Colorectal Cancer Disparities Across the Continuum of Cancer Care: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Solomiya Syvyk BA[1]; Sanford E. Roberts MD[1,2]; Caitlin B. Finn MD[1,4]; 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

[4]NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital/Weill Cornell Medicine, Department of Surgery, New York, New York.

Disclosures and Funding Sources: Nothing to disclose.

Synopsis:

In this systematic review on disparities along the colorectal cancer care continuum, we found that 64% of research has been focused on prevention, screening, or diagnosis while only 6% addressed surgical disparities. In the meta-analysis, Black patients were less likely to undergo surgery, more likely to refuse surgery, and less likely to undergo laparoscopic surgery, when compared to White patients. Future research should target treatment differences across populations in order to impact persistent disparities in colorectal cancer survival.

Structured Abstract

Background and Objectives

Disparate colorectal cancer outcomes persist in vulnerable populations. We aimed to examine the distribution of research across the colorectal cancer care continuum, and to determine disparities in the use of Surgery among Black patients.

Methods

A systematic review and meta-analysis of colorectal cancer disparities studies was performed. The meta-analysis assessed three utilization measures in Surgery.

Results

Of 1,199 publications, 60% focused on Prevention, Screening, or Diagnosis, 20% on Survivorship, 15% on Treatment, and 1% on End-of-Life Care. A total of 16 studies, including 1,110,674 patients, were applied to three separate meta-analyses regarding utilization of Surgery. Black colorectal cancer patients were less likely to receive surgery, twice as likely to refuse surgery, and less likely to receive laparoscopic surgery when compared to White patients.

Conclusions

Over the past 10 years, the majority of published research remained focused on the prevention, screening, or diagnosis domain. Given the observed treatment disparities and persistently elevated disease-specific mortality among Black patients, future efforts to reduce colorectal cancer disparities should include interventions within Surgery.

Keywords: colorectal cancer; cancer care continuum; disparities; utilization of surgery

Introduction

Despite substantial progress in care for patients with colorectal cancer over the past several decades, these advances have been unevenly distributed. While colorectal cancer mortality rates have decreased for Black and White patients at all stages, the declines have been smaller for Black patients by 15%-28% at every stage.[1] Similarly, the Black community continues to suffer from worse adverse colorectal cancer outcomes such as higher risk-adjusted post-operative complications and lower overall survival rates. [2] The mortality difference may reflect lower utilization of recommended colorectal cancer treatment among Black patients when compared to White patients.[3]

The majority of research and policy work in colorectal cancer disparities performed before 2010 was focused on prevention, screening and diagnosis.[4,5] Over two decades, there were more than 230 publications and numerous policy and clinical efforts focused on interventions to increase colorectal cancer screening for Black patients. These efforts were associated with an increase in colorectal cancer screening rates from 32% (2000) to 59% (2016) among Black patients which was similar to rates among White patients.[6,7]

Effective efforts to ameliorate disparities in colorectal cancer outcomes have been focused on prevention, screening, and diagnosis. Little is known about efforts to eradicate disparities across the remainder of the colorectal cancer care continuum. We conducted this systematic review and meta-analysis to guide future research efforts. 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.

Materials and 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.[8] 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 January 1, 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 entire cancer care continuum, as per the Institute of Medicine Framework.[9] Commentaries, letters, and publications reporting on populations outside of the United States were excluded. Review articles were excluded from the primary analysis, but their reference lists were 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 modality. 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. 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 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 and 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 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.[10] 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 the five separate analyses focused on utilization of Surgery outcomes: receipt of surgery (colorectal, colon, and rectal), refusal of surgery, and receipt of laparoscopic versus open surgery. First, we studied the association between receipt of surgery and Black race using ORs and corresponding 95% CIs from the multivariate analyses presented in the included studies. Given that some studies reported their results for colorectal procedures combined while others reported colon and rectal separately, we conducted three separate analyses for each procedure type: colorectal, colon, and rectal.

Next, we calculated pooled multivariate ORs and the associated 95% CIs for the association between refusal of colon surgery and Black race. In the fifth and 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 did not provide the appropriate outcome, the study was not included in the analysis for the outcome. A funnel plot and regression asymmetry test were originally planned to assess for small study bias, but could not be performed due the limited number of studies in each analysis.

