

Accepted Manuscript

# *British Journal of General Practice*

## Socioeconomic differences in help-seeking experiences in primary care for symptoms related to colorectal cancer during COVID-19: A UK-wide qualitative interview study

Ip, Athena; Black, Georgia; Vindrola-Padros, Cecilia; Taylor, Claire; Otter, Sophie; Hewish, Madeleine; Bhuiya, Afsana; Callin, Julie; Wong, Angela; Machesney, Michael; Fulop, Naomi; Taylor, Cath; Whitaker, Katriina

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/BJGP.2021.0644>

To access the most recent version of this article, please click the DOI URL in the line above.

Received 16-November-2021

Revised 04-February-2022

Accepted 24-February-2022

© 2022 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by British Journal of General Practice. For editorial process and policies, see: <https://bjgp.org/authors/bjgp-editorial-process-and-policies>

When citing this article please include the DOI provided above.

### **Author Accepted Manuscript**

This is an 'author accepted manuscript': a manuscript that has been accepted for publication in British Journal of General Practice, but which has not yet undergone subediting, typesetting, or correction. Errors discovered and corrected during this process may materially alter the content of this manuscript, and the latest published version (the Version of Record) should be used in preference to any preceding versions

# Socioeconomic differences in help-seeking experiences in primary care for symptoms related to colorectal cancer during COVID-19: A UK-wide qualitative interview study

Athena Ip<sup>1\*</sup>, Research Fellow, PhD; Georgia Black<sup>2</sup>, THIS Institute postdoctoral fellow and Principal Research Fellow, PhD; Cecilia Vindrola-Padros<sup>3</sup>, Senior Research Fellow and Director of RREAL, PhD; Claire Taylor<sup>4</sup>, Macmillan Nurse Consultant, RGN, BN, MSc, PGCAP, PhD; Sophie Otter<sup>5</sup>, Consultant Clinical Oncologist, MD(Res) MBBChir MRCP FRCR; Madeleine Hewish<sup>5</sup>, Consultant Medical Oncologist, MBBS, BSc, MRCP, PhD; Afsana Bhuiya<sup>6</sup>, Cancer GP lead, MBBS, Bsc; Julie Callin<sup>7</sup>, Patient Representative; Angela Wong<sup>8</sup>, Consultant Gastroenterologist, MD; Michael Machesney<sup>8</sup>, Consultant General Surgeon, MD, FRCS; Naomi J Fulop<sup>2</sup>, Professor of healthcare organisation and management, PhD; Cath Taylor<sup>1</sup>, Professor of Healthcare Workforce Organisation and Wellbeing, PhD Psychol; Katriina L Whitaker<sup>1</sup>, Reader in Cancer Care, PhD.

<sup>1</sup>School of Health Sciences, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK; <sup>2</sup>Department of Applied Health Research, University College London, London, UK; <sup>3</sup>Department of Targeted Intervention, University College London, London, UK; <sup>4</sup>London North West University Healthcare NHS Trust; <sup>5</sup>Royal Surrey County Hospital NHS Foundation Trust; <sup>6</sup>University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust; <sup>7</sup>Patient Representative; <sup>8</sup>Bart's Health NHS Trust

\*Corresponding author, [a.ip@surrey.ac.uk](mailto:a.ip@surrey.ac.uk) (ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8574-2569)

## Abstract

### Background

COVID-19 has led to rapid changes in health care delivery, raising concern that these changes may exacerbate existing inequalities in patient outcomes.

### Aim

To understand how patients' help-seeking experiences in primary care for colorectal cancer symptoms during COVID-19 were affected by socioeconomic status (SES).

### Design & setting

Qualitative semi-structured interviews with men and women across the UK, recruited using purposive sampling by SES.

### Method

Interviews were carried out with 39 participants (20 higher SES; 19 lower SES) who contacted primary care about possible symptoms of colorectal cancer during COVID-19. Data were analysed using framework analysis followed by comparative thematic analysis to explore differences between groups.

### Results

Three themes were identified with differences between SES groups: (1) How people decided to seek medical help through appraisal of symptoms; (2) How people navigated services; and (3) Impact of COVID-19 on how patients interacted with healthcare professionals. The lower SES group expressed uncertainty appraising symptoms and navigating services (in terms of new processes resulting from covid and worries about infection). There was also potential for increased disparity in diagnosis and

management, with other methods of getting in touch (e.g., email, 111) taken up more readily by higher SES patients.

## **Conclusion**

Our findings suggest that COVID-19 exacerbated disparities between higher and lower SES participants. This study raises awareness around challenges in help-seeking in the context of the pandemic which are likely to persist (post-COVID) as healthcare systems settle on new models (e.g., digital) of care. Recommendations are provided to reduce inequalities of care.

**Keywords: Primary care, Covid-19, primary healthcare, qualitative research, colorectal cancer, inequalities**

## **How this fits in**

In order to understand people's help-seeking behaviours during COVID-19 and inequalities in accessing care, semi-structured interviews were carried out with people who contacted primary care with possible symptoms of colorectal cancer. The Candidacy framework was used to understand how people decided to seek medical help, how they navigated services, ease of accessing services, and their perception of the interaction with healthcare professionals. Disparities between higher and lower SES participants were found in how people appraised their symptoms during the pandemic and how they perceived changes in primary care in terms of considerations around the need to visit the GP during the pandemic, understanding of how to access primary care, views about remote technology, safety-netting during COVID-19 and attitudes towards accessing care. Recommendations are made for minimising negative impacts on patient care during and post-pandemic.

