

Socio-economic deprivation and cancer incidence in England: Quantifying the role of smoking

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

Nick W. S. Payne^{1*}, Katrina F. Brown¹, Christine Delon¹, Yannis Kotrotsios¹, Isabelle Soerjomataram², Jon Shelton¹

¹ Policy, Information and Communication Directorate, Cancer Research UK, 2 Redman Place, London, E20 1JQ

² Section of Cancer Surveillance, International Agency for Research on Cancer, Lyon, France.

* Correspondence: Nick Payne, Nicholas.Payne@cancer.org.uk

32 **Abstract**

33 **Background**

34 More deprived populations typically experience higher cancer incidence rates and smoking
35 prevalence compared to less deprived populations. We calculated the proportion of cancer
36 cases attributable to smoking by socio-economic deprivation in England and estimated the
37 impact smoking has on the deprivation gap for cancer incidence.

38 **Methods**

39 Data for cancer incidence (2013-2017), smoking prevalence (2003-2007) and population
40 estimates (2013-2017) were split by sex, age-group and deprivation quintile. Relative risk
41 estimates from meta-analyses were used to estimate the population attributable fraction
42 (PAF) for 15 cancer types associated with smoking. The deprivation gap was calculated using
43 age-specific incidence rates by deprivation quintile.

44 **Results**

45 Smoking-related cancer PAFs in England are 2.2 times larger in the most deprived quintile
46 compared to the least deprived quintile (from 9.7% to 21.1%). If everyone had the same
47 smoking prevalence as the least deprived quintile, 20% of the deprivation gap in cancer
48 incidence could have been prevented. If nobody smoked, 61% of the deprivation gap could
49 have been prevented.

50 **Conclusions**

51 The majority of the deprivation gap in cancer incidence could have been prevented in
52 England between 2013-2017 if nobody had smoked. Policy makers should ensure that
53 tobacco control policies reduce overall smoking prevalence by tackling smoking inequalities.

54

55 **Background**

56 Smoking is the main cause of preventable cancer and death in the UK.^{1,2} In England, smoking
57 accounted for 15% (around 44,000 cases) of all cancer cases in 2015.¹ Smoking causes at
58 least 15 different types of cancer, and the proportion of cases caused by smoking varies
59 greatly by cancer type, ranging from 0.3% for ovarian cancer to 72% for lung cancer in
60 England.

61 Cancer incidence varies by socio-economic position across the UK.^{3,4,5,6} For example, cancer
62 incidence rates for all cancers combined in England are 17% higher in the most deprived
63 quintile compared to the least.⁷

64 The majority of cancer types' incidence rates are positively associated with deprivation in
65 England, leading to an estimated 27,200 deprivation-associated cancer cases each year.³

66 Many of the cancer types associated with deprivation are also associated with smoking.^{3,8}

67 A clear socio-economic divide is observed for adult smoking prevalence in the UK.⁹ In
68 England, smoking prevalence is around 2.5 times higher in the most deprived group
69 compared to the least deprived group.^{9,10} In line with this, previous studies in France and
70 Australia have reported that more deprived populations had a higher burden of cancer
71 incidence attributable to smoking.^{11,12} These studies also investigated the impact of the
72 removal of smoking inequalities, which estimated that 7-13% of all cancers caused by
73 smoking in men and 8-9% in women, could be prevented if everyone smoked like the least
74 deprived quintile.

75 We aimed to estimate the proportion of cancer cases attributable to smoking by socio-
76 economic position in England. Additionally, we estimated what proportion of the observed
77 deprivation gap in cancer incidence in England could have been prevented if: 1) everyone had
78 the same smoking prevalence as the least deprived group; 2) nobody smoked.

79 **Methods**

80 **Cancer Types**

81 To calculate the proportion of cancer cases attributable to smoking we included 15 cancer
82 types which have ‘sufficient’ evidence of a causal association with smoking based on the
83 International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) Monograph⁸: oral cavity, pharynx,
84 nasopharynx, larynx, oesophagus, stomach, colorectal, liver, pancreas, lung, cervix uteri,
85 kidney, bladder, ovarian (mucinous) and acute myeloid leukaemia (see Supplementary
86 Material A for International Classification of Diseases version 10 codes). These cancers
87 contribute to 44% (around 134,300 cases) of the total cancer incidence in England every year
88 (2013-2017). We will refer to these cancer types as ‘smoking-related cancers’.

