36  
37 site and cancer stage at diagnosis, while t-tests compared group averages for age and Charlson  
38  
39 comorbidity score.  
40

### 41 *Cancer Incidence*

42  
43  
44 Annual cancer incidence was calculated for each year from 2004/2005 to 2010/2011.  
45  
46 Separate rates for on and off-reserve populations were determined by identifying the number of  
47  
48 individuals with a cancer diagnosed each year divided by the annual population counts of on and  
49  
50 off-reserve FN people. Differences in annual crude incidence rates and the cumulative incidence  
51  
52 rate over the 7-year period between on- and off-reserve status FN populations were tested for  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 significance using chi-squared tests. To account for demographic differences between on- and  
4  
5 off-reserve populations, adjusted rates using a generalized linear model with a negative binomial  
6  
7 log link function was estimated. This model controlled for age, sex, income quintile and RHA  
8  
9 area of residence. Trends over time were analyzed with linear regression models fit to the annual  
10  
11 rates.  
12  
13

### 14 *Mortality*

15  
16  
17 Cox proportional hazard regression models compared the risk of mortality between FN  
18  
19 patients living on-reserve and those living off-reserve. Time to death was measured in days from  
20  
21 the date of cancer diagnosis to the date of death. Patient data was censored at five years if they  
22  
23 were still alive, or at the time of discontinuation of health insurance coverage, usually indicating  
24  
25 the person moved out of Manitoba. In the analysis of cancer-specific mortality, patient data was  
26  
27 censored at the time of death for all non-cancer-related causes of death. Potential confounding  
28  
29 variables accounted for in the analyses included age, sex, Charlson comorbidity index, stage of  
30  
31 cancer, income quintile and RHA area of residence. All effect estimates are reported as hazard  
32  
33 ratios with 95% confidence intervals and the significance level was  $p < 0.05$ . Analysis was  
34  
35 completed on the secure server at MCHP using SAS statistical software, V9.4 (SAS Institute).  
36  
37  
38  
39

## 40 **Results**

### 41 **Characteristics of Patients with a First Diagnosis of Cancer**

42  
43  
44 There were 1,524 newly diagnosed cancers among status FN people in Manitoba between  
45  
46 April 1, 2004 and March 31, 2011. On average, those living on-reserve were older (60.6 years vs.  
47  
48 57.5 years,  $p < 0.0001$ ), with a higher Charlson Comorbidity Index score (1.4 vs. 1.3;  $p = 0.013$ ).  
49  
50 In both the on-reserve and off-reserve groups, a higher proportion of women were newly  
51  
52 diagnosed with cancer than men.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 2****Cancer Diagnoses by Stage & Site**

A significant difference was found in cancer stage at diagnosis, with a lower proportion of on-reserve patients diagnosed at Stage I than off-reserve patients (21.7% vs. 26.9%;  $p=0.019$ ). No other significant differences in stage at diagnosis were found. Regarding cancer sites, we found significantly lower proportions of breast and cervical cancers, and significantly higher proportions of kidney, ovarian and prostate cancers in the on-reserve group than in the off-reserve group.

**Table 3****Table 4****Cancer Incidence & Trends**

There were no significant differences in yearly crude or adjusted annual incidence rates, except for 2007/08, in which the off-reserve group had a higher adjusted annual incidence of cancer (291 vs. 380/100,000;  $p=0.0423$ ). The overall adjusted incidence of cancer over the study years was higher in the off-reserve group than in the on-reserve group (287/100,000 vs. 247/100,000;  $p=0.0243$ ) There were no significant trends in cancer incidence over time in either group.