## **Introduction**

Earlier diagnosis of cancer is considered a potential casualty of the COVID-19 pandemic (1) leading to avoidable deaths and significant economic impacts.(2) There have been a number of calls to action to ensure people seek prompt medical help, receive appropriate referrals and follow-up care.(3, 4) This is particularly important in the UK context, given the lower cancer survival compared with countries with similar healthcare systems(5) and the likely influence of later diagnosis on these differences.(6) For colorectal cancer, 98% of patients diagnosed at Stage 1 survived their disease for at least one year, compared to 44% of patients diagnosed at Stage 4.(7)

The impact of COVID-19 on colorectal cancer care is of particular concern, because it risks perpetuating persistent social/health inequalities in outcomes,(8, 9) including late presentation,(10) less access to treatment,(11) delayed treatment,(12) higher mortality (13, 14) and poorer survival for more deprived groups.(11)

Evidence from population- based and community studies during the pandemic suggest that people were less likely to seek medical help for their symptoms,(15, 16) were fearful of catching or transmitting COVID-19 by contacting their GP practice (16) and were less likely to be referred, diagnosed or treated for colorectal cancer.(17, 18) It is not yet clear whether these impacts are socially patterned.

Recent data from Public Health Scotland suggests that significantly lower numbers of people were diagnosed with colorectal cancer (25% less) than before the pandemic and there was a trend

suggesting that the fall in numbers of people being diagnosed with Stage 1 disease was higher in the most deprived areas compared with less deprived areas.(19)

Primary care underwent rapid transformation as a result of the pandemic,(20) with 90% of consultations delivered remotely in April 2020.(21) These changes present trade-offs for patients (22) and clinicians,(20) particularly in the context of assessing potential cancer symptoms.(23) Any positive consequences (e.g. improved flexibility/reducing COVID-19 infection risk), have to be balanced with ensuring adequate diagnostic assessment,(23) and avoiding exacerbation of health inequalities.(24)

This study addressed a gap in the literature by providing qualitative evidence about patients' experiences of accessing primary care during the pandemic, and whether these experiences were shaped by socioeconomic differences. We draw on the concept of candidacy as an underpinning framework because it describes the way in which equity in access can differ because of the way patients and health services determine eligibility for healthcare.(25) This evidence can be used to make recommendations to mitigate against exacerbating existing inequalities in care.

## **Method**

### **Approach**

Semi-structured interviews were carried out to provide an in depth understanding of patient experiences of the healthcare system when contacting about possible symptoms of colorectal cancer during the COVID-19 pandemic and how this varied by socioeconomic status.

### **Participant selection and recruitment**

Participants were recruited through a research recruitment company (SAROS) who have a database of over 60,000 potential respondents across the UK and can screen based on different variables to gain populations of interest. Screening questions were developed by the research team to identify people from higher and lower socioeconomic (SES) groups across the UK who contacted primary care about symptoms related to colorectal cancer during the COVID-19 pandemic (since March 2020) and administered by the recruitment company. After screening, the research company arranged the interview between the participant and the researcher (AI) and provided the researcher with the participants contact details. Participants were given £50 for taking part in the interview. Symptoms included in the screening questions were those listed on the Bowel Cancer Awareness Measure toolkit (26) and Bowel Cancer UK website.(27) The main index for SES used in this study was education as this has been used in previous research exploring impact of SES on response to cancer symptoms.(28) People with 'O' levels/GCSEs or equivalent or with no formal qualification were in the lower SES group and those with A level or above were in the higher SES group.

### **Data collection**

Interviews were carried out by an experienced qualitative researcher (AI) from October 2020 to November 2020 via phone or Zoom (duration=57 minutes; range: 31-86 minutes). Participants gave verbal consent to take part in the study. Interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim. The topic guide (Supplementary Box 1) focused on aspects of the Candidacy framework to understand how people decided to seek medical help and how they navigated services.(25)

### **Analysis**

Transcripts were repeatedly read by one qualitative researcher (AI) to ensure familiarity with the data before coding using framework analysis. We used the Candidacy Framework to help organise

the data, but themes were developed using an inductive approach. This framework was useful for exploring individual's identification of their 'candidacy' for accessing and negotiating healthcare services which highlighted barriers and facilitators to accessing care during the pandemic. Comparative thematic analysis(28) was then carried out to explore the differences between higher and lower SES groups. This involved initially analysing interviews by socio-economic group, before moving to analysing differences between groups. This two-step approach to analysis was useful for identifying themes that were running across the whole sample before looking at the differences between individual groups and comparing them with one other. AI had multiple data analysis meetings with three members of the team (KW, GB, CV) to further refine the findings and ensure that the final themes reflected the data. These were then further discussed with the wider team.

