

Supplementary material (Tables 1S-3S)

Table 1S. Univariable and multivariable analysis of BSW uptake for invitations during period 2019/20 (Invitation period 1st August-31st October)

Characteristic	Population (n)	Uptake (%)	OR	95% CI	p	Adjusted uptake (%)	aOR	95% CI	p
Overall	69,397	62.7	-	-	-	63.0	-	-	-
Sex									
Male	33,771	61.8	Reference			62.4	Reference		
Female	35,626	63.6	0.92	0.90-0.95	<0.001	63.3	1.04	1.01-1.07	0.022
Age group									
60-64 years	28,482	58.5	Reference			59.2	Reference		
65-69 years	18,532	62.8	1.96	1.15-1.24	<0.001	62.9	1.17	1.13-1.22	<0.001
70-74 years	22,383	68.0	1.50	1.45-1.56	<0.001	67.4	1.44	1.38-1.49	<0.001
Location									
Urban	23,610	61.8	Reference			62.4	Reference		
Rural	42,220	64.8	1.14	1.10-1.18	<0.001	63.7	1.09	1.05-1.12	<0.001
Income deprivation									
Q5 (least deprived)	14,380	69.4	Reference			69.0	Reference		
Q4	14,427	66.0	0.86	0.82-0.90	<0.001	65.7	0.86	0.81-0.90	<0.001
Q3	13,723	63.0	0.75	0.72-0.79	<0.001	62.9	0.76	0.72-0.80	<0.001
Q2	12,529	59.4	0.65	0.61-0.68	<0.001	59.6	0.66	0.62-0.69	<0.001
Q1 (most deprived)	10,771	53.9	0.52	0.49-0.54	<0.001	54.6	0.54	0.51-0.56	<0.001
Ethnic group									
White	57,281	65.1	Reference			65.0	Reference		
Mixed	210	54.8	0.65	0.49-0.85	0.002	55.1	0.66	0.50-0.88	0.004
Asian	520	55.8	0.68	0.56-0.81	<0.001	56.7	0.71	0.60-0.85	<0.001
Black	117	48.7	0.51	0.35-0.73	<0.001	52.4	0.60	0.41-0.88	0.009
Other	101	55.4	0.67	0.45-0.99	0.044	55.8	0.68	0.45-1.02	0.062
Unknown	11,168	51.2	0.56	0.54-0.59	<0.001	51.7	0.57	0.55-60.0	<0.001

Table 2S. Univariable and multivariable analysis of BSW uptake for invitations during period 2018/19 (Invitation period 1st August-31st October)

Characteristic	Population (n)	Uptake (%)	OR	95% CI	p	Adjusted uptake (%)	aOR	95% CI	p
Overall	70,369	52.8	-	-	-	53.2	-	-	-
Sex									
Male	34,576	51.3	Reference			51.7	Reference		
Female	35,793	54.3	0.89	0.86-0.91	<0.001	54.1	1.10	1.07-1.13	<0.001
Age group							Reference		
60-64 years	27,960	51.3	Reference			51.9	1.07	1.03-1.10	<0.001
65-69 years	23,584	53.4	1.09	1.05-1.13		53.4	1.08	1.04-1.12	<0.001
70-74 years	18,825	54.3	1.13	1.08-1.17	<0.001	53.8	1.10	1.07-1.13	<0.001
Location									
Urban	23,881	52.2	Reference			52.8	Reference		
Rural	43,254	54.3	1.09	1.06-1.13	<0.001	53.1	1.04	1.01-1.08	0.012
Income deprivation									
Q5 (least deprived)	14,190	60.1	Reference				Reference		
Q4	14,843	55.5	0.83	0.79-0.87	<0.001	55.5	0.84	0.80-0.88	<0.001
Q3	14,086	52.9	0.75	0.71-0.78	<0.001	52.8	0.75	0.71-0.79	<0.001
Q2	12,804	49.5	0.65	0.62-0.68	<0.001	49.6	0.66	0.63-0.69	<0.001
Q1 (most deprived)	11,212	44.4	0.53	0.50-0.56	<0.001	44.7	0.53	0.51-0.56	<0.001
Ethnic group									
White	58,664	54.9	Reference			54.9	Reference		
Mixed	198	48.5	0.77	0.59-1.02	0.072	50.3	0.83	0.62-1.11	0.207
Asian	538	45.2	0.58	0.57-80.3	<0.001	44.9	0.68	0.57-0.81	<0.001
Black	103	44.7	0.66	0.45-0.98	0.039	48.4	0.78	0.52-1.17	0.227
Other	94	47.9	0.76	0.50-1.13	0.174	50.0	0.82	0.54-1.24	0.335
Unknown	10,772	42.1	0.59	0.57-0.62	<0.001	42.3	0.60	0.58-0.63	<0.001

