medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Colorectal Cancer Disparities Across the Continuum of Cancer Care with a Focus on Surgery and Black Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Solomiya Syvyk BA[1]; Sanford Roberts MD[1,2]; Caitlin Finn MD[1]; Chris Wirtalla BA[1,2]; Rachel Kelz MD, MSCE, MBA[1,2,3]

Author Affiliations

[1] Center for Surgery and Health Economics, Department of Surgery, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA.
[2] Department of Surgery, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
[3] Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Corresponding Author

Rachel Kelz, MD MSCE MBA
Center for Surgery and Health Economics,
Department of Surgery,
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA.
Electronic address: Rachel.Kelz@uphs.upenn.edu.

Disclosures

None

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Importance
Despite increases in screening among vulnerable populations, colorectal cancer disparities persist.

Objective
To direct future efforts towards high impact opportunities in addressing these disparities, we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of the colorectal cancer disparities literature with a focus on the utilization of Surgery, the primary treatment for colorectal cancer.

Data Sources
Two electronic databases (PubMed and SCOPUS) were searched for prospective and retrospective studies reporting on colorectal cancer disparities between 2011 and March 29, 2021.

Study Selection
Studies for the systematic review were selected if: (1) reported on disparities within colorectal, colon, or rectal cancer (2) articles were published in the English language (3) articles used only United States-sourced data.
Studies for the meta-analysis were selected if: (1) reported on at least one of three utilization of surgery outcomes: receipt of colorectal, colon, or rectal surgery, refusal of surgery, or receipt of laparoscopic versus open surgery (2) Outcomes were reported as Odds ratio according to multivariate analysis.

Data Extraction and Synthesis
Quality appraisal and data extraction were performed independently by 2 reviewers using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for quality assessment. For the meta-analysis, pooled multivariate odds ratios for the three outcomes regarding utilization of surgery were separately calculated according to fixed or random-effects models. Reporting followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analyses guidelines.

Main Outcomes and Measures
Systematic Review: The volume of publications attributed to the following sectors of the colorectal cancer care continuum: (1) Prevention, Screening, or Diagnosis (2) Treatment (3) Survivorship (4) End-of-life Care. Meta-analysis: Receipt of Colorectal, Colon, or Rectal Surgery and Black Race, Refusal of Surgery and Black Race, or Receipt of Laparoscopic versus Open Surgery and Black Race.

Results
The systematic review included 1,199 relevant publications. Among them, 60% were focused on Prevention, Screening, or Diagnosis, followed by Survivorship (20%), Treatment (15%), and End-of-Life Care (1%). Within the studies reporting on treatment disparities, 46% were focused on Race/Ethnicity, followed by Socioeconomic Status (28%), Age (17%), Gender (6%), Disabilities/Comorbidities (3%), and LGBTQI+ (0%). A total of 16 studies, including 1,110,674 patients, were applied to three separate meta-analyses regarding utilization of Surgery. Patients of black race were less likely to receive colorectal, or colon, or rectal surgery (OR 0.75, 95% CI 0.67-0.83), less likely to receive laparoscopic versus open colorectal cancer surgery (OR 0.91, 95% CI 0.88-0.94), and twice as likely to refuse colon surgery (OR 2.41, 95% CI 1.91-3.06).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Conclusions and Relevance
The majority of research, to date, related to colorectal cancer disparities is focused on prevention, screening, or diagnosis and a minimal amount is dedicated to treatment. Additionally, all of the limited publications related to colorectal cancer surgery, as a treatment modality, are observational in nature. The application of this knowledge of past efforts and current continuing adverse outcomes is required in order to shift the focus of the research community towards treatment. In particular, research addressing surgical disparities is necessary, as surgery remains the primary treatment for colorectal cancer.