## Results

A total of 39 participants were recruited (mean age= 50 years, range from 25-78 years) from higher (n=20) and lower (n=19) SES backgrounds across the UK. This sample size was to ensure that we had as close to equal number of participants in both groups to be able to conduct a comparative analysis. For information about participant characteristics including employment status, living arrangements etc., see Supplementary Table 1. The most reported symptoms in both groups was a combination of extreme tiredness for no obvious reason and a persistent and unexplained change in bowel habits (n=6). Telephone consultations (higher SES=17; Lower SES=16) were the most reported initial mode of consultation followed by face-to-face (higher SES=2; lower SES=2), e-consult (lower SES=1) and video (higher SES=1). Three main themes were identified across the data exploring how people decided to seek help, how people navigated services and ease of accessing these, and impact of COVID-19 on how patients interacted with healthcare professionals (Table 1).

[Table 1 here]

### 1. How people decided to seek medical help through appraisal of symptoms 1.1 Distinguishing between colorectal and COVID-19 symptoms

Some participants in the lower SES group reported uncertainty about whether their colorectal symptoms were associated with COVID-19.(29) This included their reports of persistent and unexplained changes in bowel habits (e.g. diarrhoea), blood in the poo and extreme tiredness for no obvious reason (which they related to long COVID). For some participants, the idea that their symptoms might be due to COVID-19 accelerated their decision to consult the GP (Supplementary Table 2).

*"I just felt not right and obviously diarrhoea and going to the loo and everything, that was obviously something else that was different, that's another symptom of the COVID, isn't it?." (P5, 51, Lower SES, extreme tiredness for no obvious reason, unexplained changes in bowel habits)*

Their reasons for contacting the GP were mainly to assure themselves of the right course of action, for example, whether they should go for a COVID test. Some expressed uncertainty about whether their symptoms could be attributed to COVID-19:

*"I first thought have I got coronavirus, I thought but you just you know, your mind just goes crazy with it and I thought I've never heard anything on the news that people get pains in their stomach if they've got coronavirus, but you think you've got it because you're poorly, you know what I mean?" (P10, 46, Lower SES, pain in abdomen)*

In contrast, people in the higher SES group were more confident in the likelihood that their symptoms were related to COVID-19, which influenced their assessment of going to the GP practice:

*“Obviously with a stomach thing it’s less likely that I’ve got COVID, so I suppose they’re more amenable to you coming in.” (P21, 61, Higher SES, pain in abdomen, persistent and unexplained change in bowel habits)*

## **1.2 Relationship between body vigilance and lifestyle modifications**

Some people in the higher SES group reported how lifestyle modifications during the pandemic including working from home or being furloughed made them more vigilant about changes in their body. They reported how this increased awareness was a driver for seeking help from the GP:

*“I didn’t wait as long as what I would have done in the past, probably because then I had to start working from home and teach from home and all that so I felt like I had more control of my time.” (P17, 54, Higher SES, bleeding from bottom/or blood in poo, persistent and unexplained changes in bowel habits)*

Changes in diet and exercise as well as heightened worry and stress, were described by higher SES as contributing to their symptoms and may have made symptom discrimination more difficult:

*“I thought, maybe the weight loss was because we are at home, we all went for exercise, healthier eating, cooking more at home, you know.” (P16, 50, Higher SES, unexplained weight loss, pain in abdomen)*

*“Well I wondered at first whether it might be, you get a bit anxious in lockdown and so on and I’m a vulnerable age, so I thought it might be that, but then I wasn’t so sure.” (P28, 70, Higher SES, persistent and unexplained change in bowel habits)*

In contrast, people in the lower SES group did not mention lifestyle changes, working from home or being furloughed as influences on whether they noticed symptoms or sought help from their GP.

## **2. How people navigated services**

### **2.1 Accessing healthcare in the face of a pandemic**

Both groups weighed up the balance between their own needs against potential risks and NHS resources. However, people in the higher SES group appeared to be more determined to contact their GP for advice, despite the pandemic, in case their condition was serious or worsened:

*“Lockdown didn’t influence my decision at all. I made the decision because I needed some clinical advice and action.” (P4, 67, Higher SES, bleeding from bottom/or blood in poo)*

*“Because I kind of like understand that Covid and stuff like that, there is more danger, obviously, than usual. But in the same time, I was concerned about my health, so for me it doesn’t matter, I was determined to see GP or, you know, kind of like book an appointment, to be honest. So it was in back of my mind, the concern, but it will, it will not stop me kind of like to book an appointment, to be honest.” (P16, Higher SES, unexplained weight loss, pain in abdomen)*

People in the lower SES group showed more hesitancy in accessing healthcare during the pandemic. They showed particular concern about what to expect, comparing themselves to others who may be worse off and not wanting to waste NHS resources:

*I’d have probably left it for another few months and seen how it went on sort of thing. I know, I know the pandemic’s on and there’s people suffering a lot worse than me and what have you but the GPs should still be there sort of on the ground floor to sort out basic*

*ailments and illnesses and what have you.” (P8, 60, Lower SES, extreme tiredness for no obvious reason, persistent and unexplained change in bowel habits)*

As a result, there was evidence that people with lower SES may have delayed seeking help longer than participants in the higher SES group.

*“I didn’t want to really go into a doctor’s, go into a hospital, if I didn’t have to do, which is why I you know, initially sort of tried to put it off and you know, ignored it a bit when it first started...” (P39, 33, Lower SES, extreme tiredness for no obvious reason, pain in abdomen, persistent and unexplained change in bowel habits)*

## **2.2 Understanding the process and perceptions of safety measures when accessing primary care**

Both groups expected that the process of getting an appointment would be different because of COVID. However, people in the higher SES group appeared to know more about what to expect when deciding to access primary care during the pandemic. This included expectations of contacting the practice by phone and expecting telephone consultations initially, with a better understanding of the triage process in general.