Table 3S. Univariable and multivariable analysis of BSW uptake for invitations during period 2017/18 (Invitation period 1st August-31st October)

Characteristic	Population (n)	Uptake (%)	OR	95% CI	p	Adjusted uptake (%)	aOR	95% CI	p
Overall	70,009	56.0	-	-	-	56.1	-	-	-
Sex									
Male	33,808	54.5	Reference			55.2	Reference		
Female	36,201	57.4	0.89	0.86-0.92	<0.001	57.1	1.08	1.05-1.12	<0.001
Age group									
60-64 years	28,082	49.1	Reference			49.9	Reference		
65-69 years	19,882	59.3	1.51	1.45-1.56	<0.001	59.3	1.47	1.42-1.53	<0.001
70-74 years	22,045	61.8	1.67	1.61-1.73	<0.001	61.4	1.61	1.55-1.67	<0.001
Location									
Urban	24,221	55.1	Reference			55.9	Reference		
Rural	43,023	58.1	1.13	1.10-1.17	<0.001	56.8	1.04	1.01-1.07	0.040
Income deprivation									
Q5 (least deprived)	14,723	63.5	Reference			63.1	Reference		
Q4	14,986	59.5	0.85	0.81-0.89	<0.001	59.3	0.85	0.81-0.89	<0.001
Q3	13,926	56.3	0.74	0.71-0.79	<0.001	56.2	0.75	0.71-0.78	<0.001
Q2	12,870	52.5	0.64	0.62-0.67	<0.001	52.7	0.65	0.62-0.68	<0.001
Q1 (most deprived)	10,739	45.8	0.49	0.46-0.51	<0.001	46.6	0.50	0.47-0.53	<0.001
Ethnic group									
White	59,122	58.4	Reference			58.3	Reference		
Mixed	207	51.7	0.76	0.58-1.00	0.052	53.8	0.84	0.63-1.11	0.222
Asian	483	47.8	0.65	0.55-0.78	<0.001	49.9	0.72	0.60-0.86	<0.001
Black	104	47.1	0.64	0.43-0.93	0.021	51.3	0.78	0.52-1.16	0.214
Other	99	49.5	0.69	0.47-1.04	0.074	52.2	0.77	0.51-1.15	0.194
Unknown	9,994	42.4	0.53	0.50-0.55	<0.001	43.5	0.54	0.52-0.57	<0.001

