



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Colorectal Cancer Screening - surely FIT for us too

McFerran, E., Kee, F., & Coleman, H. (2019). Colorectal Cancer Screening - surely FIT for us too. *Frontline Gastroenterology*. <https://doi.org/10.1136/flgastro-2018-101125>

Published in:
Frontline Gastroenterology

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights
© 2019 The Authors. This work is made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Open Access
This research has been made openly available by Queen's academics and its Open Research team. We would love to hear how access to this research benefits you. – Share your feedback with us: <http://go.qub.ac.uk/oa-feedback>

Title Page

Title: Colorectal Cancer Screening - surely FIT for us too

Authors

1. Corresponding author: MCFERRAN, ETHNA;
Postal address: Queen's University Belfast Centre for Public Health,
Institute of Clinical Sciences, Block B, Royal Victoria Hospital, Belfast
BT12 6BA
Phone - 028 9097 6430
2. Kee, Frank; Queen's University Belfast, Centre for Public Health
3. Coleman, Helen; Queens University Belfast, Centre for Public Health

KEYWORDS: COLORECTAL CANCER, COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING, CANCER PREVENTION, CANCER, HEALTH ECONOMICS

Word Count: 486 words

a. Contributors Statement

All authors have made substantial contributions to the conception of the work, the analysis and interpretation of data for the work. All authors have taken part in drafting and revising it critically for important intellectual content, and have approved the version to be published. All authors are in agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

b. funding

EMF is funded through a post-doctoral grant from Cancer Focus Northern Ireland. HC holds a Cancer Research UK funded Career Establishment Award.

c. competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

d. acknowledgement

We are happy to provide further information or references which inform this piece.

e. licence for publication

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in BJO and any other BMJPG products and sublicenses such use and exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence (<http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-for-authors/licence-forms>).

A dwindling minority of countries now offer guaiac-based colorectal cancer (CRC) screening tests (including Croatia, Finland, Greece and Hungary) since, for over a decade, faecal immunochemical testing (FIT) has been shown to be more effective¹. FIT detects more positive results compared to guaiac-based tests with fewer false negatives and for participants is a more acceptable test.

In Northern Ireland, three years on from when the UK National Screening Committee (UKNSC) recommended a move to FIT (in January 2016), no decision to support its implementation has been approved. The inequity is unacceptable, as UKNSC published economic evidence showing FIT implementation would improve outcomes with cost savings².

Transition to FIT in England and Wales continues with additional plans to extend CRC screening to 50-74-year-olds announced (August 2018)³. Scotland leads the way on this change. Wisely, plans are being made to ensure sufficient investigative capacity. Similarly, in the Republic of Ireland, the FIT-based screening programme (launched in 2012), received a commitment for full expansion to ensure coverage for 55-74-year-olds by 2021.

Meanwhile, Northern Ireland approaches the second anniversary of collapsed devolved government and a longer period without a cancer strategy. Elected officials vocalise the need to keep Northern Ireland in line with the rest of Great Britain (GB) and/or the Republic of Ireland (depending on their persuasion) in discussions of all things 'Brexit'. Sadly, in this case, they have been virtually silent when it comes to alignment issues pertaining to health and healthcare.

The public health research community is increasingly frustrated by this reticence. The Northern Ireland population is being left behind with an inferior screening test. Moreover, since CRC screening is offered to 60-74-year-olds in Northern Ireland, those in their 50s will not have the option to undergo screening, unlike their GB counterparts, and this will widen regional health inequalities.

When concerns were raised, the Permanent Secretary and HSC Chief Executive suggests that 'extending the age range to 50 remains an option to be considered'. Perhaps the evidence-based arguments endorsed in the rest of the UK have been diluted without a reasoned recourse to the high economic value of prevention. This is worrying when the current trends suggest that CRC is increasing among younger people⁴.

It is deeply concerning that a straightforward cost saving and evidenced-based policy change cannot be made in Northern Ireland to ensure the same access to FIT screening as other parts of the UK. The potential impact on inequalities of changing to FIT should be welcomed since the evidence suggests that its uptake is improved in lower socioeconomic groups and its use improves participation rates⁵.

Two decades on since the Good Friday agreement, political inaction (not bombs and bullets, thankfully) may be costing lives in Northern Ireland. It is time to safeguard public health and our health service. *“In any moment of decision, the best thing you can do is the right thing. The worst thing you can do is nothing.” — Theodore Roosevelt*

References

1. Robertson DJ, Lee JK, Boland CR, et al. Recommendations on Fecal Immunochemical Testing to Screen for Colorectal Neoplasia: A Consensus Statement by the US Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer. *Gastroenterology*. 2017;152(5):1217-1237.e3. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2016.08.053
2. Murphy J. *The Cost-Effectiveness of Immunochemical Faecal Occult Blood Testing vs . Guaiac Faecal Occult Blood Testing for Colorectal Cancer Screening in the NHS Bowel Cancer Screening Programme Report to the UK National Screening Committee.*; 2015. <http://legacy.screening.nhs.uk/bowelcancer>.
3. UK National Screening Committee. UK NSC recommendation on bowel cancer screening. <https://legacyscreening.phe.org.uk/bowelcancer>. Published 2018.
4. Siegel RL, Fedewa SA, Anderson WF, et al. Colorectal Cancer Incidence Patterns in the United States, 1974-2013. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2017;109(8):27-32. doi:10.1093/jnci/djw322
5. Moss S, Mathews C, Day TJ, 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):1631-1644. doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2015-310691