*“I knew that they were doing these telephone consultations, but I felt that my condition was nothing you could do over the telephone or video, and that it would have to be a visit...” (P4, 67, Higher SES, bleeding from bottom/or blood in poo)*

People in the lower SES group had mixed views about what to expect from accessing services during the pandemic, thinking that it would be the same as pre-pandemic, whilst others assumed services would not be available except in case of emergency and telephone lines would be busier:

*“I thought I was actually going to see the doctor the first time but I thought they was just going to say to you wear a mask, infection, you know.” (P6, 36, Lower SES, extreme tiredness for no obvious reason, bleeding from bottom/or blood in poo, persistent and unexplained change in bowel habits)*

*“I didn’t think they’d be overrun with patients or full sort of working, I just thought they might be shut and only emergencies go through the doctors.” (P8, 60, Lower SES, extreme tiredness for no obvious reason, persistent and unexplained change in bowel habits)*

Although people in both groups expressed hesitancy about attending their GP practice because of fears of catching COVID, *“But unless it’s necessary, I’d still rather avoid it (P12, 32, Lower SES, pain in your abdomen, bleeding from bottom/or blood in poo).* Higher SES participants also reported trust in the system/ themselves to avoid infection which meant they were more confident to attend:

*“The measures that all doctors’ practices will be taking, and similar services, will be very good and will be efficient and effective. So I’m quite confident in what they would be able to do to protect you from COVID.” (P4, 67, Higher SES, bleeding from bottom/or blood in poo)*

This indicates that having confident expectations about making contact with health services and avoiding contagion could affect help-seeking behaviours, particularly disadvantaging lower SES participants.

### **3. Impact of COVID-19 on how patients interacted with healthcare professionals**

#### **3.1 Views about utility of remote technology**

The majority of people in the higher SES group and some in the lower SES group described advantages to remote consultations such as convenience (higher and lower SES), not competing with work commitments (lower SES) and recognising that the use of technology was a positive outcome of the pandemic and the way forward for the NHS (higher SES):

*“So I think maybe it’s speeded up the technology for the better that will enable GPs to maximise their time.” (P33, 75, Higher SES, pain in abdomen, bleeding from bottom/or blood in poo, persistent and unexplained change in bowel habits)*

*“[...] it’s a lot quicker and it is a lot more convenient, you know, like I say, being able to maybe contact the GP and get an appointment from work, rather than having to take you know a couple of hours out of work, or an hour out of work to actually go down....” (P39, 33, Lower SES, extreme tiredness for no obvious reason, pain in abdomen, persistent and unexplained change in bowel habit)*

A few people in the higher SES group had reservations about remote consultations because they felt that it could not be used to resolve symptoms, it was difficult to read emotions and facial expressions, and required existing “face-to-face established relations” (P27, 50, Higher SES, extreme tiredness for no obvious reason, persistent and unexplained change in bowel habits)

However, more than half of the participants in the lower SES group described reservations including practical barriers such as missing phone calls and not getting a call back, dependent on internet/technology working and additional disadvantages for specific groups such as older people:

*“But if you don’t answer the phone in two or three rings, you’re cancelled. That’s the disadvantage of it...Not the way you’d want to do it every time once the pandemic’s over.” (P5, 51, Lower SES, extreme tiredness for no obvious reason)*

*“people that live near me they’re all in their 80s and 90s and what have you, they don’t even know how a mobile phone works, they keep one at the side of them if they need one for emergencies” (P8, 60, Lower SES, extreme tiredness for no obvious reason, persistent and unexplained change in bowel habits)*

Some people reported that they would prefer video consultations if offered as the health professional would be able to see the symptom as opposed to over the telephone where it can be more difficult to explain:

*“I prefer face-to-face, even if you’re not in direct contact, at least they can see you. Because trying to sometimes explain over the phone your symptoms is sometimes a bit difficult.” (P6, 36, Lower SES, extreme tiredness for no obvious reason, bleeding from bottom/or blood in poo, persistent and unexplained change in bowel habits)*

### **3.2 Knowing how and when to seek further help**

The increase in remote contact methods for primary care affected how lower and higher SES groups felt their safety was being monitored. For example, people in the higher SES group reported more active forms of safety netting, including a timescale for re-contact when symptoms had not resolved, medication to ease symptoms whilst waiting for their referral appointment, or other remote options of getting back in touch such as emailing or calling 111. This made participants feel reassured:

*“there was the reassurance that you know, if this, if the symptoms persist then you will need to call me back, because we might need to investigate it a bit further.” (P11, 52, Higher SES, persistent and unexplained change in bowel habits)*



People in the lower SES group had mixed perceptions about how they were monitored, with some participants mentioning not being given safety netting advice and others not remembering what advice was given:

*“After the, it’s probably not COVID, I’m not going to lie to you I kind of mentally checked out a bit, I was like oh cool, I don’t have to worry then. ...” (P12, 32, Lower SES, pain in your abdomen, bleeding from bottom/or blood in poo)*

Another participant felt that a follow-up appointment was less likely because of COVID:

*“I mean, it does feel different to what it used to, where you’d always get a follow-up, always, this time I don’t feel that you will, necessarily.” (P23, 56, Lower SES, pain in abdomen)*