89 Only cancer types positively associated with deprivation – defined as having significantly
90 higher age-standardised incidence rates in the most deprived quintile compared to the least
91 deprived – between 2013 and 2017 in England were included for calculation of the observed
92 deprivation gap in cancer incidence³: head and neck (oral cavity, salivary glands, pharynx,
93 nasopharynx, larynx, nasal cavity and middle ear, accessory sinuses), oesophagus, stomach,
94 colorectal, liver, pancreas, lung, cervix uteri, kidney, bladder, small intestine, anal,
95 gallbladder, vulva, vagina, uterus, penis, Hodgkin lymphoma and cancer of unknown primary
96 (see Supplementary Material A for ICD-10 codes). These cancers contribute to 50% (around
97 154,000 cases) of the total cancer incidence in England every year (2013-2017). We will refer
98 to these cancer types as ‘deprivation-related cancer types’.

99 **Data sources**

100 Cancer incidence for England between 2013 and 2017 was provided by Public Health
101 England and population estimates between 2013 and 2017 were provided by the Office for
102 National Statistics. Each data set was split by sex, 5-year age band and quintiles of the

103 Income domain from the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015 (IMD 2015). The Income
104 domain of the IMD is a relative, local-level measure of deprivation based on the proportion of
105 the population in that area estimated to experience deprivation because of low income. The
106 cancer data was additionally split by ICD-10 3-digit code, or International Classification of
107 Diseases for Oncology version 3 (ICD-O-3) code (e.g. mucinous ovarian, oesophageal
108 adenocarcinoma and oesophageal squamous cell carcinoma).

109 Adult (16+ years) smoking prevalence between 2003-2007 and second-hand smoking
110 prevalence was collated from Health Survey for England (HSE) datasets (2003-2007) and
111 categorised by sex, 10-year age band and equivalised household income quintiles, accessed
112 through the UK Data Service. A 10-year latency period between smoking exposure and
113 subsequent cancer incidence was used in line with previous methodology.^{1,13} Smoking
114 prevalence for 2004 had to be imputed using a simple linear model based on available years:
115 2003, 2005, 2006 and 2007.

116 Relative risk (RR) estimates (see Supplementary Material A) were obtained from meta-
117 analyses through a literature search using previously defined search terms (see
118 Supplementary Material B).¹ The literature was reviewed between two researchers (NP and
119 KB) to decide on the most appropriate RR estimate to use for each cancer type.

120 **Population Attributable Fraction formula**

121 To calculate the proportion of cancer cases attributable to smoking by deprivation quintile,
122 the standard population attributable fraction (PAF) formula was used:¹³

123

124

$$(p_1 \times ERR_1) + (p_2 \times ERR_2)$$

125

126
$$1 + [(p_1 \times ERR_1) + (p_2 \times ERR_2)]$$

127

128 Where p_1 is the proportion of ‘current cigarette smokers’ in England, p_2 is the proportion of
129 ‘ex-regular cigarette smokers’, ERR_1 is the excess relative risk (relative risk – 1) for current
130 smokers and ERR_2 is the excess relative risk (relative risk – 1) for ex-smokers. Lung cancer
131 had a specific adjustment to the calculation which included an extension of the formula above
132 to account for second-hand smoke exposure prevalence (see Supplementary Material C).

133 Smoking-attributable cases were calculated for each cancer type and then summed to obtain
134 figures for all smoking-related cancer types combined. Overall PAF estimates used the
135 smoking-attributable cancer cases as the numerator and all cancers combined excluding non-
136 melanoma skin cancer (C00-C97 excl. C44) as the denominator, by sex and deprivation
137 quintile. PAF estimates are presented for all ages combined (0-99+ years) and broken down
138 by two broad age groups (24-64 years and 65+ years). Confidence intervals were not
139 calculated, all comparisons are based on point estimates.

140 **Observed deprivation gap in cancer incidence and smoking**

141 To further investigate the contribution of smoking to cancer incidence by socio-economic
142 position in England, we grouped smoking-related cancer types together to form a combined
143 age-standardised incidence rate (ASR) by deprivation quintile (2013-2017). We then
144 modelled ASR’s for two hypothetical smoking scenarios based on smoking-related cancer
145 types where: scenario 1) everyone had the same smoking prevalence as the least deprived
146 quintile; scenario 2) nobody smoked. Rates were age-standardised to the 2013 European
147 Standard Population.¹⁴

148 To calculate the proportion of avoidable cases under each smoking scenario, we used
149 deprivation-associated cases for deprivation-related cancer types (representing the observed

150 deprivation gap in cancer incidence) as the denominator, and the number of deprivation-
151 associated cases in scenario 1 and scenario 2 as the numerator.

152 Deprivation-associated cases were calculated using age-specific incidence rates, as has been
153 previously described.¹⁵ Briefly, ‘expected’ cases were estimated by applying the age-specific
154 incidence rate from the least deprived quintile to each population of the remaining 4 quintiles.
155 The ‘expected’ cases were then subtracted from their corresponding observed cases to
156 produce excess deprivation-associated cases. For the remainder of this article, ‘deprivation-
157 associated cases’ will be used to refer to excess cases due to higher incidence rates in more
158 deprived populations compared to the least deprived.