The Cochran's test was used to assess for heterogeneity of the included studies in each respective analysis. For the heterogeneity measure, derived from two-tailed tests, p values less than 0.10 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 $I^2 > 50\%$), a random-effects model was used to pool the estimate across studies, per analysis, with the DerSimonian-Laird method. Otherwise, a 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 title and abstract 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 and Ethnicity, followed by SES (28%), Age (17%), Gender (6%), Disabilities/Comorbidities (3%), and LGBTQI+ (0.0%). Within the treatment category, the most commonly examined disparate population was Black race. Of 95 articles that included surgical data, 69/1,199 (6%) focused exclusively on surgical disparities and 26/1,199 (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.[11-24] Bliton et. al and Samuel et. al were 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 with moderate heterogeneity (I^2 = 94.3%; p = 0.00). 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 = 0.955) and (rectal: I^2 = 39.2%; p = 0.193). 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). Black race was associated with a lower likelihood of receiving colon cancer surgery (OR 0.78, 95% CI 0.74-0.83); and a lower likelihood of receiving rectal cancer surgery (OR 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%; p = 0.106). 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).

Receipt of Laparoscopic versus Open colorectal cancer Surgery and Black Race

There was limited 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 = 0.977). 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.[25] Since the publication of that report, the majority of the published research has remained focused on prevention, screening and diagnosis. Our approach offers researchers perspective into what areas within colorectal cancer disparities research may be saturated versus those which remain unexplored or underexplored.

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 as a treatment (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, none of the studies examined interventions designed to address disparities in Surgery.

Our findings are consistent with previous literature, 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.[4,5,26,27, 33, 34] Other colorectal cancer reviews have noted a disproportionately high amount of representation of racial minorities and a very limited representation of the LGBTQI+ community.[30,31] This is particularly problematic given the colorectal cancer treatment barriers and disparate outcomes noted in the LGBTQI+ population.[32,33,34]

Our systematic review highlights the limited number of studies 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 colorectal cancer related death rates are 47% higher in Black men and 34% higher in Black women compared to their White counterparts.[37] According to our findings, Black patients have been less likely to utilize Surgery for the treatment of colorectal cancer and are twice as likely to refuse Surgery compared to White patients. Further, the laparoscopic approach to resection has been used less often in Black patients (as opposed to the open approach) 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.[11,14]

Receipt of Colorectal Surgery

When considering the modern published literature, our systematic review and meta-analysis further suggests that patient medical factors do not fully explain the disparate delivery of surgical care to Black patients.[14] Additionally, 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,[38] 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,[39,40] the potential for a higher likelihood of poor communication between providers and patients of varying racial backgrounds,[41] and low health literacy among some Black patients.[42,43] Interestingly, physicians commonly overestimate patient level of health literacy, especially among Black

patients (54%) compared to White patients (11%).[44] 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.[45]

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.[46,47,48,49] 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.[49] Our finding that Black patients are less likely to receive laparoscopic surgery, when compared to White patients, may contribute to the observed disparities in surgical outcomes and colorectal cancer outcomes, in general.[50,51]

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.[52] It is possible that differences in BMI between the typical Black and White patient may drive the observed differences in receipt of laparoscopic surgery.[53] If this is the underlying etiology, then consideration for preoperative optimization to overcome this barrier must be pursued.

Studies, that adjusted for BMI, have shown that the underutilization of laparoscopic colorectal surgery cannot be entirely explained by differences in patient characteristics or availability of laparoscopic equipment.[54] However, geographic and hospital factors are significantly associated with receipt of laparoscopic colorectal surgery, thus potentially influencing a patient's options for surgical approach.[55,56] 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 (1.3 times), 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.[57] 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 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. The two studies that examined refusal of Surgery had overlapping patient cohorts. Interestingly, the more recent study demonstrated trend towards a greater likelihood for Black patients to refuse surgery than the earlier study. 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.

Conclusions

Despite disparities that exist across the continuum of cancer care, the vast majority of research in the past 10 years has remained focused on Prevention, Screening, or Diagnosis within racial minorities.

Relatively few studies have addressed disparities within the treatment domain. All of the surgical studies were observational without any studies testing interventions to reduce surgical disparities. Future studies should include an expansion of the existing work to understudied populations such as the LGBTQI+ community. Additionally, because 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, future efforts to reduce colorectal cancer disparities should include interventions within Surgery.