**Table 5****Table 6****Cancer Mortality**

The on-reserve group had a significantly higher risk of all-cause mortality than the off-reserve group (HR 1.28, 95% CI 1.11-1.26,  $p=0.005$ ), however there was no significant

1  
2  
3 difference after adjusting for covariates. We found no significant difference in the risk of cancer-  
4  
5 specific mortality before or after adjustment.  
6  
7

## 8 **Table 7**

### 10 **Interpretation**

11  
12 This retrospective analysis of health administrative data examined cancer incidence, site,  
13  
14 stage at diagnosis, and mortality among Manitoba FN people diagnosed with cancer between  
15  
16 2004/2005 and 2010/2011 living on-reserve and off-reserve. While differences in cancer-related  
17  
18 events exist between FN and non-FN people, this is the first study to specifically compare status  
19  
20 FN people living on-reserve with those living off-reserve. We found that the on-reserve group  
21  
22 was on average older, with higher Charlson Comorbidity Index scores than the off-reserve group.  
23  
24 A lower proportion of on-reserve patients were diagnosed at Stage I than off-reserve patients.  
25  
26 While there were no significant differences in yearly cancer incidence between groups, the  
27  
28 adjusted incidence of cancer over all seven years was higher in the off-reserve group than in the  
29  
30 on-reserve group. No significant differences in mortality were found.  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 Our study found a lower proportion of FN people living on-reserve were diagnosed with  
37  
38 cancers in Stage I than those living off-reserve, which may be related to differential access to  
39  
40 healthcare services (18). FN people living on-reserve are more likely to live in rural and remote  
41  
42 areas, and to experience difficulties in accessing cancer-related diagnostic and specialty care  
43  
44 (27,28). For many FN patients, gaining entry “into the system at the front end or diagnostic  
45  
46 stage” is a significant problem (26, p. 15). Moreover, FN patients living on-reserve encounter  
47  
48 additional bureaucratic ‘red tape’ and challenges with securing transportation required to access  
49  
50 diagnostic and specialty care (28–30), which may result in later stage cancer diagnoses. In  
51  
52 addition, for many FN people, access to healthcare and cancer services is determined not only by  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *where* those services are delivered, but *how* they are delivered at the point of care (31,32). In  
4  
5 particular, lack of culturally safe services, and frequent experiences of racism substantially  
6  
7 impact how and when cancer services are accessed by FN people (31).  
8  
9

10 Notably, no differences in mortality between FN peoples living on-reserve and those  
11  
12 living off-reserve were found through this study. These findings were counterintuitive for our  
13  
14 team, as we anticipated FN patients living on-reserve would have worse outcomes due to  
15  
16 proximity and accessibility of healthcare services. We assumed those living off-reserve lived in  
17  
18 more urban areas and in closer proximity to healthcare services, and therefore have better access  
19  
20 to healthcare services and other support services and programs. These findings seem to suggest  
21  
22 that proximity to healthcare services does not necessarily decrease mortality. An alternate  
23  
24 consideration, raised by our community partners, was that FN people tend to be transient,  
25  
26 moving back and forth on and off reserve communities, or between FN communities and other  
27  
28 communities. While no definitive conclusions can be draw based on this consideration, it is  
29  
30 important to remember that despite the listed place of residence (i.e., on vs. off-reserve), many  
31  
32 FN people have similar experiences in accessing healthcare services and our measure for on  
33  
34 versus off-reserve may not translate well into lived realities.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

### 40 **Strengths & Limitations**

41  
42 Study findings are strengthened through our use of multiple population-based and well-  
43  
44 validated administrative data sets, minimizing bias related to recall or small samples. We also  
45  
46 benefitted from strong relationships with FN partners, which enriched our interpretation of  
47  
48 findings. Our findings should be considered in relation to several study limitations. First, we  
49  
50 included only FN individuals registered under the *Indian Act* ('status' FN). At present, there is  
51  
52 no mechanism to identify non-registered FN people in these datasets. Including non-status FN  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 people may have resulted in additional differences between groups. However, in Manitoba,  
4  
5 status FN people represent approximately 97% of all FN (34). Second, we were not able to  
6  
7 analyze differences in mortality between the FN people living on and off-reserve by cancer site  
8  
9 because of small sample sizes, and there may be significant differences in mortality depending  
10  
11 on cancer site. Third, income was measured at the area level only, which does not account for  
12  
13 individual and family differences. Fourth, location of residence was calculated at the RHA level,  
14  
15 which may obscure important differences between those living in urban vs. rural versus remote  
16  
17 areas within an RHA. Fifth, categorization into on or off-reserve residence was based on postal  
18  
19 code of residence on a fixed date. As our community partners suggested, FN people tend to be  
20  
21 highly mobile, moving between reserve and non-reserve communities, which could result in  
22  
23 accessing healthcare services in multiple locations. Finally, this study only included status FN  
24  
25 people living in Manitoba, and results may not be generalizable to FN residents living in other  
26  
27 Canadian provinces. Although status FN people across Canada experience similar health status,  
28  
29 socioeconomic status and healthcare services, there may be differences in the location of reserve  
30  
31 communities or other important differences that preclude generalizability of our results.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 **Conclusion**

