

available at www.sciencedirect.comjournal homepage: www.ejconline.com

Differences according to educational level in the management and survival of colorectal cancer in Sweden

Nina Cavalli-Björkman ^{a,*}, Mats Lambe ^{b,c}, Sonja Eaker ^b, Fredrik Sandin ^b,
Bengt Glimelius ^{a,d}

^a Department of Oncology, Radiology and Clinical Immunology, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

^b Regional Oncologic Centre, Uppsala University Hospital, Uppsala, Sweden

^c Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

^d Department of Oncology and Pathology, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 4 October 2010

Received in revised form 7

December 2010

Accepted 14 December 2010

Available online 13 January 2011

Keywords:

Colorectal cancer

Socioeconomic status

Education level

Management

Survival

Social gradients

ABSTRACT

Socioeconomic status (SES) affects survival after a cancer diagnosis. The extent to which differences in management can explain this is not known. Record-linkage between two Swedish Regional Clinical Quality Registers of colorectal cancer and a socio-economic database generated a dataset with information on diagnostic procedures, treatment and survival in patients of different educational background. Three thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine rectal cancer patients from the years 1995 to 2006 and 5715 colon cancer patients from 1997 to 2006 were evaluated. Compared to patients with high education, those with shorter education had poorer relative and overall survival (57.9% 5-year relative survival versus 63.8% in colon cancer, 58.7% versus 69.1% in rectal cancer). There were also differences in diagnostic activity with preoperative computer tomography (40% versus 47.3%) and colonoscopy (56.3% versus 62.8%) being more frequent in highly educated groups ($p = 0.001$ and 0.037 , respectively). Surgery resulting in colostomy was performed in 26.9% of rectal cancer patients of high education compared to 35.5% of those with low education ($p = 0.005$). Although rectal cancer has poorer prognosis than colon cancer, it was noted that among the highly educated, rectal cancer patients had better survival than colon cancer patients (69.1% versus 63.8% 5-year relative survival). It thus appears that improved rectal cancer management has benefited mainly patients of middle and higher educational levels. We conclude that socioeconomic differences exist in diagnostic activity and management of colorectal cancer, which may affect survival.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Studies conducted in a variety of settings have shown that cancer survival is better in individuals with high compared to low socioeconomic status (SES).^{1–3} Possible explanations for these gradients include differences in comorbidity burden, life style and health awareness. In some studies marital status and patient's partner's level of education has influenced choice of, and adherence to, treatment.^{4,5} Other investigators

have reported associations between ethnic background and management and survival.⁶ Also, variations in health care seeking behaviour and timing and stage at diagnosis may play a role.^{7–9} To date, only few studies have explored possible socioeconomic differences in the management of cancer patients.^{10–14}

While some research groups have not found socioeconomic variations in patterns of care and survival,^{15,16} others have found differences also in countries with National Health

* Corresponding author. Address: Department of Oncology, Akademiska University Hospital, 75185 Uppsala, Sweden. Fax: +46 18 6111027.

E-mail address: nina.cavalli-bjorkman@akademiska.se (N. Cavalli-Björkman).

0959-8049/\$ - see front matter © 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2010.12.013

Table 1 – Patient characteristics.

	Colon cancer					P-value [†]	Rectal cancer					P-value [†]
	Education level				Total N = 5715		Education level				Total N = 3899	
	Low N = 2255	Middle N = 2182	High N = 1254	Missing N = 24			Low N = 1641	Middle N = 1460	High N = 775	Missing N = 23		
Gender (%)						0.688						0.631
Male	1172 (52.0)	1136 (52.1)	635 (50.6)	13 (54.2)	2956 (51.7)		989 (60.3)	865 (59.2)	475 (61.3)	17 (73.9)	2346 (60.2)	
Female	083 (48.0)	1046 (47.9)	619 (49.4)	11 (45.8)	2759 (48.3)		652 (39.7)	595 (40.8)	300 (38.7)	6 (26.1)	1553 (39.8)	
Age						<0.001						<0.001
Median (range)	68 (15–74)	64 (18–74)	62 (22–74)	68 (11–74)	65 (11–74)		67 (27–74)	63 (24–74)	62 (27–74)	67 (45–74)	65 (24–74)	
Mean (sd)	66.0 (7.3)	62.1 (9.7)	61.0 (9.6)	61.5 (17.4)	63.4 (9.1)		65.6 (7.1)	61.8 (9.1)	60.5 (9.1)	65.7 (8.6)	63.2 (8.6)	
Age (%)						<0.001						<0.001
0–54	168 (7.5)	413 (18.9)	296 (23.6)	4 (16.7)	881 (15.4)		135 (8.2)	297 (20.3)	185 (23.9)	3 (13.0)	620 (15.9)	
55–64	596 (26.4)	706 (32.4)	420 (33.5)	6 (25.0)	1728 (30.2)		458 (27.9)	500 (34.2)	288 (37.2)	5 (21.7)	1251 (32.1)	
65–74	1491 (66.1)	1063 (48.7)	538 (42.9)	14 (58.3)	3106 (54.3)		1048 (63.9)	663 (45.4)	302 (39.0)	15 (65.2)	2028 (52.0)	
Stage (%)						0.324						0.025
I	247 (11.0)	224 (10.3)	152 (12.1)	4 (16.7)	627 (11.0)		328 (20.0)	332 (22.7)	207 (26.7)	1 (4.3)	868 (22.3)	
II	784 (34.8)	751 (34.4)	400 (31.9)	6 (25.0)	1941 (34.0)		443 (27.0)	372 (25.5)	179 (23.1)	10 (43.5)	1004 (25.8)	
III	645 (28.6)	615 (28.2)	368 (29.3)	9 (37.5)	1637 (28.6)		452 (27.5)	422 (28.9)	210 (27.1)	3 (13.0)	1087 (27.9)	
IV	531 (23.5)	556 (25.5)	304 (24.2)	5 (20.8)	1396 (24.4)		336 (20.5)	273 (18.7)	143 (18.5)	6 (26.1)	758 (19.4)	
Missing	48 (2.1)	36 (1.6)	30 (2.4)	0 (0.0)	114 (2.0)		82 (5.0)	61 (4.2)	36 (4.6)	3 (13.0)	182 (4.7)	
Distance from anal verge (%)												0.032 ^a
0–5 cm							513 (31.3)	441 (30.2)	219 (28.3)	12 (52.2)	1185 (30.4)	
5.01–10 cm							656 (40.0)	566 (38.8)	285 (36.8)	5 (21.7)	1512 (38.8)	
10.01–15 cm							444 (27.1)	428 (29.3)	260 (33.5)	6 (26.1)	1138 (29.2)	
>15 cm							4 (0.2)	4 (0.3)	2 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	10 (0.3)	
Missing							24 (1.5)	21 (1.4)	9 (1.2)	0 (0.0)	54 (1.4)	

[†] P-value for the hypothesis of no difference between the three education groups.^a Comparison when excluding >15 cm and missing.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8447474>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8447474>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)