Introduction

Colorectal Cancer is the third most commonly diagnosed cancer in the United States. Patients of minority race/ethnicity, particularly of black race, are disproportionately impacted by adverse outcomes, including lower screening and higher mortality rates when compared with white patients. The majority of research and policy work in colorectal cancer disparities performed before 2010 was focused on prevention, screening and diagnosis.[1,2] With over 230 publications and numerous policy and clinical efforts focused on interventions to increase colorectal cancer screening for black patients, colorectal cancer screening rates for the black population increased from 32% in 2000 to 59% over the course of 20 years.[3,4]

Since the early 2000s, colorectal cancer mortality rates have decreased for black and white patients at all stages, but the declines were smaller for black patients by 15%-28% at every stage.[5] Similarly, the black community continues to suffer from adverse colorectal cancer outcomes such as higher post-operative complications and lower survival rates - even after controlling for tumor stage at diagnosis, socioeconomic status (SES), and co-morbidities. [6] The mortality difference may reflect lower rates of use of recommended colorectal cancer treatment among black patients when compared to white patients.[7]

Disparities have been continuously addressed, reduced, and well documented regarding colorectal cancer prevention, screening, and diagnosis, but little is known about the amount of research regarding disparities within the remainder of the colorectal cancer care continuum. Also, while

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

screening interventions are highly prevalent, an unknown amount of recent research has been dedicated to reducing colorectal cancer disparities via treatment interventions.

We conducted this systematic review and meta-analysis to provide insight into where the research community's focus must be shifted in order to take further action against adverse colorectal cancer outcomes in disparate populations. To that end, first, we assessed the volume of colorectal cancer disparities publications attributed to each domain of the cancer care continuum. Secondly, because Surgery is the primary and most common treatment for non-metastatic colorectal cancer, we examined disparities within the utilization of Surgery as a treatment modality.

Methods

Protocol

We performed this systemic review and meta-analysis in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. A preliminary version was published on medRxiv. Since its posting, the study has been significantly modified.

Information Sources and Search Strategies

We performed a systematic literature search of MEDLINE and Scopus databases using search terms related to colorectal cancer disparities. Table 1 in the Supplement gives the search strategy used for MEDLINE. Within the Scopus database, the following search terms were applied: "colorectal" AND "disparities". Our searches were limited to studies with full manuscripts, published in English, and from 2011 to March 29, 2021.

Eligibility Criteria

We included studies that reported on colon, rectal, or colorectal disparities within the United States. We considered studies along the cancer care continuum, as per the Institute of Medicine Framework.[8] Commentaries, letters, and publications with data sourced outside of the United States,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

were excluded. Review articles were excluded from the primary analysis and used as a source of additional relevant articles.

The meta-analysis was designed specifically to examine disparities in the utilization of Surgery as a treatment. For the meta-analysis, we included studies relating to disparities in the utilization of Surgery: receipt of surgery, refusal of surgery, and receipt of laparoscopic versus open surgery.

Black race was the most studied of all disparate populations within the Treatment category, yet patients of black race continue to disproportionately suffer from adverse colorectal cancer outcomes. As such and in accordance with the results of the systematic review, we tailored our meta-analyses to patients of black race.

Study Selection and Data Collection

Two authors (S.R. and S.S.) independently screened study titles and abstracts for potential inclusion. Full text of the relevant studies was extracted and reviewed for eligibility. Disagreements between the reviewers were resolved by consensus or by the third author (R.R.K). We manually searched reference lists of prior review articles for pertinent additional studies. Two authors (S.R. and S.S.) independently extracted data from the included studies and discrepancies were resolved by discussion.

Data Items

We captured the following: (1) General Study Information including: title, author(s), year of publication, data source, and sample size (2) Primary Disparity including: race/ethnicity, SES (income level, insurance status, location, hospital effects, or education level), age, gender, comorbidities/disabilities, and LGBTQIA+ (3) Categorization by the Cancer Care Continuum including: Prevention, Screening, or Diagnosis, Treatment, Survivorship, or End-of-Life Care, (4) Treatment Type including: Radiation, Systemic Therapy, Surgery, or Combined Treatment, (5) Utilization of Surgery Outcome(s) including: receipt of surgery, refusal of surgery, and receipt of laparoscopic versus open

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

surgery. For studies included in the meta-analyses, we extracted the Odds ratios (ORs), corresponding Confidence Intervals (CIs), the focus and control group sample sizes, and the covariates.

Risk of Bias in Individual Studies

Two authors (S.R. and S.S.) independently assessed the studies included in the meta-analysis for potential bias using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale.[9] This scale assesses the potential of bias in 3 domains: (1) selection of the study groups; (2) comparability of groups; and (3) ascertainment of exposure and outcome. The maximum score in the selection domain is 4 stars, in the comparability domain is 2 stars, and in the outcome domain is 3 stars. Studies with scores of 7 or higher were considered as having a low risk of bias, scores of 4 to 6 as having a moderate risk of bias, and scores less than 4 as having a high risk of bias. Disagreements were resolved by consensus or by the third author (R.R.K).