159 Confidence intervals were calculated for ASRs, but not for deprivation-associated case
160 estimates. See Supplementary Materials D and E for more detailed information on these
161 calculations.

162 **Sensitivity analysis**

163 Due to lack of data, the measure of deprivation used for smoking prevalence (equivalised
164 household income) and cancer incidence (income domain of IMD) was not a direct match. To
165 assess the robustness of the main results to differences in deprivation measurement, PAFs
166 were also calculated with smoking prevalence by ‘all domains’ IMD (7 domains: income,
167 employment, health and disability, education, barriers to housing and services, crime and
168 living environment) from HSE datasets (2003-2007), accessed through the UK Data Service.

169

170

171

172

173 **Results**

174 **Population Attributable Fraction (PAF) of cancer related to smoking by deprivation**

175 **quintile**

176 A strong deprivation gradient was observed for the proportion of cancer cases attributable to
177 smoking in England (Table 1). For all ages combined, the smoking PAF was 2.2 times larger
178 in the most deprived quintile compared to the least deprived quintile. The smoking PAF
179 increased from 9.7% in the least deprived quintile to 21.1% in the most deprived quintile.

180 Similar relative increases in PAFs were observed for both sexes, but the PAFs were generally
181 larger for males compared to females.

182 A similar deprivation gradient was found for each broad age group. However, the smoking
183 PAFs were generally smaller in the younger age group compared to the older age group.

184 There was variation in PAFs by cancer type, with both lung cancer and laryngeal cancer
185 having the largest PAFs, as well as strong deprivation gradients (Figures 1a and 1b).

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195 **Table 1. Average number and proportion of smoking-attributable cancer cases per year by sex,**
 196 **age and deprivation quintile, England, 2013-2017**

Deprivation quintile	25-64 years			65+ years			All ages (0-99+ years)		
	Observed cases	PAF*	Smoking attributable cases	Observed cases	PAF*	Smoking attributable cases	Observed cases	PAF*	Smoking attributable cases
Females									
1 (least)	11,675	4.6%	542	18,654	9.7%	1,817	30,626	7.7%	2,359
2	11,919	6.3%	751	19,969	10.9%	2,184	32,176	9.1%	2,935
3	11,404	8.2%	930	18,934	13.1%	2,482	30,654	11.1%	3,413
4	11,202	10.3%	1,153	17,042	16.9%	2,872	28,569	14.1%	4,026
5 (most)	10,990	14.3%	1,566	15,009	19.9%	2,991	26,398	17.3%	4,558
Males									
1 (least)	8,832	9.2%	810	24,049	12.6%	3,031	33,203	11.6%	3,841
2	9,067	12.1%	1,099	25,223	15.1%	3,812	34,616	14.2%	4,911
3	8,954	14.9%	1,332	22,743	17.5%	3,979	32,011	16.6%	5,311
4	8,945	18.1%	1,619	19,768	21.4%	4,227	29,059	20.1%	5,846
5 (most)	9,228	23.4%	2,161	17,198	26.3%	4,529	26,829	24.9%	6,690
Persons									
1 (least)	20,507	6.6%	1,352	42,703	11.4%	4,848	63,828	9.7%	6,200
2	20,986	8.8%	1,850	45,192	13.3%	5,996	66,792	11.7%	7,846
3	20,358	11.1%	2,262	41,677	15.5%	6,461	62,665	13.9%	8,724
4	20,147	13.8%	2,772	36,810	19.3%	7,099	57,628	17.1%	9,871
5 (most)	20,217	18.4%	3,727	32,206	23.3%	7,520	53,227	21.1%	11,247

197 *PAF: Population attributable fraction out of all cancers (excl. non-melanoma skin cancer)

198

199 **Figures 1a (females) and 1b (males). Population Attributable Fraction (PAF) for smoking, by**
 200 **cancer type and deprivation quintile, England, 2013-2017**

201 *Acute myeloid leukaemia; **Oesophageal adenocarcinoma; ***Oesophageal squamous cell
 202 carcinoma

203

204 **Cancer incidence by deprivation quintile**

205 Age-standardised incidence rates by deprivation quintile and sex are displayed in Figures 2a
 206 and 2b. A clear deprivation gradient is observed for smoking-related cancer types for both
 207 sexes, with a 63% and a 60% relative increase in ASR between the least and most deprived
 208 quintiles for females and males, respectively.

209 The deprivation gap for incidence rates between the least and most deprived quintiles is

210 partly reduced in scenario 1 to a 51% and 45% relative increase in ASR between the least and

211 most deprived quintile for females and males, respectively. For scenario 2 where nobody
212 smoked, there is a marked reduction in both the cancer incidence rate and the deprivation
213 gradient, which shows a 28% and 24% relative increase in ASR between the least and most
214 deprived quintile for females and males, respectively.