39  
40 Our retrospective analysis of provincial health administrative data found differences  
41  
42 between FN patients living on-reserve and those living off-reserve. A lower proportion of on-  
43  
44 reserve patients were diagnosed with cancers at Stage I compared to those living off-reserve;  
45  
46 however, overall cancer incidence over the study years was higher in the off-reserve group. We  
47  
48 found no significant differences in 5-year mortality between groups. Further research is needed  
49  
50 to better understand the reasons for differences in stage at diagnosis, particularly in relation to  
51  
52 access to healthcare.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### References

1. Tjepkema M, Wilkins R, Senécal S, Guimond É, Penney C. Mortality of Metis and registered Indian adults in Canada: An 11 year follow-up study. *Heal Reports*. 2009;20(4):31–52.
2. Mazereeuw M V, Withrow DR, Nishri ED, Tjepkema M, Marrett LD. Cancer incidence among First Nations adults in Canada: Follow-up of the 1991 Census Mortality Cohort (1992–2009). *Can J Public Heal*. 2018;109:700–9.
3. Waldram JB, Herring DA, Young TK. *Aboriginal Health in Canada: Historical, Cultural, and Epidemiological Perspectives*. 2nd ed. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press; 2006.
4. Kelm M. *Colonizing bodies: Aboriginal health and healing in British Columbia 1900-50*. Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press; 1998.
5. Young TK, Choi NW. Cancer risks among residents of Manitoba. *CMAJ*. 1985;132:1269–72.
6. Marrett LD, Chaudhry M. Cancer incidence and mortality in Ontario First Nations, 1968-1991 (Canada). *Cancer Causes Control*. 2003;14(3):259–68.
7. Louchini R, Beaupre M. Cancer incidence and mortality among Aboriginal people living on reserves and northern villages in Quebec. *Int J Circumpolar Health*. 2008;67(5):445–51.
8. McGahan CE, Linn K, Guno P, Johnson H, Coldman AJ, Spinelli JJ, et al. Cancer in First Nations people living in British Columbia, Canada: an analysis of incidence and survival from 1993 to 2010. *Cancer Causes Control*. 2017;28(10):1105–16.
9. Rosenberg T, Martel S. Cancer trends from 1972-1991 for Registered Indians living on