Statistical Analysis

We calculated combined estimates for five separate disparities-focused analyses in Surgery. First, we pooled the association between receipt of colorectal surgery and black race using ORs and corresponding 95% CIs from the multivariate analyses presented in the included studies. An additional two data sets were separately pooled and analyzed according to cancer type (colon versus rectal cancer) and black race.

Next, we calculated pooled multivariate ORs and the associated 95% CIs for the association between refusal of colon surgery and black race. In the final analysis, we calculated the association between receipt of laparoscopic versus open surgery and black race; multivariate ORs and corresponding 95% CIs were obtained from the relevant studies.

When data was unclear or not provided for the appropriate outcome, the study was not included in the analysis for the outcome, assuming that the data was missing at random. A funnel plot and regression asymmetry test were originally planned to asses for small study bias, but could not be performed due the limited number of studies in each analysis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The Cochran's test was used to assess for heterogeneity of the included studies in each respective analysis. For the heterogeneity tests, P values less than .10 were deemed to indicate significance. Forest plots and the I^2 statistic results were also assessed with $I^2 > 50\%$ indicating moderate heterogeneity. If heterogeneity was observed ($P < .10$ or $I^2 > 50\%$), the random-effects model was used to pool the estimate across studies, per analysis, with the Der Simonian-Laird method. Otherwise, the fixed-effects model was applied.

All database search results were downloaded, merged, and deduplicated by the systematic review management software, Covidence (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia). All analyses were performed using Stata statistical software version 16.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

Results

A total of 2,674 potentially relevant publications were reviewed (Figure 1). Among them, 1,199 met the inclusion criteria for this systematic review. Over 60% of all included publications were focused on Prevention, Screening, or Diagnosis, followed by Survivorship (20%), Treatment (15%), and End-of-Life Care (1%) (Figure 2).

Within the studies reporting on treatment disparities, 46% were focused on Race/Ethnicity, followed by SES (28%), Age (17%), Gender (6%), Disabilities/Comorbidities (3%), and LGBTQI+ (0%). Within the treatment category, the most commonly examined disparities included race and SES; 95 articles related to Surgery. Articles focused exclusively on surgical disparities constituted 69 (6%) of the 1,199 primary publications and 26 (2%) included Surgery as part of a combined treatment (Table 1).

Sixty-seven of the total 95 surgery-related articles reported on other outcomes such as pain management or delay in treatment and fourteen either did not include multivariate analysis, odds ratios, or 95% CIs. Ultimately, 14 publications (16 studies) were included in the meta-analysis as three separate analyses: receipt of colorectal cancer surgery, refusal of colon surgery, and receipt of laparoscopic versus open surgery and patients of black race.[10-23] Bliton et. al and Samuel et. al were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

applied to both receipt of colorectal cancer (colon) surgery and black race and receipt of colorectal cancer (rectal) surgery and black race without patient overlap. All 14 included publications were retrospective, and the total number of patients included was 1,110,674 (Table 2 in the Supplement).

Risk of Bias Within Studies

The quality of studies ranged between 6 and 7, indicating predominantly high quality with low risk of bias. For comparability of groups, the variables chosen were a measure for patient comorbidities and stage of cancer. All of the studies reported a loss-to-follow up due to their retrospective nature and inherent limitations within certain national databases. (Table 3 in the Supplement).

Meta-analyses

Receipt of Surgery and Black Race

A total of five studies evaluated the receipt of colorectal cancer surgery. In the random-effects model used to obtain pooled results, black patients with colorectal cancer were less likely to undergo Surgery (OR 0.75, 95% CI 0.60-0.93) when compared to white patients.

The additional two analyses by cancer type, colon or rectal, produced similar results, but with low between-study heterogeneity, (colon: I^2 = 0.0%;P>.10) and (rectal: I^2 = 39.2%;P>.10). The analyses by colon or rectal cancer included an additional six studies that were specific to the cancer type: colon (n=3) and rectal (n=3). In the analysis of receipt of colon surgery and black race, the pooled OR was 0.78 (95% CI 0.74-0.83); for receipt of rectal surgery and black race, the pooled OR was 0.73 (95% CI 0.65-0.81) (Figure 3).