215

216 **Figures 2a (females) and 2b (males). Combined European Age-Standardised incidence rates**
217 **(ASR) per 100,000 population for smoking-related cancer types* by deprivation quintile and**
218 **sex, for observed cancer incidence (the current situation), scenario 1 and scenario 2, England,**
219 **2013-2017**

220 *oral cavity, pharynx, nasopharynx, larynx, oesophagus, stomach, colorectal, liver, pancreas, lung,
221 cervix uteri, kidney, bladder, ovarian (mucinous) and leukaemia (acute myeloid)

222

223

224 **Deprivation gap in cancer incidence and smoking**

225 A summary of deprivation-associated cases and the proportion of the observed deprivation
226 gap in cancer incidence that could have been prevented in scenarios 1 and 2 is presented in
227 Table 2. For deprivation-related cancer types, it is estimated that there were an average of
228 27,156 cases (11,851 in females and 15,305 in males) associated with deprivation every year
229 in England between 2013 and 2017.

230 If everyone had the same smoking prevalence as the least deprived quintile 20.3% (5,504
231 cases every year) of deprivation-associated cases could have been prevented. If nobody
232 smoked, 60.9% (16,544 cases every year) of deprivation-associated cases could have been
233 prevented.

234

235

236

237 **Table 2. Estimated average number of deprivation-associated cases per year for deprivation-**
 238 **related cancer types* and smoking-related cancer types**, scenario 1 and scenario 2; and the**
 239 **estimated number of deprivation-associated cases and proportion of the observed deprivation**
 240 **gap in cancer incidence that could have been prevented, in England, in 2013-2017**

		25-64 years			65+ years			All ages (0-99+ years)		
		Female	Male	Persons	Female	Male	Persons	Female	Male	Persons
Deprivation-associated cases	Deprivation - related cancer types	4,380	5,242	9,622	7,467	10,043	17,510	11,851	15,305	27,156
	Smoking-related cancer types	3,562	4,782	8,344	6,413	9,248	15,661	10,009	14,057	24,066
	Scenario 1 ¹	2,605	3,481	6,086	5,403	7,012	12,415	8,043	10,519	18,562
	Scenario 2 ²	1,154	1,474	2,628	2,281	2,552	4,833	3,470	4,052	7,522
Preventable deprivation-associated cases (Preventable proportion of the observed deprivation gap in cancer incidence)^a	Scenario 1 ¹	957 (21.9%)	1,301 (24.8%)	2,258 (23.5%)	1,010 (13.5%)	2,236 (22.3%)	3246 (18.5%)	1,966 (16.6%)	3,538 (23.1%)	5,504 (20.3%)
	Scenario 2 ²	2,408 (55.0%)	3,308 (63.1%)	5,716 (59.4%)	4,132 (55.3%)	6,696 (66.7%)	10,828 (61.8%)	6,539 (55.2%)	10,005 (65.4%)	16,544 (60.9%)

241 ¹Scenario where everyone has the same smoking prevalence as the least deprived quintile; ²Scenario
 242 where nobody smoked

243 ^aCalculation: 957 = 3562-2605; 21.9% = 957/4380

244 *head and neck (oral cavity, salivary glands, pharynx, nasopharynx, larynx, nasal cavity and middle
 245 ear, accessory sinuses), oesophagus, stomach, colorectal, liver, pancreas, lung, cervix uteri, kidney,
 246 bladder, small intestine, anal, gallbladder, vulva, vagina, corpus uteri, penis, Hodgkin Lymphoma and
 247 cancer of unknown primary

248 **oral cavity, pharynx, nasopharynx, larynx, oesophagus, stomach, colorectal, liver, pancreas, lung,
 249 cervix uteri, kidney, bladder, ovarian (mucinous) and leukaemia (acute myeloid)

250

251 Sensitivity Analysis

252 The PAFs estimated from smoking prevalence by IMD all domains were similar to the PAFs
 253 estimated from smoking prevalence by equivalised household income. For females, the PAFs
 254 increased from 7.9% in the least deprived quintile to 18.4% in the most deprived. For males,

255 the PAFs increased from 12.1% in the least deprived to 24.3% in the most deprived (see
256 Supplementary Material F).