References

1. Public Health Wales. Cancer Incidence in Wales, 2002-2018. Data for FY2018, persons aged 60-74. 2021. Available from: <https://phw.nhs.wales/services-and-teams/welsh-cancer-intelligence-and-surveillance-unit-wcisu/cancer-incidence-in-wales-2002-2018/>. Accessed 20 Mar 2022.
2. Public Health Wales. Cancer Mortality in Wales, 2002-2021. 2022. Available from: <https://phw.nhs.wales/services-and-teams/welsh-cancer-intelligence-and-surveillance-unit-wcisu/cancer-mortality-in-wales-2002-2021/>. Accessed 20 Mar 2022.
3. Scholefield JH, Moss S, Sufi F, Mangham CM, Hardcastle JD. Effect of faecal occult blood screening on mortality from colorectal cancer: Results from a randomised controlled trial. *Gut*. 2002;50(6):840–4.
4. Schreuders EH, Ruco A, Rabeneck L, Schoen RE, Sung JJY, Young GP, et al. Colorectal cancer screening: A global overview of existing programmes. *Gut*. 2015;64(10):1637–49. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2014-309086.
5. Scholefield JH, Moss SM, Mangham CM, Whynes DK, Hardcastle JD. Nottingham trial of faecal occult blood testing for colorectal cancer: A 20-year follow-up. *Gut*. 2012; 61(7): 1036-1040. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2011-300774.
6. Public Health Wales. Bowel Screening Wales Annual Statistical Report 2018-19. 2020. Available from: <https://phw.nhs.wales/services-and-teams/screening/bowel-screening/information-resources/programme-reports/bsw-annual-statistical-reports/bsw-annual-statistical-report-2018-19/>. Accessed 01 Feb 2022.
7. Hurtado JL, Bacigalupe A, Calvo M, Esnaola S, Mendizabal N, Portillo I, et al. Social inequalities in a population based colorectal cancer screening programme in the Basque Country. *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15(1): 1-14. doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-2370-5.
8. von Wagner C, Baio G, Raine R, Snowball J, Morris S, Atkin W, et al. Inequalities in participation in an organized national colorectal cancer screening programme: Results from the first 2.6 million invitations in England. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2011; 40(3): 712-718. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyr008.
9. Quyn AJ, Fraser CG, Stanners G, Carey FA, Carden C, Shaukat A, et al. Uptake trends in the Scottish Bowel Screening Programme and the influences of age, sex, and deprivation. *J Med Screen*. 2018; 25(1): 24-31. doi: 10.1177/0969141317694065.
10. Burnett-Hartman AN, Mehta SJ, Zheng Y, Ghai NR, McLerran DF, et al. Racial/ethnic disparities in colorectal cancer screening across healthcare systems. *Am J Prev Med*. 2016;51(4): e107-e115. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2016.02.025.
11. Ollberding NJ, Nomura AMY, Wilkens LR, Henderson BE, Kolonel LN. Racial/ethnic differences in colorectal cancer risk: The multiethnic cohort study. *Int J Cancer*. 2011;129(8):1899–906. doi: 10.1002/ijc.25822.
12. Price CL, Szczepura AK, Gumber AK, Patnick J. Comparison of breast and bowel cancer screening uptake patterns in a common cohort of South Asian women in England. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2010; 10(1):1-9. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-10-103.
13. Bansal N, Bhopal RS, Steiner MFC, Brewster DH. Major ethnic group differences in breast cancer screening uptake in Scotland are not extinguished by adjustment for indices of geographical residence, area deprivation, long-term illness and education. *Br J Cancer*. 2012;106(8):1361–6. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2012.83.
14. Szczepura A, Price C, Gumber A. Breast and bowel cancer screening uptake patterns over 15 years for UK south Asian ethnic minority populations, corrected for differences in socio-demographic characteristics. *BMC Public Health*. 2008; 8(1):1-5. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-8-346.