Refusal of Colon Surgery and Black Race

The 2 studies on refusal of colon surgery and black race demonstrated moderate heterogeneity (I^2 = 61.7% and P>.10). Applying the random-effects model, our pooled analysis indicated that black patients are more likely to refuse colon surgery than white patients (OR 2.41, 95% CI 1.91-3.06) (Figure 4).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Receipt of Laparoscopic versus Open colorectal cancer Surgery and Black Race

There was no between-study heterogeneity presented in the three publications which assessed the receipt of laparoscopic versus open colorectal cancer surgery and black race (I^2 = 0.0%;P>.10). In our pooled analysis, black patients were less likely to receive laparoscopic versus open colorectal cancer surgery when compared to white patients (OR 0.91, 95% CI 0.88-0.94) (Figure 5).

Discussion

In 2002, the Institute of Medicine's report titled "Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care", summarized the multi-factorial roots of racial disparities, including patient, provider, and systemic factors.[24] Since the publication of that report, most of the published research has focused on one specific part of the cancer continuum and on one, or very few, populations of at-risk people. Our systematic review and meta-analysis is not restricted as we report on studies across the entire colorectal cancer care continuum and multiple populations to identify the research areas which may be saturated versus those which remain unexplored or underexplored. Additionally, we report on the existing evidence of disparities within the utilization of colorectal cancer surgery among the black population.

We identified a disproportionate research focus on prevention, screening, or diagnosis at 64% of all included studies – four times the volume of studies focused on treatment (15%) and a tenfold difference to publications focused on Surgery (6%). Within the treatment studies, the majority focused on racial minorities (46%) and low socioeconomic status (28%) and few addressed disparities among the LGBTQI+ population. Out of the 1,199 primary articles, zero interventions were found that related to the eradication of disparities in Surgery.

Our findings are consistent with previous literature, over the past 20 years, citing the limited research dedicated to interventions regarding colorectal cancer surgery and the relatively vast amount of research on colorectal cancer prevention, screening, or diagnosis.[2,3,25,26] Additionally, other colorectal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

cancer reviews have noted a disproportionately high amount of representation of racial minorities and a very limited representation of the LGBTQI+ community.[27,28] This is particularly problematic given the colorectal cancer treatment barriers and disparate outcomes in the LGBTQI+ population.[29,30,31]

Our findings offer a unique perspective into the past two decades of research efforts on colorectal cancer disparities; our findings indicate how to navigate forward given the past efforts' modern-day outcomes. Palmer et., al, published a systematic review on social disparities within colorectal cancer across the cancer care continuum with national data between 1990-2004. Their findings further emphasize our objective as their results also demonstrated that the majority of published research was focused on prevention, screening, or diagnosis in underrepresented racial minorities.[32] Since that time, disparities within this section of the cancer care continuum have been substantially reduced. A prominent example is the success of the statewide Delaware Colorectal Cancer Screening Program which not only eliminated screening disparities, but equalized incidence rates, and reduced the percentage of black patients with regional and distant disease from 79% to 40%.[33]

Meanwhile, as our review demonstrates, limited research efforts have been dedicated to treatment, particularly Surgery. The lack of focus on treatment disparities may provide an insight into the current state of disparities within the United States. For example, current mortality rates are 47% higher in black men and 34% higher in black women compared to whites.[34] According to our findings, black patients are less likely to utilize Surgery for the treatment of colorectal cancer and are twice as likely to refuse Surgery compared to white patients. Further, black patients receive the laparoscopic approach (as opposed to the open approach) less often, when compared to white patients. These surgical treatment differences have been found to underlie a substantial portion of the mortality and survival disparities in colorectal cancer outcomes for the black patient population.[10,13]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Receipt of Colorectal Surgery

When considering the modern published literature, our systematic review and meta-analysis confirms that patient medical factors do not fully explain the disparate delivery of surgical care to black patients.[13] Further, in the context of work by Gill et., al which reported similar odds of receiving colon cancer surgery between black and white patients in an equal access healthcare system,[35] it is plausible that access to care is driving some of the observed differences in the utilization of Surgery for colorectal cancer.