- 1  
2  
3 Manitoba reserves. *Int J Circumpolar Health*. 1998;57(Suppl 1):392–8.  
4
- 5  
6 10. Chiefs of Ontario, Cancer Care Ontario. *Cancer in First Nations People in Ontario:*  
7  
8 *Incidence, Mortality, Survival and Prevalence* [Internet]. Toronto, CAN; 2017. Available  
9  
10 from: [www.cancercare.on.ca/firstnationscancerreport](http://www.cancercare.on.ca/firstnationscancerreport)  
11
- 12  
13 11. Decker KM, Demers AA, Kliewer E V, Biswanger N, Musto G, Elias B, et al. Pap test use  
14  
15 and cervical cancer incidence in First Nations women living in Manitoba. *Cancer Prev Res*  
16  
17 [Internet]. 2015;8(1):49–55. Available from:  
18  
19 <http://cancerpreventionresearch.aacrjournals.org/content/8/1/49.long>  
20
- 21  
22 12. Young TK, Kliewer E, Blanchard J, Mayer T. Monitoring disease burden and preventative  
23  
24 behavior with data linkage: Cervical cancer among Aboriginal people in Manitoba,  
25  
26 Canada. *Am J Public Health*. 2000;90(9):1466–8.  
27
- 28  
29 13. Decker KM, Kliewer E V., Demers AA, Fradette K, Biswanger N, Musto G, et al. Cancer  
30  
31 incidence, mortality, and stage at diagnosis in First Nations living in Manitoba. *Curr*  
32  
33 *Oncol*. 2016;23(4):225–32.  
34
- 35  
36 14. Alvi RA. *Breast, cervical and colorectal cancer survival rates for Northern Saskatchewan*  
37  
38 *residents and First Nations*. University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon; 1999.  
39
- 40  
41 15. Sheppard AJ, Chiarelli AM, Marrett LD, Mirea L, Diane Nishri E, Trudeau ME. Detection  
42  
43 of later stage breast cancer in first nations women in Ontario, Canada. *Can J Public Heal*.  
44  
45 2010;101(1):101–5.  
46
- 47  
48 16. Horrill TC, Dahl L, Sanderson E, Munro G, Garson C, Fransoo R, et al. Describing cancer  
49  
50 incidence, stage at diagnosis and outcomes of First Nations and all other Manitobans with  
51  
52 a cancer diagnosis between 2004/05 & 2010/11: A retrospective analysis. Unpubl  
53  
54 Manuscript. 2019.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

17. Erickson B, Biron VL, Zhang H, Seikaly H, Côté D. Survival outcomes of First Nations patients with oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma (Poliquin 2014). *J Otolaryngol - Head Neck Surg* [Internet]. 2015;44(1). Available from: <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=4323206&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>
18. Withrow DR, Pole JD, Diane Nishri E, Tjepkema M, Marrett LD. Cancer survival disparities between First Nation and non-Aboriginal adults in Canada: Follow-up of the 1991 census mortality cohort. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2017;26(1):145–51.
19. Nishri ED, Sheppard AJ, Withrow DR, Marrett LD. Cancer survival among First Nations people of Ontario, Canada (1968-2007). *Int J Cancer.* 2015;136(3):639–45.
20. Elias B, Kliwer E V., Hall M, Demers AA, Turner D, Martens P, et al. The burden of cancer risk in Canada's indigenous population: A comparative study of known risks in a Canadian region. *Int J Gen Med.* 2011;4:699–709.
21. Decker KM, Demers AA, Kliwer E V., Musto G, Shu E, Biswanger N, et al. Colorectal cancer screening in first nations people living in manitoba. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2015;24(1):241–8.
22. Statistics Canada. Total population by Aboriginal identity and Registered or Treaty Indian status, Manitoba [Internet]. 2016 Census. 2019 [cited 2019 May 24]. Available from: <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-PR-Eng.cfm?TOPIC=9&LANG=Eng&GK=PR&GC=46&>
23. Statistics Canada. Aboriginal Peoples: Fact Sheet for Canada [Internet]. Statistics Canada. 2015 [cited 2018 Jul 27]. Available from: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-656-x/89-656-x2015001-eng.htm>