15. Kerrison RS, Prentice A, Marshall S, Choglay S, Levitan M, Alter M, et al. Ethnic inequalities in older adults bowel cancer awareness: findings from a community survey conducted in an ethnically diverse region in England. *BMC Public Health*. 2021; 21(1):1-3. doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-10536-y.
16. Welsh Government. An Anti-racist Wales. Race Equality Action Plan for Wales. 2021. Available from: https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/consultations/2021-03/race-equality-action-plan-an-anti-racist-wales_2.pdf. Accessed 21 Nov 2021.
17. Equality Act (2010). London: The Stationery Office Limited; 2010.
18. Dekker E, Chiu HM, Lansdorp-Vogelaar I, Caro LE, Dominitz JA, Halloran S, et al. Colorectal Cancer Screening in the Novel Coronavirus Disease-2019 Era. 2020; 159(6):1998-2003. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2020.09.018.
19. Mazidimoradi A, Tiznobaik A, Salehiniya H. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Colorectal Cancer Screening: a Systematic Review. *J Gastrointest Cancer*. 2021. doi:10.1007/s12029-021-00679-x.
20. de Jonge L, Worthington J, van Wifferen F, Iragorri N, Peterse EFP, Lew J Bin, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on faecal immunochemical test-based colorectal cancer screening programmes in Australia, Canada, and the Netherlands: a comparative modelling study. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2021;6(4):304–14. doi: 10.1016/S2468-1253(21)00003-0.
21. Morris EJA, Goldacre R, Spata E, Mafham M, Finan PJ, Shelton J, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the detection and management of colorectal cancer in England: a population-based study. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2021; 6(3):199-208. doi: 10.1016/S2468-1253(21)00005-4.
22. Greene G, Griffiths R, Akbari A, Han J, Jones M, Lawler M, et al. Impact of Societal Lockdown and Health System Response to the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Pandemic on Female Breast, Colorectal and Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Incidence, Stage at Diagnosis and Referral Route During 2020 in Wales, UK: A Population Study Using a National Cancer Clinical Record System. 2020.
23. Carethers JM, Sengupta R, Blakey R, Ribas A, D'Souza G. Disparities in cancer prevention in the covid-19 era. *Cancer Prev Res*. 2020;13(11):893–6. doi: 10.1158/1940-6207.CAPR-20-0447.
24. Campbell C, Sommerfield T, Clark GRC, Porteous L, Milne AM, Millar R, et al. COVID-19 and cancer screening in Scotland : A national and coordinated approach to minimising harm. 2020; 151:106606. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2021.106606.
25. Balzora, S., Issaka, R. B., Anyane-Yeboah, A., Gray II, D. M., & May FP. Impact of COVID-19 on colorectal cancer disparities and the way forward. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2020; 92(4):946-50. doi: 10.1016/j.gie.2020.06.042.
26. Lyons RA, Jones KH, John G, Brooks CJ, Verplancke JP, Ford D V., et al. The SAIL databank: Linking multiple health and social care datasets. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2009;9(1):1–8. doi: 10.1186/1472-6947-9-3.
27. Ford D V., Jones KH, Verplancke JP, Lyons RA, John G, Brown G, et al. The SAIL Databank: Building a national architecture for e-health research and evaluation. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2009;9:1–12. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-9-157.
28. Welsh Government. Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019. 2020. Available from: <http://gov.wales/statistics-and-research/welsh-index-multiple-deprivation/?lang=en>. Accessed 14 Jan 2022.
29. Office for National Statistics. 2011 rural/urban classification. 2016. Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/geography/geographicalproducts/ruralurbanclassifications/2011ruralurbanclassification>. Accessed 16 Jan 2022.
30. Public Health Wales NHS Trust. Identifying vulnerable patient lists. 2020. Available

- from: <https://nwis.nhs.wales/coronavirus/digital-support-updates-for-healthcare-professionals/identifying-shielding-patients>. Accessed 16 Jan 2022.
31. Office for National Statistics. Ethnic group, national identity and religion. 2020. Available from: <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/style-guide/ethnic-groups#2011-census>. Accessed 12 Oct 2021.
 32. Public Health Wales. Bowel Screening Wales Annual Statistical Report 2019-20. Available from: <https://phw.nhs.wales/services-and-teams/screening/bowel-screening/information-resources/programme-reports/bsw-annual-statistical-reports/bsw-annual-statistical-report-2019-2020/>. Accessed 16 Jan 2022.
 33. Martins T, Abel G, Ukoumunne OC, Mounce LTA, Price S, Lyratzopoulos G, et al. Ethnic inequalities in routes to diagnosis of cancer: a population-based UK cohort study. *Br J Cancer*. 2022;1–9. doi: 10.1038/s41416-022-01847-x.
 34. Hirst Y, Stoffel S, Baio G, McGregor L, von Wagner C. Uptake of the English Bowel (Colorectal) Cancer Screening Programme: an update 5 years after the full roll-out. *Eur J Cancer*. 2018; 103:267-73. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2018.07.135.
 35. De Cuevas RMA, Saini P, Roberts D, Beaver K, Chandrashekar M, Jain A, et al. A systematic review of barriers and enablers to South Asian women's attendance for asymptomatic screening of breast and cervical cancers in emigrant countries. *BMJ Open*. 2018; 8(7):e020892. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020892.
 36. Crawford J, Ahmad F, Beaton D, Bierman AS. Cancer screening behaviours among South Asian immigrants in the UK, US and Canada: A scoping study. *Health and Social Care in the Community*. 2016; 24(2):123-53. doi: 10.1111/hsc.12208.
 37. Moondance Cancer Initiative. Improving uptake of bowel screening. 2021. Available from: <https://moondance-cancer.wales/projects/bowel-cancer-programme/improving-uptake-of-bowel-screening>. Accessed 1 Mar 2022.
 38. Moss S, Mathews C, Day TJ, Smith S, Seaman HE, Snowball J, et al. Increased uptake and improved outcomes of bowel cancer screening with a faecal immunochemical test: Results from a pilot study within the national screening programme in England. *Gut*. 2017; 66(9):1631-44. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2015-310691.
 39. Campbell C, Douglas A, Williams L, Cezard G, Brewster DH, Buchanan D, et al. Are there ethnic and religious variations in uptake of bowel cancer screening? A retrospective cohort study among 1.7 million people in Scotland. *BMJ Open*. 2020; 10(10):e037011. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-037011.
 40. Welsh Government. Ethnicity by area and ethnic group. 2021. Available from: <https://statswales.gov.wales/Catalogue/Equality-and-Diversity/Ethnicity/ethnicity-by-area-ethnicgroup>. Accessed 16 Jan 2022.
 41. Fazil Q. Cancer and black and minority ethnic communities briefing paper. A Race and Equality Foundation Briefing Paper. Available from: <http://raceequalityfoundation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/REF-Better-Health-471-1.pdf>. Accessed 18 Jan 2022.
 42. Grath-Lone LM, Libuy N, Etoori D, Blackburn R, Gilbert R, Harron K. Ethnic bias in data linkage. *Lancet Digit Heal*. 2021;3(6):e339. doi: 10.1016/S2589-7500(21)00081-9.