Refusal of Colon Surgery

The limited literature on refusal of surgery also found an increased likelihood of black patients refusing recommended colon surgery when compared to white patients. Refusal of recommended surgery by black patients can be attributed to socio-cultural factors including mistrust of the US health care system,[36,37] the potential for a higher likelihood of poor communication between providers and patients of varying racial backgrounds,[38] and low health literacy and comprehension rates among black patients.[39,40] Interestingly, physicians commonly overestimate patient level of health literacy, especially among black patients (54%) compared to white patients (11%).[41] This may be impeding the clarification of common misunderstandings that drive patients to refuse surgery; misunderstandings such as the belief that Surgery enables cancer to spread or confusion regarding the difference between malignant and metastatic disease.[42]

Laparoscopic versus Open Colorectal Cancer Surgery

Laparoscopic colorectal resection is associated with better overall outcomes, including: lower frequency of blood transfusions and surgical site infections and decreased rates of readmission and mortality.[43,44,45,46] Additionally, the laparoscopic approach for colon resection has also been shown to result in an 11.3% reduction in postoperative ileus and a shorter length of stay when compared with open surgery.[46] Our finding, that black patients are less likely to receive laparoscopic surgery, when

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

compared with white patients, may contribute to the observed disparities in surgical outcomes and colorectal cancer outcomes, in general.[47,48]

Patient and provider factors may influence the observed disparities in the receipt of laparoscopic surgery among black patients. Body mass index (BMI) is the primary factor demonstrated to be a predictor of open versus laparoscopic surgery for colorectal cancer. It is possible that differences in BMI between the typical black and white patient may drive the observed differences in receipt of laparoscopic surgery. If this is the underlying etiology, then consideration for preoperative optimization to overcome this barrier must be pursued.

Adjusting for BMI, studies have shown that the underutilization of laparoscopic colorectal surgery cannot be entirely explained by differences in patient characteristics or availability of laparoscopic equipment.[49] However, geographic and hospital factors are significantly associated with receipt of laparoscopic colorectal surgery, thus potentially influencing a patient's options for surgical approach.[50,51] Keller et. al reported that the following factors indicated a higher likelihood of approaching colon cancer laparoscopically: higher volume surgeons (3.5 times), Colorectal versus General Surgeons (32%), and urban versus rural location of hospital (1.5 times). Additionally, hospitals in the Northeast and Western United States were more likely to utilize the laparoscopic approach versus hospitals in the Midwest.[52] As such, differences in hospital and surgeon selection between black and white patients may also influence the observed disparity in the use of laparoscopic surgery among black patients.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. Based on the existing literature, all of the studies included in the meta-analysis were retrospective. Due to the limitations of the data sources used for the primary studies, longitudinal outcomes could not be evaluated. We observed notable heterogeneity for two analyses: receipt and refusal of colorectal surgery. To address this limitation, we used random effects

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

models for these analyses. For the receipt of surgery analysis, we also conducted separate analyses of nonoverlapping patient groups who received surgery on the colon or the rectum. These individual analyses had limited heterogeneity and the results among all three analyses presented similar odds ratios. Further, studies within the receipt of surgery analysis, are largely limited by the inability to assess whether lack of surgery was due to patient refusal or whether surgery was not presented as an option. Finally, within the risk of bias assessment for comparability of groups, the primary variable of collecting a measure for comorbidities, was absent in three studies. Two of the studies were used in the receipt of colorectal surgery meta-analysis which may explain the observed high heterogeneity.

Conclusion

According to our study, despite disparities that exist across the entire continuum of cancer care, the vast majority of research in the past 10 years has been dedicated to only one domain of the colorectal cancer care continuum - Prevention, Screening, or Diagnosis. A very limited amount of research has been dedicated to colorectal cancer disparities within treatment; no research has been dedicated to interventional studies on colorectal cancer disparities in Surgery. The abundant efforts to improve screening have resulted in increased screening rates and a decline in the prevalence of late-stage diagnoses among black patients. However, black patients remain less likely to receive colorectal surgery, twice as likely to refuse surgery, and less likely to receive laparoscopic surgery for colorectal cancer. To improve cancer survival and minimize morbidity, the research community must shift its focus to address disparities within colorectal cancer treatment beginning with the mainstay of treatment, Surgery.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Colorectal Cancer Disparities Across the Continuum of Cancer Care with a Focus on Surgery and Black Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Figure 1. Flow Diagram of Study Disposition