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282 **Discussion**

283 **Interpretation of main findings**

284 We observed a strong deprivation gradient for the proportion of cancer cases attributable to
285 smoking in England, which reflects the clear and longstanding socio-economic inequality
286 observed for smoking prevalence in England.^{9,16}

287 Smoking is a key driver of socio-economic inequality in cancer incidence in England. If
288 everyone had the same smoking prevalence as the least deprived quintile 20% (5,504 cases
289 every year) of deprivation-associated cancer cases between 2013 and 2017 could have been
290 prevented. If no one in England had smoked, 61% (16,544 cases every year) of deprivation-
291 associated cases could have been prevented, indicating that smoking explained the majority
292 of the observed deprivation gap in cancer incidence in England between 2013 and 2017.

293 Though the majority of the observed deprivation gap in cancer incidence can be explained by
294 smoking for both sexes, other risk factors are probably contributing to the remainder of the
295 gap. Obesity (body mass index [BMI] 30+) is positively associated with deprivation for
296 adults in England,¹⁰ as well as being related to 8 cancer types that are also related to
297 deprivation.^{3,8} Routine and manual workers may have higher risk of exposure to occupational
298 risk factors (e.g. asbestos, silica, aromatic amines) that are related to cancers of the lung, head
299 and neck and bladder.^{17,18,19,20} Prevalence of the human papillomavirus (HPV) infection and
300 helicobacter pylori infection are positively associated with deprivation in the UK, and are
301 linked to numerous cancers that are more common in deprived areas.^{8,21,22}

302 Other research has addressed the hypothetical removal of socio-economic inequality in risk
303 factor exposure on subsequent cancer incidence or mortality, however direct comparisons are
304 precluded by methodological differences (e.g. measure of deprivation, RRs, outcome
305 measures). A French study estimated that 43.4% and 27.5% of deprivation-associated cancer

306 cases for smoking-related cancer types could have been prevented if everyone smoked like
307 the least deprived, in females and males respectively.¹¹ In Australia it was estimated that 4%
308 of all cancer cases could have been prevented if smoking, overweight and obesity and
309 physical activity prevalence matched the least deprived across all deprivation quintiles.¹²
310 Smoking accounted for the vast majority of these deprivation-associated cases. A UK team
311 showed that 30% of lung and laryngeal cancer deaths in men, and 23% of those in women,
312 could be prevented if everyone smoked like those with tertiary education.²³

313 **Policy Implications**

314 The UK government's prevention green paper recently set the aim of England becoming
315 smoke free by 2030, defined as smoking prevalence below 5%.²⁴ Successful UK public
316 health initiatives have contributed to overall smoking prevalence declining over time,²⁵ but
317 smoking inequalities have widened.^{9,16} The Marmot review of 2010 argued that action is
318 needed across the social gradient 'with a scale and intensity that is proportionate to the level
319 of disadvantage'.²⁶ To incorporate this, action is needed at both a national and local level.

320 Fiscal measures provide a national cost-effective approach to help target and reduce smoking
321 prevalence, particularly for future generations, whilst also increasing government revenues.²⁷
322 And fiscal measures may also be effective for more deprived smokers where price is more of
323 a potential barrier to consumption.^{28,29} A study modelling the impact of a 10% increase per
324 annum in the price of cigarettes in England and Wales projected a 74% and 86% reduction in
325 the socio-economic gap in lung cancer incidence by 2050, in females and males,
326 respectively.³⁰

327 Local level support can aid smoking cessation for current smokers, particularly for those from
328 the most deprived communities. Smokers from deprived backgrounds are subject to barriers
329 (e.g. lack of social support, high nicotine dependence) that makes it difficult for them to

330 quit.^{31,32,33} Local Stop Smoking Services provide multi-faceted smoking cessation support
331 within communities that can engage with smokers from deprived communities.^{33,34} However,
332 these services are increasingly threatened due to central funding cuts, making it difficult for
333 them provide support locally across the country. Reversing of these cuts would likely help
334 tackle smoking inequalities and prove cost-effective, by reducing smoking-related ill-health
335 that negatively impacts on the National Health Service and productivity.^{35,36}

336 **Strengths and Limitations**

337 We provide a unique quantification of the relationship between socio-economic deprivation,
338 smoking and subsequent cancer incidence in England. Modelling like this may help inform
339 and reinforce policy to prevent smoking-related cancer and improve health more generally in
340 deprived populations. The analysis used high quality cancer incidence and smoking
341 prevalence data, which was averaged over 5 years to reduce the risk of spurious results as a
342 consequence of any year-on-year fluctuation.

343 This analysis is not without limitations. The same RRs for current and ex-smoking prevalence
344 were applied across all deprivation quintiles. This may reduce the accuracy of the point
345 estimates if the risk associated with those broad definitions varies by deprivation quintile. For
346 example, more deprived smokers may smoke more heavily and start smoking younger.^{37,38}

347 They are also more likely to have multiple cancer risk factors,³⁹ including those which
348 combine synergistically with smoking to raise cancer risk, such as alcohol,^{40,41} obesity^{42,43} and
349 occupational exposures.^{44,45} However, the net effect of this is likely to be underestimation of
350 the deprivation gap in smoking PAFs.