## **Discussion**

### **Summary**

Interviews with the public who contacted primary care during the pandemic highlighted disparities between SES groups in how people decided to seek medical help, how they navigated services and how they perceived interactions with healthcare professionals. The overshadowing of COVID-19 and uncertainty about its symptoms had differential effects on both groups, as compared to the lower SES group, the higher SES group appeared more certain about signs of COVID-19 and were more likely to seek a face-to-face appointment and follow-up consultations for their colorectal symptoms, rather than worrying about viral transmission. Furthermore, lifestyle changes because of COVID-19 restrictions allowed people in the higher SES group to be more body vigilant, which appeared to speed up their decision to consult. Awareness of the NHS being under strain and the increased needs of the public may have had a differential effect on both groups in terms of prioritising their own health needs, as the lower SES group appeared more concerned about burdening the NHS. Perceptions around accessibility and safety measures during the pandemic were divided according to SES, with the higher SES group knowing more about how to navigate access compared to the lower SES group. We also found differences in attitudes towards remote consultations, with more reservations reported by people in the lower SES group which may have had an impact on participants’ ability to articulate their symptoms and may have implications for future help-seeking behaviours. Finally, with the introduction of remote consultations there was an increased importance of transparent safety-netting and care planning during the pandemic, and differences in the use/perceptions of these may have exacerbated inequalities between higher and lower SES participants.

### **Strengths and limitations**

To the authors’ knowledge, this is the first study to explore views and experiences of patients accessing primary care during the pandemic for symptoms of colorectal cancer, and whether there were socioeconomic differences. Participants were recruited from across the UK making the findings generalisable to UK nations.

Participants were identified through a research company and this method of recruitment can result in a highly self-selecting group of participants who will have a degree of technical skills that may increase their competence in engaging with telemedicine during covid restrictions. However, it also increases access to people from lower SES groups who may otherwise be hard to reach and recruit.

The means by which we recruited participants meant that member checking following study completion was not possible, although previous research in the field has found this a helpful strategy for augmenting and interpreting interview data with participants.(30)

Although we sampled into higher and lower SES groups to draw out differences, the binary nature of our analyses is a limitation, and does not necessarily capture the nuances across the SES gradient. We also focused on people who sought help during the pandemic as we particularly interested in understanding how changes due to the pandemic influenced accessing primary care. However, it would have been useful to capture views of those who did not seek help too. Finally, we did not capture healthcare professionals' views on how delivery of care changed and the challenges communicating this to patients, however, we are exploring this in another study.

The mean age of our sample was reflective of when the risk of colorectal cancer starts to rise in the general population,(31) although those in the higher SES group were on average slightly older than those in the lower SES group which may have impacted aspects of the pathway (e.g. decision to refer). However, it remains important to ensure safety-netting strategies and communication about next steps are the same for all patient sub-groups, particularly as the incidence of colorectal cancer is rising in younger age groups.(32)

### **Comparisons with existing literature**

These findings support previous research, which applied the candidacy framework to understand how aspects of the doctor-patient interaction influence perceived eligibility for help-seeking based on challenges with recognising that symptoms need medical attention and subsequently how to navigate services.(25) However, they extend them by showing differences between lower and higher SES groups. This study found that the higher SES group reported being more body vigilant during the pandemic and were more likely to seek help, linking this to working from home or being furloughed because of COVID-19. This is in line with a previous study exploring the impact of body vigilance on cancer 'alarm' symptoms,(33) which found that paying more attention to bodily changes was significantly associated with seeking help for cancer symptoms. This was less apparent in the lower SES group.

People in the lower SES group were less certain when discussing the cause of their symptoms and were more likely to worry that their symptoms were COVID-related (which would make them more likely to consult their GP about COVID and risk delaying care for potential symptoms of colorectal cancer). Previous studies have also found that non-recognition of symptom seriousness and lower cancer symptoms knowledge in lower educated groups,(34-37) is linked to delays in presentation for lower SES groups.(38, 39)

The finding that people in the lower SES group were more likely to express concern about burdening the healthcare system may be explained within the context of candidacy because people in more deprived areas may witness greater burden of ill health in their communities, and therefore higher levels of frequent attendance in primary care.(40)

Safety-netting during the pandemic is also highlighted as important in a previous study as with the use of remote consultations and in situations of uncertain clinical presentations, it can be an effective way of monitoring people to reduce clinical risk.(41) However, patients need to know how to seek further help/re-present if their symptoms persist. This is of particular significance since we

know COVID-19 has led to delayed presentations suggesting people require additional support when navigating through the pathway due to new methods of contacting the GP.(3)

Many of the participants in this study experienced remote consultations by telephone as opposed to video despite some participants reporting that they would have liked a video consultation if given the choice. However, the rarity of video consultations is usual in general practice as there is a perception that telephone or face-to-face consultations are more useful for majority of circumstances.(21) The importance of considering patient preferences when offering remote consultations and recognising how it may be difficult for certain groups was echoed in a recent study exploring experiences of healthcare professionals during the pandemic.(20) Other studies have also mentioned how remote consultations could potentially widen inequalities in healthcare particularly for older and vulnerable groups.(24, 42-44)

We found that participants navigated services during the pandemic depending on their perceptions of safety and knowledge of processes (e.g., online appointment systems). This is consistent with a recent survey study that found there was low public awareness of changes to face-to-face consultations.(45) Reluctance to access primary care due to fears of catching COVID-19 is reported by other studies conducted around the pandemic.(3, 46, 47) Addressing barriers to accessing care may help to reduce this gap,(48) which was already a concern pre-pandemic.