- 1  
2  
3 24. Deyo RA, Cherkin DC, Ciol MA. Adapting a clinical comorbidity index for use with ICD-  
4  
5 9-CM administrative databases. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1992;45(6):613–9.  
6  
7
- 8 25. Quon H, Sundararajan V, Halfon P, Fong A, Burnand B, Luthi JC et al. Coding algorithms  
9  
10 for defining comorbidities in ICD-9-CM and ICD-10 administrative data. *Med Care*.  
11  
12 2005;1130–9.  
13
- 14 26. Edge SB, American Joint Committee on Cancer. *AJCC Cancer Staging Manual*. 7th ed.  
15  
16 New York, NY: Springer; 2010.  
17  
18
- 19 27. Minore B, Boone M, Katt M, Kinch P, Cromarty H. How clients choices influence cancer  
20  
21 care in northern Aboriginal communities. *Int J Circumpolar Health*. 2004;63 Suppl 2:129–  
22  
23 32.  
24  
25
- 26 28. The Saint Elizabeth First Nations Inuit and Metis Program. “Walk a Mile in My  
27  
28 Moccasins” Foundations For Action in First Nations Cancer Control [Internet]. 2012.  
29  
30 Available from:  
31  
32 [http://www.cancerview.ca/idc/groups/public/documents/webcontent/fnim\\_cancer\\_ctrl\\_on](http://www.cancerview.ca/idc/groups/public/documents/webcontent/fnim_cancer_ctrl_on_res.pdf)  
33  
34 [\\_res.pdf](http://www.cancerview.ca/idc/groups/public/documents/webcontent/fnim_cancer_ctrl_on_res.pdf)  
35  
36
- 37 29. CancerCare Manitoba. *The cancer story: Canadian Cancer Control in First Nations*  
38  
39 *Populations Living Off-Reserve in Rural, Remote and Isolated Areas* [Internet].  
40  
41 Winnipeg, CAN; 2013. Available from: [https://dev.partnershipagainstcancer.ca/wp-](https://dev.partnershipagainstcancer.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/cancer_story_first_nations_off_reserve_EN.pdf)  
42  
43 [content/uploads/2018/12/cancer\\_story\\_first\\_nations\\_off\\_reserve\\_EN.pdf](https://dev.partnershipagainstcancer.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/cancer_story_first_nations_off_reserve_EN.pdf)  
44  
45
- 46 30. Lavoie JG, Kaufert J, Browne AJ, O’Neil JD. Managing Matajoosh: Determinants of First  
47  
48 Nations’ cancer care decisions. *BMC Health Serv Res* [Internet]. 2016;16(402). Available  
49  
50 from:  
51  
52 <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rzh&AN=117539143&site=ehost>  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 -live  
4  
5  
6 31. Horrill TC, Linton J, Lavoie JG, Martin D, Wiens A, Schultz ASH. Access to Cancer Care  
7 among Indigenous Peoples in Canada: A Scoping Review. Winnipeg, CAN; 2019.  
8  
9  
10 32. Horrill T, Mcmillan DE, Schultz ASH, Thompson G. Understanding access to healthcare  
11 among Indigenous peoples: A comparative analysis of biomedical and postcolonial  
12 perspectives. Nurs Inq. 2018;  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 33. Mazereeuw, M. V.; Yurkiewich, A.; Jamal, S.; Cawley, C.; Jones, C. R.; Marrett LD.  
18  
19 Cancer risk factors and screening in First Nations in Ontario. Heal Promot Chronic Dis  
20  
21 Prev Canada. 2017;37(6):186–93.  
22  
23  
24 34. Statistics Canada. Manitoba [Province] and Canada [Country] (table). Census Profile.  
25  
26 2016 Census. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-316-X2016001. Ottawa, CAN; 2017.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1: Data sets used**

| <b>Data Set</b>                            | <b>Description of Data Set &amp; Data Used</b>   | <b>Variable</b>   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Manitoba Health Insurance Registry</b>  | Demographic information for all residents of Manitoba Eligible to receive healthcare services  | Demographic information   |
| <b>Indian Registry System (IRS)</b>        | List of all status FN people, including residence on or off-reserve  | FN status<br>Residence on or off-reserve                            |
| <b>Manitoba Cancer Registry (MCR)</b>      | Information on all incident cases of diagnosed cancer, cancer treatment, tumor characteristics, cancer site and stage at diagnosis.  | Cancer incidence<br>Cancer stage at diagnosis<br>Cancer site        |
| <b>Hospital Abstracts</b>                  | International Classification of Diseases (ICD-9-CM and ICD-10-CA) diagnostic codes and Canadian Classification for Health Interventions (CCI) procedure codes for all hospital admissions in Manitoba. | Patient co-morbidities<br>Patient socio-demographic characteristics |
| <b>Medical Services</b>                    | Claims submitted for physician and nurse practitioner services provided in Manitoba (and the associated ICD-9-CM)  | Patient co-morbidities<br>Patient socio-demographic characteristics |
| <b>Census of Canada</b>                    | Aggregate data file used to create quintiles of area-level income  | Socioeconomic characteristics                                       |
| <b>Vital Statistics Mortality Registry</b> | Records all deaths in Manitoba and the primary cause of death  | Mortality   |