351 These calculations can only be considered estimates because of the PAF methodology used,
352 which is an indirect and relatively simple method that is subject to some uncertainty around
353 point estimates. We used a 10-year latency period, in line with Parkin et al.'s methodology,¹³

354 and this may under-represent the true lag time between smoking exposure and subsequent
355 cancer incidence. A 10-year latency period also assumes people will remain in the same
356 deprivation group from exposure through to recording of cancer incidence. The cancer
357 incidence data uses highly granular area-level rather than individual-level deprivation,
358 meaning these findings may be subject to ecological fallacy.

359 **Conclusion**

360 Smoking is an important driver of cancer incidence inequalities in England. Efforts to reduce
361 smoking prevalence should focus on minimising smoking inequalities. More research is
362 required to better understand and overcome the complex barriers that smokers from deprived
363 populations face in order to enhance smoking cessation interventions.

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380 **Additional Information**

381 **Acknowledgements**

382 We acknowledge the work of the England cancer registry, as without their work there would
383 be no incidence data. This work uses data provided by patients and collected by the NHS as
384 part of their care and support. We also acknowledge the work of NHS Digital of the Health
385 Survey for England team at the Health and Social Survey Research group at the Department
386 of Epidemiology at University College London with NatCen Social Research for their
387 smoking prevalence data. Their data provides detailed and reliable breakdowns across a range
388 of different metrics and over many years, that helped enable this research to take place.

389 **Authors' contributions**

390 NP carried out the main analysis and wrote the manuscript. KB, IS and JS provided advice
391 and support on the analysis and manuscript. CD provided support by checking methods and
392 data. YK accessed the data and helped prep part of it.

393 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

394 Data was de-identified, obtained from either Public Health England via the Office for Data
395 Release or from a publicly available source (UK Data Service). Therefore, no ethical
396 approval was necessary as part of accessing these data.

397 **Data availability**

398 The cancer incidence data analysed during the current study are available from the National
399 Cancer Registration and Analysis Service (part of Public Health England), on request through
400 the Office for Data Release but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were
401 used under license for the current study, and so are not publicly available.