### **Implications for practice**

A summary of recommendations for practice is provided in Box 1. With the uncertainty around COVID-19 symptoms and colorectal cancer symptoms, there is the potential for future impact of long COVID on colorectal symptom appraisal and confusion.(49) Furthermore, the changing nature of guidance about COVID-19 symptoms and differences between NHS and other public bodies in their public-facing communication (e.g., where bowel symptoms are present in some but not others) makes raising awareness of symptoms a challenging avenue. There needs to be consensus on advice that is accessible to the public to avoid ongoing confusion and disseminating these through campaigns and more sustainable information (e.g., on GP practice websites and NHS letters).

There is an urgent need for campaigns to encourage particularly lower SES groups to notice changes in their bodies, such as offering practical action plans (e.g., campaigns to encourage people to set aside time to notice any changes and provide flexible and feasible options to make appointments), as external influences (such as type/place of employment) may make it harder for them to notice and interpret potential cancer symptoms. For people in the higher SES group this will also be important as the easing of the pandemic will result in more people going back to work and being less likely to notice bodily changes.

Reassuring people that safety measures are in place through reliable sources and using different methods to reach people (email, text, letter, practice website) will help, particularly for people from lower SES groups who showed more hesitancy around accessing primary care due to uncertainty about the process and subsequent safety measures.

It is important that people are signposted to appropriate and reliable information about methods of consultation. Proactive efforts to address primary care access and ensuring that patients have an option for face-to-face or remote consultation, will support those with digital access challenges.

Providing people with active safety-netting through different methods (e.g. providing people with a timeframe of when to reconsult and through different methods such as phone, email or app) will

help going forwards, especially given the backlog in cancer referrals(17) and the added uncertainty due to the pandemic.

Further research is needed to look at how inequalities may be generated across the care pathway, gathering perceptions from healthcare professionals on the main changes to the cancer pathway and their impact on inequalities, and link changes in care with data similar to epidemiological studies conducted during COVID(1, 8) to see whether the gap is sustained. For example, concerns have been raised that the introduction of quantitative faecal immunochemical test (qFIT) to stratify risk and prioritise patients for limited endoscopic services has led to missed cancers,(50) despite showing promise pre-pandemic.(51)

In conclusion, this study provides important insights into barriers accessing primary care during the pandemic and highlights the disparities between higher and lower SES groups including appraisal of symptoms, perceptions around safety and availability of services during the pandemic, use of remote consultations and safety-netting. Recommendations are provided on how we can reduce these inequalities and potentially decrease barriers which may lead to delayed cancer diagnosis. These findings may also be applicable to help-seeking for other symptoms, not just those related to colorectal cancer.

*[Box 1 here]*

#### **Acknowledgements**

We would like to acknowledge the significant contribution of our patient representative, Bronwyn Bartlett, who sadly died during the course of the study. We would also like to thank the participants for their willingness to share their experiences and perspectives during the pandemic.

#### **Conflict of interest**

None declared.

#### **Funding**

This study has been funded by the Health Foundation: 2202174

## References:

1. Maringe C, Spicer J, Morris M, et al. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer deaths due to delays in diagnosis in England, UK: a national, population-based, modelling study. *Lancet Oncol.* 2020;21(8):1023-34.
2. Gheorghe A, Maringe C, Spicer J, et al. Economic impact of avoidable cancer deaths caused by diagnostic delay during the COVID-19 pandemic: A national population-based modelling study in England, UK. *Eur J Cancer.* 2021.
3. Jones D, Neal RD, Duffy SRG, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the symptomatic diagnosis of cancer: the view from primary care. *Lancet Oncol.* 2020;21(6):748-50.
4. Macmillan. The Forgotten 'C'? The impact of Covid-19 on cancer care. 2020.
5. Arnold M, Rutherford MJ, Bardot A, et al. Progress in cancer survival, mortality, and incidence in seven high-income countries 1995–2014 (ICBP SURVMARK-2): a population-based study. *Lancet Oncol.* 2019;20(11):1493-505.
6. Araghi M, Arnold M, Rutherford MJ, et al. Colon and rectal cancer survival in seven high-income countries 2010–2014: variation by age and stage at diagnosis (the ICBP SURVMARK-2 project). *Gut.* 2021;70(1):114.
7. Office for National Statistics. Cancer survival by stage at diagnosis for England (experimental statistics): Adults diagnosed 2012, 2013 and 2014 and followed up to 2015 2016 [Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/cancersurvivalbystageatdiagnosisforenglandexperimentalstatistics/adultsdiagnosed20122013and2014andfollowedupto20152016> 2016; Last Accessed November 1, 2021.
8. Balzora S, Issaka RB, Anyane-Yeboah A, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on colorectal cancer disparities and the way forward. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy.* 2020;92(4):946-50.
9. Musselwhite LW, May FP, Salem ME, Mitchell EP. Colorectal Cancer: In the Pursuit of Health Equity. *Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book.* 2021(41):108-17.
10. Askari A, Nachiappan S, Currie A, et al. The relationship between ethnicity, social deprivation and late presentation of colorectal cancer. *Cancer Epidemiol.* 2017;47:88-93.
11. Lejeune C, Sassi F, Ellis L, et al. Socio-economic disparities in access to treatment and their impact on colorectal cancer survival. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2010;39(3):710-7.
12. Hayes L, Adams J, McCallum I, et al. Age-related and socioeconomic inequalities in timeliness of referral and start of treatment in colorectal cancer: a population-based analysis. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2021;75(1):1.
13. Fowler H, Belot A, Njagi EN, et al. Persistent inequalities in 90-day colon cancer mortality: an English cohort study. *Br J Cancer.* 2017;117(9):1396-404.
14. McPhail S, Johnson S, Greenberg D, et al. Stage at diagnosis and early mortality from cancer in England. *Br J Cancer.* 2015;112(1):S108-S15.
15. Petrova D, Pollán M, Rodriguez-Barranco M, et al. Anticipated help-seeking for cancer symptoms before and after the coronavirus pandemic: results from the Onco-barometer population survey in Spain. *Br J Cancer.* 2021;124(12):2017-25.
16. Quinn-Scoggins H, Cannings-John R, Moriarty Y, et al. The Impact of COVID-19 on Cancer Symptom Experience and Help-Seeking Behaviour in the United Kingdom: A Cross-Sectional Population Survey. revisions submitted to *BMJ Open.* 2021.
17. Morris EJA, Goldacre R, Spata E, 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.