**Table 2: Patient Characteristics**

| <b>Characteristic</b>                             | <b>On-Reserve<br/>n=930 (61%)</b> | <b>Off-Reserve<br/>n=594 (39%)</b> | <b>p value</b> |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Age (yrs) mean $\pm$ SD                           | 60.6 +/- 14.5                     | 57.5 +/- 14                        | <.0001         |
| Male  | 456 (49.0%)                       | 223 (37.5%)                        | <.0001         |
| Female  | 474 (51.0%)                       | 371 (62.5%)                        |                |
| Rural Residency                                   | 846 (91.0%)                       | 266 (44.8%)                        |                |
| Regional Health Authority                         |                                   |                                    | <.0001         |
| IE  | 257 (27.6%)                       | 81 (13.6%)                         |                |
| NO  | 428 (46.0%)                       | 107 (18.0%)                        |                |
| SO  | 6 (0.6%)                          | 7 (1.2%)                           |                |
| WE  | 68 (7.3%)                         | 20 (3.4%)                          |                |
| WP  | 102 (11.0%)                       | 66 (11.1%)                         |                |
| PT  | 69 (7.4%)                         | 313 (52.7%)                        |                |
| Income Quintile                                   |                                   |                                    | <.0001         |
| NF  | 12 (1.3%)                         | 9 (1.5%)                           |                |
| R1 (lowest rural)                                 | 508 (54.6%)                       | 79 (13.3%)                         |                |
| R2  | 209 (22.5%)                       | 43 (7.2%)                          |                |
| R3  | 43 (4.6%)                         | 43 (7.2%)                          |                |
| R4  | 75 (8.1%)                         | 51 (8.6%)                          |                |
| R5 (highest rural)                                | 11 (1.2%)                         | 50 (8.4%)                          |                |
| U1 (lowest urban)                                 | 49 (5.3%)                         | 170 (28.6%)                        |                |
| U2  | 12 (1.3%)                         | 67 (11.3%)                         |                |
| U3  | s                                 | 38 (6.4%)                          |                |
| U4  | s                                 | 32 (5.4%)                          |                |
| U5 (highest urban)                                | s                                 | 12 (2.0%)                          |                |
| Charlson Comorbidity Index Score<br>(Mean +/- SD) | 1.4 +/- 1.4                       | 1.3 +/- 1.3                        | 0.0132         |

**Table 3: Cancer Stage at Diagnosis by Location**

| <b>Cancer Stage</b> | <b>On-Reserve</b> | <b>Off-Reserve</b> | <b><i>p</i> value</b> |
|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| I                   | 202 (21.7%)       | 160 (26.9%)        | 0.0196                |
| II                  | 207 (22.3%)       | 133 (22.4%)        | 0.9517                |
| III                 | 176 (18.9%)       | 109 (18.4%)        | 0.7791                |
| IV                  | 216 (23.2%)       | 126 (21.2%)        | 0.3581                |
| Unknown             | 129 (13.9%)       | 66 (11.1%)         | 0.1157                |