Figure Legend

Figure 1. Flow Diagram of Study Disposition

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

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

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

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

Data Availability Statement:

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available in PubMed (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/) at

Reference number 11; DOI Link: 10.1016/j.amjsurg.2020.06.020
Reference number 12; DOI Link: 10.1245/s10434-017-6306-4
Reference number 13; DOI Link: 10.1016/j.suronc.2018.11.010
Reference number 14; DOI Link: 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-20-0950
Reference number 15; DOI Link: 10.1002/cncr.26034
Reference number 16; DOI Link: 10.1007/s00464-017-5782-8
Reference number 17; DOI Link: 10.1002/jso.25917
Reference number 18; DOI Link: 10.1016/s0027-9684(15)30112-7
Reference number 19; DOI Link: 10.1002/cam4.3316
Reference number 20; DOI Link: 10.1097/DCR.0000000000000874
Reference number 21; DOI Link: 10.1097/MCG.0000000000000951
Reference number 22; DOI Link: 10.2105/AJPH.2014.302079
Reference number 23; DOI Link: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000001781

Reference number 24; DOI Link: 10.1002/cncr.32529

References

1. Robbins, A. S., Siegel, R. L., & Jemal, A. (2012). Racial disparities in stage-specific colorectal cancer mortality rates from 1985 to 2008. *Journal of clinical oncology*, *30*(4), 401-405.
2. Alexander DD, Waterbor J, Hughes T, Funkhouser E, Grizzle W, Manne U. African-American and Caucasian disparities in colorectal cancer mortality and survival by data source: an epidemiologic review. Cancer Biomark. 2007;3(6):301-13. doi: 10.3233/cbm-2007-3604. PMID: 18048968; PMCID: PMC2667694.
3. Tramontano, Angela C et al. "Racial/ethnic disparities in colorectal cancer treatment utilization and phase-specific costs, 2000-2014." *PloS one* vol. 15,4 e0231599. 14 Apr. 2020, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0231599
4. Powe B.D., Faulkenberry R., Harmond L. A review of intervention studies that seek to increase colorectal cancer screening among African Americans. *Am J Health Promot.* 2010;25:92–99.
5. Naylor K, Ward J, Polite BN. Interventions to improve care related to colorectal cancer among racial and ethnic minorities: a systematic review. J Gen Intern Med. 2012 Aug;27(8):1033-46. doi: 10.1007/s11606-012-2044-2. PMID: 22798214; PMCID: PMC3403155.
6. Roy, S., Dickey, S., Wang, HL. *et al.* Systematic Review of Interventions to Increase Stool Blood Colorectal Cancer Screening in African Americans. *J Community Health* 46, 232–244 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-020-00867-z
7. Montminy EM, Karlitz JJ, Landreneau SW. Progress of colorectal cancer screening in United States: Past achievements and future challenges. Prev Med. 2019 Mar;120:78-84. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2018.12.004. Epub 2018 Dec 21. PMID: 30579938.

8. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gotzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. BMJ 2009;339:b2700.
9. Institute of Medicine.2013. Delivering High-Quality Cancer Care: Charting a New Course for a System in Crisis. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.https://doi.org/10.17226/18359.
10. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality if nonrandomizes studies in meta-analyses. http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp.
11. Alty IG, Dee EC, Cusack JC, Blaszkowsky LS, Goldstone RN, Francone TD, Wo JY, Qadan M. Refusal of surgery for colon cancer: Sociodemographic disparities and survival implications among US patients with resectable disease. Am J Surg. 2021 Jan;221(1):39-45. doi: 10.1016/j.amjsurg.2020.06.020. Epub 2020 Jun 23. PMID: 32723488.
12. Arsoniadis EG, Fan Y, Jarosek S, Gaertner WB, Melton GB, Madoff RD, Kwaan MR. Decreased Use of Sphincter-Preserving Procedures Among African Americans with Rectal Cancer. Ann Surg Oncol. 2018 Mar;25(3):720-728. doi: 10.1245/s10434-017-6306-4. Epub 2017 Dec 27. PMID: 29282601.
13. Birkett RT, O'Donnell MMT, Epstein AJ, Saur NM, Bleier JIS, Paulson EC. Elective colon resection without curative intent in stage IV colon cancer. Surg Oncol. 2019 Mar;28:110-115. doi: 10.1016/j.suronc.2018.11.010. Epub 2018 Nov 13. PMID: 30851883.
14. Bliton JN, Parides M, Muscarella P, Papalezova KT, In H. Understanding Racial Disparities in Gastrointestinal Cancer Outcomes: Lack of Surgery Contributes to Lower Survival in African American Patients. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2021 Mar;30(3):529-538. doi: 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-20-0950. Epub 2020 Dec 10. PMID: 33303644; PMCID: PMC8049948.