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2. Proportion of Studies Published on Disparities in Colorectal Cancer Care Across the Cancer Care Continuum



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.01.21259880; this version posted October 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1. Distribution of Treatment Disparities Studies within Colorectal Cancer by Treatment Type and Study Population

Distribution of Treatment Disparities Studies within Colorectal Cancer by Treatment Type						
Treatment Type	**Surgery**	**Combined**		**Radiation**		**Systemic Therapy**
		w/ Surgery	**w/o Surgery**			
Publications, n (%)	69 (6%)	26 (2%)	37 (3%)	13 (1%)		33 (3%)
Distribution of Treatment Disparities Studies within Colorectal Cancer by Study Population						
Disparate Population	**Race/Ethnicity**	**SES**	**Age**	**Gender**	**Disabilities/Comorbidities**	**LGBTQI+**
Publications, n (%)	82 (46%)	50 (28%)	30 (17%)	10 (6%)	6 (3%)	0 (0%)
Note. Percentages for the type of treatment are calculated out of the total number of disparities studies; Percentages for the study population are calculated out of the total number of publications on treatment disparities						

Figure 3. Meta-analysis of 9 Studies Assessing Receipt of Colorectal, Colon, or Rectal Cancer Surgery and Black Race

Cancer Type and Study (Year)	Black Patient Events	Black Patient Total	White Patient Events	White Patient Total	Study Size	OR (95% CI)	% Weight
Colorectal							
Haas JS, et. al (2011)	2606	3051	30069	33597	36648	0.60 (0.55, 0.66)	10.90
Munene G, et. al (2013)	249	14208	2151	79334	93542	0.61 (0.52, 0.71)	9.37
Raoof M., et. al (2020)	98	1591	997	9664	11255	0.75 (0.58, 0.95)	7.09
Uppal A., et. al (2019)	357	2601	1889	12078	14679	0.91 (0.79, 1.05)	9.72
Rodriguez EA., et. al (2018)	2001	5190	14614	34577	39767	0.93 (0.86, 0.99)	11.28
Subgroup					195891	0.75 (0.60, 0.93)	48.37
(I-squared = 94.3%)							
Colon							
Samuel CA., et. al (2014)	1069	1173	5020	5375	6548	0.76 (0.58, 0.98)	6.74
Bliton JN., et. al (2021)	26927	28646	183061	190688	219334	0.78 (0.73, 0.83)	11.39
Birkett RT., et. al (2019)	359	542	3115	4292	4834	0.80 (0.64, 0.98)	7.91
Subgroup					230716	0.78 (0.74, 0.83)	26.03
(I-squared = 0.0%)							
Rectal							
Samuel CA., et. al (2014)	169	251	1296	1636	1887	0.57 (0.39, 0.82)	4.69
Bliton JN., et. al (2021)	8555	11111	90768	106786	117897	0.71 (0.70, 0.88)	10.39
Arsoniadis EG., et. al (2017)	1600	7560	21097	100877	108437	0.78 (0.70, 0.87)	10.52
Subgroup					228221	0.73 (0.65, 0.81)	25.60
(I-squared = 39.2%)							
Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.421							
Overall					654828	0.75 (0.67, 0.83)	100.00
(I-squared = 86.7%)							



NOTE: Weights are from random-effects model

Figure 4. Meta-analysis of 2 Studies Assessing Refusal of Colon Cancer Surgery and Black Race

Study (Year)	Black Patient Events	Black Patient Total	White Patient Events	White Patient Total	Study Size	OR (95% CI)	% Weight
Alty IG., et al (2021)	215	19898	879	147513	167411	2.11 (1.77, 2.84)	44.46
Lu PW., et al (2020)	217	17152	783	120730	137882	2.69 (2.26, 3.21)	55.54
Overall					305293	2.41 (1.91, 3.06)	100.00
(I-squared = 61.7%)							



Figure 5. Meta-analysis of 3 Studies Assessing Receipt of Laparoscopic versus Open Colorectal Cancer Surgery and Black Race