402 The population and smoking prevalence data are publicly available.

403 **Competing interests**

404 We, the authors, declare we have no conflicts of interest.

405 **Funding information**

406 The authors received no specific funding for this work.

407

408 References

- ¹ Brown, K.F., Rumgay, H., Dunlop, C. et al. The fraction of cancer attributable to modifiable risk factors in England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and the United Kingdom in 2015. *Br J Cancer* **118**: 1130-1141 (2020), DOI: [10.1038/s41416-018-0029-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41416-018-0029-6)
- ² Global Health Data Exchange. Global Burden of Disease (GBD) Results Tool. Available from <http://ghdx.healthdata.org/gbd-results-tool>. Accessed February 2021
- ³ Cancer Research UK (2020). Incidence of common cancers by deprivation. Available from <https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/incidence/common-cancers-compared#heading-Five>. Accessed February 2021
- ⁴ Information Services Division Scotland. Cancer Statistics. Available from <https://www.isdscotland.org/Health-Topics/Cancer/Cancer-Statistics/All-Types-of-Cancer/>. Accessed February 2021
- ⁵ Welsh Cancer Intelligence and Surveillance Unit. Cancer incidence in Wales 2002-2018. Available from <https://phw.nhs.wales/services-and-teams/welsh-cancer-intelligence-and-surveillance-unit-wcisw/cancer-incidence-in-wales-2002-2018/>. Accessed February 2021
- ⁶ Northern Ireland Cancer Registry. Cancer information. Available from <https://www.qub.ac.uk/research-centres/nicr/CancerInformation/official-statistics/>. Accessed February 2021
- ⁷ Cancer Research UK. Cancer in the UK 2020: Socio-economic deprivation. https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/sites/default/files/cancer_inequalities_in_the_uk.pdf
- ⁸ International Agency for Research on Cancer (2021). Agents classified by the IARC Monographs, Volumes 1-129. Available from <https://monographs.iarc.who.int/agents-classified-by-the-iarc/>. Accessed February 2021
- ⁹ Office for National Statistics. Adult smoking habits in the UK: 2019. Available from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandlifeexpectancies/bulletins/adultsmokinghabitsingreatbritain/2019#characteristics-of-current-cigarette-smokers-in-the-uk>. Accessed February 2021
- ¹⁰ NHS Digital. Health Survey for England 2019. Available from <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/2019>. Accessed February 2021
- ¹¹ Menvielle, G., Kulhánová, I., Bryere, J. et al. Tobacco-attributable burden of cancer according to socioeconomic position in France. *Int J Cancer* **143**: 478-485 (2018), DOI: [10.1002/ijc.31328](https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.31328)
- ¹² Wilson LF, Green AC, Jordan SJ et al. The proportion of cancers attributable to social deprivation: A population-based analysis of Australian health data. *Cancer Epi* **67**: 101742 (2020), DOI: [10.1016/j.canep.2020.101742](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.canep.2020.101742)
- ¹³ Parkin, D.M. The fraction of cancer attributable to lifestyle and environmental factors in the UK in 2010. *Br J Cancer* **105**(2), pp.S77-S81 (2011), DOI: [10.1038/bjc.2011.489](https://doi.org/10.1038/bjc.2011.489)
- ¹⁴ Eurostat. Revision of the European Standard Population. Available from <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3859598/5926869/KS-RA-13-028-EN.PDF/e713fa79-1add-44e8-b23d-5e8fa09b3f8f>. Accessed February 2021
- ¹⁵ Cancer Research UK and National Cancer Intelligence Network. Cancer by deprivation in England: Incidence, 1996-2010, Mortality, 1997-2011 (2014), London: NCIN. Available from http://www.ncin.org.uk/about_ncin/cancer_by_deprivation_in_england. Accessed February 2021
- ¹⁶ Cancer Intelligence Team, Cancer Research UK (2019). Smoking prevalence trends by occupation group in Health Survey for England. https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/sites/default/files/smoking_prevalence_trends_occupation_final_2020.pdf
- ¹⁷ McCormack, V., Peto, J., Byrnes, G. et al. Estimate the asbestos-related lung cancer burden from mesothelioma mortality. *Br J Cancer* **106**(3): 575-84 (2012), DOI: [10.1038/bjc.2011.563](https://doi.org/10.1038/bjc.2011.563)
- ¹⁸ Poinen-Rughooputh, S., Rughooputh, M., Guo, Y., et al. Occupational exposure to silica dust and risk of lung cancer: an updated meta-analysis of epidemiological studies. *BMC Pub Health* **16**(1): 1-17 (2016), DOI: [10.1186/s12889-016-3791-5](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3791-5)
- ¹⁹ Brown, T., Darnton, A., Fortunato, L., et al. Occupational cancer in Britain. Respiratory cancer sites: larynx, lung and mesothelioma. *Br J Cancer* **107**: S56-70 (2012), DOI: [10.1038/bjc.2012.119](https://doi.org/10.1038/bjc.2012.119)
- ²⁰ Brown, T., Slack, R., Rushton, L. British Occupational Cancer Burden Study Group. Occupational cancer in Britain. Urinary tract cancers: bladder and kidney. *Br J Cancer* **19**: S76-84 (2012), DOI: [10.1038/bjc.2012.121](https://doi.org/10.1038/bjc.2012.121)
- ²¹ Tanton, C., Soldan, K., Beddows, S. et al. High-risk human papillomavirus (HPV) infection and cervical cancer prevention in Britain: Evidence of differential uptake of interventions from a probability survey. *Cancer Epi & Prev Bio* **24**(5): 842-53 (2015), DOI: [10.1158/1055-9965](https://doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965)
- ²² Khalifa, M.M., Sharaf, R.R., Aziz, R.K. Helicobacter pylori: a poor man's gut pathogen? *Gut Path* **2**(1): 1-2 (2010), DOI: [10.1186/1757-4749-2-2](https://doi.org/10.1186/1757-4749-2-2)
- ²³ Kulik, M.C., Hoffmann, R., Judge, K. et al. Smoking and the potential for reduction of inequalities in mortality in Europe. *Eur J Epi* **28**(12): 959-71 (2013), DOI: [10.1007/s10654-013-9860-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-013-9860-5)