15. Haas JS, Brawarsky P, Iyer A, Fitzmaurice GM, Neville BA, Earle C. Association of area sociodemographic characteristics and capacity for treatment with disparities in colorectal cancer care and mortality. Cancer. 2011 Sep 15;117(18):4267-76. doi: 10.1002/cncr.26034. Epub 2011 Mar 16. PMID: 21413000.
16. Hawkins AT, Ford MM, Benjamin Hopkins M, Muldoon RL, Wanderer JP, Parikh AA, Geiger TM. Barriers to laparoscopic colon resection for cancer: a national analysis. Surg Endosc. 2018 Feb;32(2):1035-1042. doi: 10.1007/s00464-017-5782-8. Epub 2017 Aug 24. PMID: 28840352.
17. Lu PW, Fields AC, Yoo J, Irani J, Goldberg JE, Bleday R, Melnitchouk N. Sociodemographic predictors of surgery refusal in patients with stage I-III colon cancer. J Surg Oncol. 2020 Jun;121(8):1306-1313. doi: 10.1002/jso.25917. Epub 2020 Mar 29. PMID: 32227344.
18. Munene G, Parker RD, Shaheen AA, Myers RP, Quan ML, Ball CG, Dixon E. Disparities in the surgical treatment of colorectal liver metastases. J Natl Med Assoc. 2013 Summer;105(2):128-37. doi: 10.1016/s0027-9684(15)30112-7. PMID: 24079213.
19. Raoof, M., Jutric, Z., Haye, S., Ituarte, P., Zhao, B., Singh, G., Melstrom, L., Warner, S. G., Clary, B., & Fong, Y. (2020). Systematic failure to operate on colorectal cancer liver metastases in California. *Cancer medicine*, *9*(17), 6256–6267. https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.3316
20. Ratnapradipa, K. L., Lian, M., Jeffe, D. B., Davidson, N. O., Eberth, J. M., Pruitt, S. L., & Schootman, M. (2017). Patient, Hospital, and Geographic Disparities in Laparoscopic Surgery Use Among Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results-Medicare Patients With Colon Cancer. *Diseases of the colon and rectum*, *60*(9), 905–913. https://doi.org/10.1097/DCR.0000000000000874
21. Rodriguez EA, Tamariz L, Palacio A, Li H, Sussman DA. Racial Disparities in the Presentation and Treatment of Colorectal Cancer: A Statewide Cross-sectional Study. J Clin Gastroenterol. 2018 Oct;52(9):817-820. doi: 10.1097/MCG.0000000000000951. PMID: 29095418.

22. Samuel CA, Landrum MB, McNeil BJ, Bozeman SR, Williams CD, Keating NL. Racial disparities in cancer care in the Veterans Affairs health care system and the role of site of care. Am J Public Health. 2014 Sep;104 Suppl 4(Suppl 4):S562-71. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2014.302079. PMID: 25100422; PMCID: PMC4151900.
23. Turner M, Adam MA, Sun Z, Kim J, Ezekian B, Yerokun B, Mantyh C, Migaly J. Insurance Status, Not Race, is Associated With Use of Minimally Invasive Surgical Approach for Rectal Cancer. Ann Surg. 2017 Apr;265(4):774-781. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000001781. PMID: 27163956.
24. Uppal A, Smieliauskas F, Sharma MR, Maron SB, Polite BN, Posner MC, Turaga K. Facilities that service economically advantaged neighborhoods perform surgical metastasectomy more often for patients with colorectal liver metastases. Cancer. 2020 Jan 15;126(2):281-292. doi: 10.1002/cncr.32529. Epub 2019 Oct 22. PMID: 31639217.
25. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Understanding and Eliminating Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care. Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care. Smedley BD, Stith AY, Nelson AR, editors. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2003. PMID: 25032386.
26. Facciorusso A, Demb J, Mohan BP, Gupta S, Singh S. Addition of Financial Incentives to Mailed Outreach for Promoting Colorectal Cancer Screening: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open. 2021;4(8):e2122581. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.22581
27. Jager, M., Demb, J., Asghar, A. et al. Mailed Outreach Is Superior to Usual Care Alone for Colorectal Cancer Screening in the USA: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Dig Dis Sci 64, 2489–2496 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10620-019-05587-6
28. Palmer RC, Schneider EC. Social disparities across the continuum of colorectal cancer: a systematic review. Cancer Causes Control. 2005 Feb;16(1):55-61. doi: 10.1007/s10552-004-1253-3. PMID: 15750858.