Declarations**Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank Dr Bethan Bowden and Dr Sikha de Souza for their comments on a previous version of the manuscript, and Laura Cowley and David Florentin for their support with data linkage. This study makes use of anonymised data held in the Secure Anonymised Information Linkage (SAIL) Databank. This work uses data provided by patients and collected by the NHS as part of their care and support. We would also like to acknowledge all data providers who make anonymised data available for research. We wish to acknowledge the collaborative partnership that enabled acquisition and access to the de-identified data, which led to this output. The collaboration was led by the Swansea University Health Data Research UK team under the direction of the Welsh Government Technical Advisory Cell (TAC) and includes the following groups and organisations: the SAIL Databank, Administrative Data Research (ADR) Wales, Digital Health and Care Wales (DHCW), Public Health Wales, NHS Shared Services Partnership (NWSSP) and the Welsh Ambulance Service Trust (WAST). All research conducted has been completed under the permission and approval of the SAIL independent Information Governance Review Panel (IGRP) project number 0911.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author's contributions

DB was the main researcher and contributed to the design of the study, analysed the data and drafted the manuscript. AA completed the linked data method to create the ethnic groups. RG prepared or linked data sources to create the sample. SH, JS, DH, GG, AD and AG contributed to the design of this study and the revision of the manuscript. JS and KH contributed to the analysis plan, interpretation of the data, and manuscript revision. All authors read and approved the manuscript.

Funding statement

This work was supported by the Con-COV team funded by the Medical Research Council (grant number: MR/V028367/1). This work was supported by Health Data Research UK, which receives its funding from HDR UK Ltd (HDR-9006) funded by the UK Medical Research Council, Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, Economic and

Social Research Council, Department of Health and Social Care (England), Chief Scientist Office of the Scottish Government Health and Social Care Directorates, Health and Social Care Research and Development Division (Welsh Government), Public Health Agency (Northern Ireland), British Heart Foundation (BHF) and the Wellcome Trust. This work was supported by the ADR Wales programme of work. The ADR Wales programme of work is aligned to the priority themes as identified in the Welsh Government's national strategy: Prosperity for All. ADR Wales brings together data science experts at Swansea University Medical School, staff from the Wales Institute of Social and Economic Research, Data and Methods (WISERD) at Cardiff University and specialist teams within the Welsh Government to develop new evidence which supports *Prosperity for All* by using the SAIL Databank at Swansea University, to link and analyse anonymised data. ADR Wales is part of the Economic and Social Research Council (part of UK Research and Innovation) funded ADR UK (grant ES/S007393/1). This work was supported by the Wales COVID-19 Evidence Centre, funded by Health and Care Research Wales.

Availability of data and materials

The data used in this study are available in the SAIL Databank at Swansea University, Swansea, UK, but as restrictions apply they are not publicly available. All proposals to use SAIL data are subject to review by an independent Information Governance Review Panel (IGRP). Before any data can be accessed, approval must be given by the IGRP. The IGRP gives careful consideration to each project to ensure proper and appropriate use of SAIL data. When access has been granted, it is gained through a privacy protecting safe haven and remote access system referred to as the SAIL Gateway. SAIL has established an application process to be followed by anyone who would like to access data via SAIL at <https://www.saildatabank.com/application-process>