18. Boyle JM, Kuryba A, Blake HA, et al. The impact of the first peak of the COVID-19 pandemic on colorectal cancer services in England and Wales: A national survey. *Colorectal Dis.* 2021;23(7):1733-44.
19. Public Health Scotland. Cancer Staging Data using 2018-2020 DCE Data – the impact of COVID-19. 2021.
20. Wanat M, Hoste M, Gobat N, et al. Transformation of primary care during the COVID-19 pandemic: experiences of healthcare professionals in eight European countries. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2021;BJGP.2020.1112.
21. Murphy M, Scott LJ, Salisbury C, et al. Implementation of remote consulting in UK primary care following the COVID-19 pandemic: a mixed-methods longitudinal study. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2021;71(704):e166-e77.
22. Mroz G, Papoutsis C, Rushforth A, Greenhalgh T. Changing media depictions of remote consulting in COVID-19: analysis of UK newspapers. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2021;71(702):e1-e9.
23. Archer S, Calanzani N, Honey S, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer assessment in primary care: a qualitative study of GP views. *BJGP Open.* 2021;BJGPO.2021.0056.
24. Mehmi A, Winters D, Newman T, Green J. Remote clinics: a panacea during the pandemic or a promoter of health inequality? *Br J Hosp Med.* 2020;81(10):1-3.
25. Dixon-Woods M, Cavers D, Agarwal S, et al. Conducting a critical interpretive synthesis of the literature on access to healthcare by vulnerable groups. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2006;6(1):35.
26. Cancer Research UK. Bowel Cancer Awareness Measure (CAM) 2011 [June 30, 2021]. Available from: [https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/sites/default/files/health\\_professional\\_bowel\\_cam\\_toolkit\\_version\\_2.1\\_09.02.11.pdf](https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/sites/default/files/health_professional_bowel_cam_toolkit_version_2.1_09.02.11.pdf) 2011; Last Accessed June 30 2021.
27. Bowel Cancer UK. Symptoms of bowel cancer 2019 [June 30, 2021]. Available from: <https://www.bowelcanceruk.org.uk/about-bowel-cancer/symptoms/> 2019; Last Accessed June 30, 2021.
28. Marcu A, Black G, Vedsted P, et al. Educational differences in responses to breast cancer symptoms: A qualitative comparative study. *Br J Health Psychol.* 2017;22(1):26-41.
29. NHS. Main symptoms of coronavirus (COVID-19) 2021 [Available from: <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/coronavirus-covid-19/symptoms/main-symptoms/#symptoms> 2021; Last Accessed October 01, 2021.
30. Birt L, Scott S, Cavers D, et al. Member Checking: A Tool to Enhance Trustworthiness or Merely a Nod to Validation? *Qual Health Res.* 2016;26(13):1802-11.
31. Cancer Research UK. Bowel cancer incidence statistics 2021 [Januray 26, 2022]. Available from: <https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/bowel-cancer/incidence#heading-One> 2021; Last Accessed Januray 26, 2022.
32. Vuik FER, Nieuwenburg SAV, Bardou M, et al. Increasing incidence of colorectal cancer in young adults in Europe over the last 25 years. *Gut.* 2019;68(10):1820.
33. Winstanley K, Renzi C, Smith CF, et al. The impact of body vigilance on help-seeking for cancer 'alarm' symptoms: a community-based survey. *BMC Public Health.* 2016;16(1):1172.
34. Robb K, Stubbings S, Ramirez A, et al. Public awareness of cancer in Britain: a population-based survey of adults. *Nature Precedings.* 2009.
35. Whitaker KL, Winstanley K, Macleod U, et al. Low cancer suspicion following experience of a cancer 'warning sign'. *Eur J Cancer.* 2015;51(16):2473-9.
36. Davies H, Marcu A, Vedsted P, Whitaker KL. Is lower symptom recognition associated with socioeconomic inequalities in help-seeking for potential breast cancer symptoms? *Psychooncology.* 2018;27(2):626-32.
37. Hvidberg L, Pedersen AF, Wulff CN, Vedsted P. Cancer awareness and socio-economic position: results from a population-based study in Denmark. *BMC Cancer.* 2014;14(1):581.