29. Grubbs, S. S., Polite, B. N., Carney, J., Jr, Bowser, W., Rogers, J., Katurakes, N., Hess, P., & Paskett, E. D. (2013). Eliminating racial disparities in colorectal cancer in the real world: it took a village. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology*, *31*(16), 1928–1930. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2012.47.8412
30. Lee, S. J., O'Leary, M. C., Umble, K. E., & Wheeler, S. B. (2018). Eliciting vulnerable patients' preferences regarding colorectal cancer screening: a systematic review. Patient preference and adherence, 12, 2267–2282. https://doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S156552
31. Asaph Rolnitsky, Maksim Kirtsman, Hanna R Goldberg, Michael Dunn, Chaim M Bell, The representation of vulnerable populations in quality improvement studies, International Journal for Quality in Health Care, Volume 30, Issue 4, May 2018, Pages 244–249, https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzy016
32. Cahill SR. Legal and Policy Issues for LGBT Patients with Cancer or at Elevated Risk of Cancer. Semin Oncol Nurs. 2018 Feb;34(1):90-98. doi: 10.1016/j.soncn.2017.12.006. Epub 2018 Jan 11. PMID: 29336921.
33. Boehmer U, Miao X, Maxwell NI, Ozonoff A. Sexual minority population density and incidence of lung, colorectal and female breast cancer in California. BMJ Open. 2014 Mar 26;4(3):e004461. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004461. PMID: 24670430; PMCID: PMC3975738.
34. Janice A. Sabin, Rachel G. Riskind, and Brian A. Nosek, 2015:
Health Care Providers' Implicit and Explicit Attitudes Toward Lesbian Women and Gay Men American Journal of Public Health 105, 1831_1841, https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2015.302631
35. DeSantis CE, Miller KD, Goding Sauer A, Jemal A, Siegel RL. Cancer statistics for African Americans, 2019. CA Cancer J Clin. 2019 May;69(3):211-233. doi: 10.3322/caac.21555. Epub 2019 Feb 14. PMID: 30762872.

36. Gill AA, Enewold L, Zahm SH, Shriver CD, Stojadinovic A, McGlynn KA, Zhu K. Colon cancer treatment: are there racial disparities in an equal-access healthcare system? Dis Colon Rectum. 2014 Sep;57(9):1059-65. doi: 10.1097/DCR.0000000000000177. PMID: 25101601; PMCID: PMC4126203.
37. LaVeist, Thomas A et al. "Mistrust of health care organizations is associated with underutilization of health services." Health services research vol. 44,6 (2009): 2093-105. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2009.01017.x
38. Carlisle, B.L. and Murray, C.B. (2020). The Role of Cultural Mistrust in Health Disparities. In The Wiley Encyclopedia of Health Psychology (eds S.B. Gulliver and L.M. Cohen).
39. Penner, L. A., Harper, F., Dovidio, J. F., Albrecht, T. L., Hamel, L. M., Senft, N., & Eggly, S. (2017). The impact of Black cancer patients' race-related beliefs and attitudes on racially-discordant oncology interactions: A field study. *Social science & medicine (1982)*, *191*, 99–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.08.034
40. Shen, M. J., Peterson, E. B., Costas-Muñiz, R., Hernandez, M. H., Jewell, S. T., Matsoukas, K., & Bylund, C. L. (2018). The Effects of Race and Racial Concordance on Patient-Physician Communication: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Journal of racial and ethnic health disparities*, *5*(1), 117–140. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40615-017-0350-4
41. Muvuka, B., Combs, R. M., Ayangeakaa, S. D., Ali, N. M., Wendel, M. L., & Jackson, T. (2020). Health Literacy in African-American Communities: Barriers and Strategies. *Health literacy research and practice*, *4*(3), e138–e143. https://doi.org/10.3928/24748307-20200617-01
42. Kelly PA, Haidet P. Physician overestimation of patient literacy: a potential source of health care disparities. Patient Educ Couns. 2007 Apr;66(1):119-22. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2006.10.007. Epub 2006 Nov 30. PMID: 17140758.