Confidential

**Table 4: Cancer Site by Location**

| <b>Cancer Site</b>              | <b>On-Reserve<br/>n=930</b> | <b>Off-Reserve<br/>n=594</b> | <b><i>p</i> value</b> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Bladder                         | s                           | 8 (1.3%)                     | 0.0939                |
| Breast                          | 99 (10.6%)                  | 111 (18.7%)                  | <.0001                |
| Cervix                          | 19 (2.0%)                   | 26 (4.4%)                    | 0.0087                |
| Chronic lymphocytic<br>leukemia | s                           | s                            | 0.0776                |
| Colorectal                      | 153 (16.5%)                 | 87 (14.6%)                   | 0.3454                |
| Corpus uteri                    | 19 (2.0%)                   | 19 (3.2%)                    | 0.1582                |
| Kidney                          | 96 (10.3%)                  | 40 (6.7%)                    | 0.0166                |
| Lung and Bronchus               | 131 (14.1%)                 | 74 (12.5%)                   | 0.3636                |
| Melanoma of the<br>Skin         | s                           | s                            | s                     |
| Non-Hodgkin<br>Lymphoma         | 33 (3.5%)                   | 32 (5.4%)                    | 0.0832                |
| Other Cancers                   | 197 (21.2%)                 | 113 (19.0%)                  | 0.3071                |
| Ovary                           | 25 (2.7%)                   | 7 (1.2%)                     | 0.0450                |
| Pancreas                        | 19 (2.0%)                   | 13 (2.2%)                    | 0.8468                |
| Prostate                        | 100 (10.8%)                 | 34 (5.7%)                    | 0.0007                |
| Stomach                         | 18 (1.9%)                   | 11 (1.9%)                    | 0.9072                |
| Thyroid                         | 10 (1.1%)                   | 10 (1.7%)                    | 0.3089                |

**Table 5: Annual Crude Cancer Incidence by Location**

| Fiscal Year    | On-Reserve |                | Off-Reserve |                | <i>p</i> value |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|
|                | Count      | IR per 100,000 | Count       | IR per 100,000 |                |
| 2004/2005      | 116        | 308.9          | 75          | 301.8          | 0.8758         |
| 2005/2006      | 123        | 318.6          | 71          | 279.7          | 0.3817         |
| 2006/2007      | 131        | 330.7          | 71          | 273.1          | 0.1941         |
| 2007/2008      | 121        | 297.4          | 88          | 331.6          | 0.4377         |
| 2008/2009      | 154        | 367.2          | 119         | 440.0          | 0.1387         |
| 2009/2010      | 164        | 378.4          | 92          | 329.9          | 0.2927         |
| 2010/2011      | 159        | 355.0          | 100         | 347.9          | 0.8742         |
| <b>Overall</b> | <b>968</b> | <b>337.8</b>   | <b>616</b>  | <b>330.4</b>   | <b>0.6647</b>  |

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  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 6: Annual Adjusted Cancer Incidence by Location**

| Fiscal Year    | On-Reserve |                | Off-Reserve |                | <i>p</i> value |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|
|                | Count      | IR per 100,000 | Count       | IR per 100,000 |                |
| 2004/2005      | 116        | 245.1          | 75          | 280.1          | 0.3934         |
| 2005/2006      | 123        | 256.3          | 71          | 255.4          | 0.9827         |
| 2006/2007      | 131        | 260.8          | 71          | 247.3          | 0.7318         |
| 2007/2008      | 121        | 233.6          | 88          | 292.4          | 0.1316         |
| 2008/2009      | 154        | 291.0          | 119         | 380.3          | 0.0423         |
| 2009/2010      | 164        | 307.2          | 92          | 280.3          | 0.5078         |
| 2010/2011      | 159        | 283.3          | 100         | 294.8          | 0.7692         |
| <b>Overall</b> | <b>968</b> | <b>247.9</b>   | <b>616</b>  | <b>287.9</b>   | <b>0.0243</b>  |

Confidential

**Table 7: Mortality Hazard Ratios**

|  | <b>HR</b> | <b>95% CI</b> | <b><i>p</i> value</b> |
|--|-----------|---------------|-----------------------|
| All-cause mortality – Crude                                    | 1.28      | 1.11 – 1.26   | 0.0005                |
| All-cause mortality 5 years post diagnosis -<br>Adjusted       | 1.18      | 0.98 – 1.41   | 0.0652                |
| Cancer-specific mortality – Crude                              | 1.09      | 0.98 – 1.22   | 0.1172                |
| Cancer-specific mortality 5 years post<br>diagnosis - Adjusted | 1.03      | 0.90 – 1.19   | 0.6008                |

Confidential