38. Macleod U, Mitchell ED, Burgess C, et al. Risk factors for delayed presentation and referral of symptomatic cancer: evidence for common cancers. *Br J Cancer*. 2009;101 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S92-s101.
39. Forbes LJJ, Warburton F, Richards MA, Ramirez AJ. Risk factors for delay in symptomatic presentation: a survey of cancer patients. *Br J Cancer*. 2014;111(3):581-8.
40. Wyke S, Hunt K, Walker J, Wilson P. Frequent attendance, socioeconomic status and burden of ill health. *Eur J Gen Pract*. 2003;9(2):48-55.
41. Greenhalgh S, Finucane LM, Mercer C, Selfe J. Safety netting; best practice in the face of uncertainty. *Musculoskelet Sci Pract*. 2020;48:102179.
42. Gray DM, II, Joseph JJ, Olayiwola JN. Strategies for Digital Care of Vulnerable Patients in a COVID-19 World—Keeping in Touch. *JAMA Health Forum*. 2020;1(6):e200734-e.
43. Neves AL, Lawrence-Jones A, Naar L, et al. Multidisciplinary teams must work together to co-develop inclusive digital primary care for older people. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2020;70(701):582.
44. Velasquez D, A M. Ensuring The Growth Of Telehealth During COVID-19 Does Not Exacerbate Disparities In Care. *Health Affairs Blog*. 2020.
45. Duncan L, Cheng K. Public perception of NHS general practice during the first six months of the COVID-19 pandemic in England [version 1; peer review: 1 approved]. *F1000Research*. 2021;10(279).
46. Helsper CW, Campbell C, Emery J, et al. Cancer has not gone away: A primary care perspective to support a balanced approach for timely cancer diagnosis during COVID-19. *Eur J Cancer Care (Engl)*. 2020;29(5):e13290.
47. van Weert H. After the first wave: What effects did the COVID-19 measures have on regular care and how can general practitioners respond to this? *Eur J Gen Pract*. 2020;26(1):126-8.
48. Chang JE, Lai AY, Gupta A, et al. Rapid Transition to Telehealth and the Digital Divide: Implications for Primary Care Access and Equity in a Post-COVID Era. *Milbank Q*. 2021;99(2):340-68.
49. Maxwell E. Unpacking post-covid symptoms. *BMJ*. 2021;373:n1173.
50. Maeda Y, Gray E, Figueroa JD, et al. Risk of missing colorectal cancer with a COVID-adapted diagnostic pathway using quantitative faecal immunochemical testing. *BJS Open*. 2021;5(4).
51. Souza N, Georgiou Delisle T, Chen M, et al. Faecal immunochemical test is superior to symptoms in predicting pathology in patients with suspected colorectal cancer symptoms referred on a 2WW pathway: a diagnostic accuracy study. *Gut*. 2021;70(6):1130.

Table 1 Summary of differences in responses to possible colorectal cancer symptoms during COVID-19 according to the Candidacy framework (25)

Theme (in bold) and subtheme	Lower SES	Higher SES
<b>How people decided to seek medical help through appraisal of symptoms</b>		
Distinguishing between colorectal and COVID-19 symptoms	Uncertainty attributing colorectal symptoms to COVID-19	Were certain differentiating NHS cited COVID-19 symptoms with colorectal symptoms
Relationship between body vigilance and lifestyle modifications	Less body vigilant	Heightened body vigilance and ability to connect symptoms to underlying problems
<b>How people navigated services</b>		
Accessing healthcare in the face of a pandemic	Less assertive/ confident in accessing primary care compared with others	Described reasons why they were eligible to access primary care
Understanding the process and perceptions of safety measures when accessing primary care	Uncertainty about process and hesitation attending primary care	Realistic expectations of accessing primary care and less safety concerns attending primary care
<b>Impact of COVID-19 on how patients interacted with healthcare professionals</b>		
Views about utility of remote technology	Reservations about using remote technology	Positive attitudes towards adoption of remote technology
Knowing how and when to seek further help	Reported less active care planning and safety-netting	Reported knowing about care planning and safety-netting strategies used



#### Box 1. Recommendations for practice

- Provide accurate and up-to-date information about symptoms of COVID-19 in healthcare settings and on relevant websites.
- Build on campaigns designed to promote symptom awareness and importance of earlier cancer diagnosis, to specifically target socio-demographic groups less likely to recognise symptoms of colorectal cancer or less likely to be vigilant about changes in their bodies.
- Provide better signposting to services and pathways to access these by utilising known effective ways to communicate new bookings and consulting methods with patients as well as keeping GP surgery websites and their phone/text communication up to date.
- Ensure infection control measures for covid (and wider) are overt and embedded into NHS services.
- Provide people with active safety-netting including a timeframe for follow-up or symptoms to look out for and ensure that follow-up options (e.g., patient activated call, GP app access) are offered to all patients and provided with help to use it, or alternative options if needed.
- Support and build on training for primary care to address health inequalities particularly around access and digital exclusion.