43. Hoffman RL, Bryant B, Allen SR, Lee MK, Aarons CB, Kelz RR. Using community outreach to explore health-related beliefs and improve surgeon-patient engagement. J Surg Res. 2016 Dec;206(2):411-417. doi: 10.1016/j.jss.2016.08.058. Epub 2016 Aug 20. PMID: 27884337.
44. Addae JK, Gani F, Fang SY, Wick EC, Althumairi AA, Efron JE, Canner JK, Euhus DM, Schneider EB. A comparison of trends in operative approach and postoperative outcomes for colorectal cancer surgery. J Surg Res. 2017 Feb;208:111-120. doi: 10.1016/j.jss.2016.09.019. Epub 2016 Sep 17. PMID: 27993198.
45. Caroff DA, Chan C, Kleinman K, et al. Association of Open Approach vs Laparoscopic Approach With Risk of Surgical Site Infection After Colon Surgery. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2019;2(10):e1913570. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.13570
46. Shin TH, Friedrich S, Brat GA, Rudolph MI, Sein V, Munoz-Acuna R, Houle TT, Ferrone CR, Eikermann M. Effects of laparoscopic vs open abdominal surgery on costs and hospital readmission rate and its effect modification by surgeons' case volume. Surg Endosc. 2020 Oct;34(10):1-12. doi: 10.1007/s00464-019-07222-x. Epub 2019 Oct 28. PMID: 31659507.
47. Schootman, M., Mutch, M., Loux, T. *et al.* Differences in effectiveness and use of laparoscopic surgery in locally advanced colon cancer patients. *Sci Rep* 11, 10022 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-89554-0
48. Cairns, A.L., Schlottmann, F., Strassle, P.D. *et al.* Racial and Socioeconomic Disparities in the Surgical Management and Outcomes of Patients with Colorectal Carcinoma. *World J Surg* 43, 1342–1350 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-018-04898-5
49. Ramai, D., Barakat, M., Dhaliwal, A. *et al.* Gender and racial disparities in colorectal cancer incidence and mortality: a national cancer registry study. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 36, 1801–1804 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00384-021-03894-x

50. Bell S, Kong JC, Wale R, Staples M, Oliva K, Wilkins S, Mc Murrick P, Warrier SK. The effect of increasing body mass index on laparoscopic surgery for colon and rectal cancer. Colorectal Dis. 2018 Sep;20(9):778-788. doi: 10.1111/codi.14107. Epub 2018 May 4. PMID: 29577556.
51. American Cancer Society. *Cancer Facts & Figures for African Americans 2019-2021.* Atlanta: American Cancer Society, 2019.
52. Reames BN, Sheetz KH, Waits SA, Dimick JB, Regenbogen SE. Geographic variation in use of laparoscopic colectomy for colon cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2014 Nov 10;32(32):3667-72. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2014.57.1588. Epub 2014 Oct 6. PMID: 25287826; PMCID: PMC4220045.
53. Moghadamyeghaneh Z, Carmichael JC, Mills S, Pigazzi A, Nguyen NT, Stamos MJ. Variations in Laparoscopic Colectomy Utilization in the United States. Dis Colon Rectum. 2015 Oct;58(10):950-6. doi: 10.1097/DCR.0000000000000448. PMID: 26347967.
54. Reames BN, Sheetz KH, Waits SA, Dimick JB, Regenbogen SE. Geographic variation in use of laparoscopic colectomy for colon cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2014 Nov 10;32(32):3667-72. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2014.57.1588. Epub 2014 Oct 6. PMID: 25287826; PMCID: PMC4220045.
55. Keller, D.S., Parikh, N. & Senagore, A.J. Predicting opportunities to increase utilization of laparoscopy for colon cancer. *Surg Endosc* 31, 1855–1862 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-016-5185-2

Figure I. Flow Diagram of Study Disposition



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



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

Study (Year)	Black Patient Events	Black Patient Total	White Patient Events	White Patient Total	Study Size	OR (95% CI)	% Weight
Ratnapradipa KL., et al (2017)	394	923	4262	8924	9847	0.90 (0.75, 1.07)	4.05
Turner M., et al (2017)	641	1905	7989	20066	21971	0.90 (0.81, 1.01)	10.51
Hawkins AT., et al (2018)	6013	14982	46060	103753	118735	0.91 (0.87, 0.94)	85.44
Overall					150553	0.91 (0.88, 0.94)	100.00
(I-squared = 0.0%)							



Table I. 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 and 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						