- ²⁴ Department of Health and Social Care (2019). Advancing our health: prevention in the 2020s – consultation document. Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/advancing-our-health-prevention-in-the-2020s/advancing-our-health-prevention-in-the-2020s-consultation-document>. Accessed February 2021
- ²⁵ Office for National Statistics. Adult smoking habits in Great Britain. Available from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/drugusealcoholandsmoking/datasets/adultsmokinghabitsingreatbritain>
- ²⁶ Marmot, M., Goldblatt, P., Allen, J. et al. Fair society, healthy lives. *Pub Health* **126**: S4-10 (2012), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2012.05.014>
- ²⁷ Chaloupka, F.J., Straif, K., Leon, M. E. Effectiveness of tax and price policies in tobacco control. *Tob Control* **20**(3): 235-238 (2011), DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/tc.2010.039982>
- ²⁸ Townsend, J.L., Roderick, P. & Cooper, J. Cigarette smoking by socioeconomic group, sex, and age: effects of price, income, and health publicity. *Br Med J* **309**: 923–926 (1994), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.309.6959.923>
- ²⁹ Farrelly, M.C., Bray, J.W., Pechacek, T. et al. The response by adults to increases in cigarette prices by sociodemographic characteristics. *S Econ J*, **68**(1): 156–165 (2001), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1061518>
- ³⁰ Soerjomataram, I., Barendregt, J.J., Gartner, C. et al. Reducing inequalities in lung cancer incidence through smoking policies. *Lung C* **73**(3): 286-273 (2011), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lungcan.2011.01.009>
- ³¹ Brose, L.S. & McEwen, A. Neighbourhood deprivation and outcomes of stop smoking support – an observational study. *PLoS One* **11**(1): e0148194 (2016), DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0148194](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0148194)
- ³² Hiscock, R., Dobbie, F. & Bauld, L. Smoking cessation and socioeconomic status: an update of existing evidence from a national evaluation of English Stop Smoking Services. *BioMed R Int* **2015** (2015), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/274056>
- ³³ National Centre for Smoking Cessation and Training (2013). Stop Smoking Services and Health Inequalities. Available from https://www.ncscet.co.uk/user/pub/NCSCET_briefing_effect_of_SSS_on_health_inequalities.pdf. Accessed February 2021
- ³⁴ Smith CE, Hill SE, Amos A. Impact of specialist and primary care stop smoking support on socioeconomic inequalities in cessation in the United Kingdom: a systematic review and national equity analysis. *Addiction*.Jan;**115**(1):34-46 (2020), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.14760>
- ³⁵ Allender, S., Balakrishnan, R., Scarborough, P. et al. The burden of smoking-related ill health in the UK. *Tob Ctrl* **18**(4): 262-267 (2009), DOI: [10.1136/tc.2008.026294](https://doi.org/10.1136/tc.2008.026294)
- ³⁶ Baker, C.L., Flores, N.M., Zou, K.H. et al. Benefits of quitting smoking on work productivity and activity impairment in the United States, the European Union and China. *Int J Clin Prac* **71**(1): e12900 (2017), DOI: [10.1111/ijcp.12900](https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcp.12900)
- ³⁷ Jarvis, M.J., Wardle, J., Waller, J. et al. Prevalence of hardcore smoking in England, and associated attitudes and beliefs: cross sectional study. *BMJ* **326**(7398): 1061 (2003), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.326.7398.1061>
- ³⁸ Belvin, C., Britton, J., Holmes, J. et al. Parental smoking and child poverty in the UK: an analysis of national survey data. *BMC Pub Health* **15**(1): 1-8 (2015), DOI: [10.1186/s12889-015-1797-z](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1797-z)
- ³⁹ NHS digital. Health Survey for England 2017. Multiple risk factors. Available from <http://healthsurvey.hscic.gov.uk/media/78655/HSE17-MRF-rep.pdf>. Accessed February 2021
- ⁴⁰ Hashibe, M., Brennan, P., Chuang, S.C. et al. Interaction between tobacco and alcohol use and the risk of head and neck cancer: pooled analysis in the International Head and Neck Cancer Epidemiology Consortium. *C Epi Prev Bio* **18**(2): 541-550 (2009), DOI: [10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-08-0347](https://doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-08-0347)
- ⁴¹ Prabhu, A., Obi, K.O. & Rubenstein, J.H. The synergistic effects of alcohol and tobacco consumption on the risk of oesophageal squamous cell carcinoma: a meta-analysis. *Am J Gastroenterol* **109**(6): 822-827 (2014), DOI: [10.1038/ajg.2014.71](https://doi.org/10.1038/ajg.2014.71)
- ⁴² Marrero, J.A., Fontana, R.J., Fu, S. et al. Alcohol, tobacco and obesity are synergistic risk factors for hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Hepatology* **42**(2): 218-224 (2005), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2004.10.005>
- ⁴³ Roos, E.T., Lallukka, T., Lahelma, E. et al. Joint associations between smoking and obesity as determinants of premature mortality among midlife employees. *Eur J Public Health* **27**(1): 135-139 (2017), DOI: [10.1093/eurpub/ckw111](https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckw111)
- ⁴⁴ Lee, P.N. Relation between exposure to asbestos and smoking jointly and the risk of lung cancer. *Occup Environ Med* **58**(3): 145-153 (2001), DOI: [10.1136/oem.58.3.145](https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.58.3.145)
- ⁴⁵ Hertz-Picciotto, I., Smith, A.H., Holtzman, D. et al. Synergism between occupational arsenic exposure and smoking in the induction of lung cancer. *Epidemiology* **3**(1): 23-31 (1992), DOI: [10.1097/00001648-199201000-00006](https://doi.org/10.1097/00001648-199201000-00006)



