

A microsimulation study of the benefits and costs of screening for colorectal cancer

Christopher Eric Stevenson

**A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of
The Australian National University**

**September 2000
Amended April 2001**

Declaration

Except where it is otherwise indicated, the work in this thesis is my own, and is based on original research conducted at the National Centre for Epidemiology and Population health, The Australian National University.

Chris Stevenson

September 2000

This revised version of the thesis incorporates minor amendments as suggested by the examiners.

April 2001

Acknowledgments

I thank my panel of supervisors, Professor Susan Wilson, Dr Jim Butler, Dr Terry O'Neil and Dr Jane Matthews, for their guidance and valuable insights throughout the preparation of this thesis.

Academic staff and students at the National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health were always helpful and supportive, and I am grateful to the Centre for the opportunity to spend a year studying there full time. However, most of this degree was completed as a part time student and during this time I especially valued the daily support of my colleagues at the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare--particularly my fellow students Edouard d'Espaignet and Stan Bennett and the Institute's librarian Judith Abercromby. The Institute also provided valuable support and encouragement particularly in the provision of study leave without which this thesis would have been impossible.

Most importantly, I thank my wife Mandy for her constant support during all phases of my study and my son Lachlan for making the whole thing worthwhile.

Abstract

This thesis examines the benefits and costs of screening for colorectal cancer in the context of an organised population screening programme. It uses microsimulation modelling to derive an optimally cost-effective screening protocol for various combinations of the available screening tests.

First a mathematical model for the natural history of colorectal cancer is derived, based on analyses of Australian population and hospital-based cancer registries combined with data from published studies. Then a model for population based screening is derived based mainly on data from published screening studies, including the four major published randomised controlled trials of faecal occult blood test (FOBT) screening. These two models are used to simulate the application of a screening programme to the Australian population. The simulations are applied to a period of 40 years following 1990 (the study's base year), with both costs and benefits discounted back to the base year at an annual rate of 3%.

The models are applied to simulating a population screening programme based on FOBT with a colonoscopy follow up of positive tests. This simulation suggests that the optimal application of such a programme would be to offer annual screening to people aged 50 to 84 years. Such a programme would lead to a cumulative fall in years of life lost to colorectal cancer (YLL) of 28.5% at a cost per year of life saved (YLS) of \$8,987. These costs and benefits are consistent with those arising from other currently funded health interventions. They are also consistent with the cost per YLS which Australian governments appear willing to pay for health interventions when justified on the basis of cost-effectiveness. The fall in colorectal cancer deaths from this screening programme should be first detectable by a national monitoring system after around three years of screening. However the full benefits from screening would not be realised before around 30 years of screening.

These simulations are based on the standard guaiac FOBT, but the results suggest that significant cost-effective gains could be made by using the newer immunochemical FOBT. Further cost-effect gains could be made by offering sigmoidoscopy every five years in addition to annual FOBT.

The models are then applied to simulating population screening programmes using colonoscopy and sigmoidoscopy as primary screening tools. Offering colonoscopy every ten years to all people aged from 45 to 85 leads to an overall fall in cumulative YLL of 37.6%, at a cost of \$15,585 per YLS. Offering sigmoidoscopy every three years to all people aged 40 to 85 leads to an overall fall in cumulative YLL of 29.1%, at a cost of \$4,862 per YLS. Both of these cost and benefit results are also consistent with the cost per YLS which Australian governments appear willing to pay. The fall in deaths with colonoscopy screening would also be detectable after three years of screening but the fall with sigmoidoscopy screening would not be detectable until after six years of screening. Sigmoidoscopy would need around 35 years of

screening to reach its potential gains while colonoscopy screening would not reach its full potential during the 40 year screening period.

Finally the models are applied to targeting people at higher risk of cancer. The results show that offering colonoscopy every five years to people at higher risk because of a family history of colorectal cancer is a cost-effective addition to the annual FOBT screening programme.

An earlier version of chapter two of this thesis has been published as

Stevenson CE 1995. Statistical models for cancer screening. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*; 4: 19–23.

An expanded version of chapter two, along with parts of chapter one, has been published as

Stevenson CE 1998. Models of screening. In: *Encyclopedia of Biostatistics*. Armitage P, Colton T, eds. John Wiley and Sons Ltd, pp 3999–4022.

Table of contents

Acknowledgments	i
Abstract	ii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Study aims	1
1.2 Background.....	2
1.2.1 What is screening?.....	3
1.2.2 Why screen for colorectal cancer?	4
1.3 Thesis structure and methods.....	5
1.3.1 Study outline	5
1.3.2 Study methods.....	6
1.3.3 The benefits of screening over time	8
1.3.4 Suitability of screening for government funding.....	9
1.3.5 The microsimulation computer model.....	9
1.4 Figure.....	11
2 Models for cancer screening.....	12
2.1 Introduction.....	12
2.2 Why use modelling?.....	12
2.3 Types of model.....	13
2.4 Markov framework for modelling	14
2.5 Analytic Models	15
2.6 Simulation models.....	20
2.7 Model fitting and validation	23
2.8 Current state and future directions.....	26
3 A model for the natural history of colorectal cancer	27
3.1 Natural history and epidemiology of colorectal cancer.....	27
3.1.1 Incidence and prevalence	27
3.1.2 Clinical features	27
3.1.3 Risk factors	28

3.1.4	Polyps.....	30
3.1.5	The adenoma-carcinoma sequence	31
3.2	Overview of the disease model.....	32
3.2.1	Model description	32
3.2.2	Modelling assumptions	34
3.2.3	Application of the model.....	35
3.3	Previous modelling studies.....	36
3.4	Data sources for model parameters	38
3.4.1	National Cancer Statistics Clearing House.....	38
3.4.2	South Australian Hospital registry data	38
3.4.3	General demographic data.....	40
3.4.4	Published data on polyp growth.....	41
3.5	Parameters for the invasive cancer model	42
3.5.1	Sojourn times and transition probabilities for each cancer stage	42
3.5.2	Survival times and cure rates	44
3.6	Parameters for the polyp-cancer sequence	49
3.6.1	Proportion of cancer originating as polyps	49
3.6.2	Initial size distribution.....	49
3.6.3	Size distribution at transition to invasive cancer	49
3.6.4	Polyp initiation and growth rates	50
3.7	Tables.....	55
3.8	Figures.....	71
4	A model for screening for colorectal cancer	78
4.1	Screening tests.....	78
4.1.1	Faecal Occult Blood Test (FOBT).....	78
4.1.2	Sigmoidoscopy.....	79
4.1.3	Colonoscopy.....	80
4.1.4	Barium Enema	81
4.1.5	Digital Rectal Examination	82
4.2	Overview of the screening model	82
4.2.1	Model description	82
4.2.2	Modelling assumptions	83

4.2.3	Application of the model.....	84
4.3	Parameters for the screening model	85
4.3.1	Test sensitivity and specificity.....	85
4.3.2	Screening participation rates	88
4.3.3	Costs of screening and treatment.....	92
4.4	Model validation and comparison with other studies	93
4.4.1	Model validation	93
4.4.2	Mortality falls due to screening.....	94
4.4.3	Costs of screening.....	96
4.5	Tables.....	98
4.6	Figure.....	105
5	Screening with FOBT	106
5.1	Introduction.....	106
5.2	Population based mass screening.....	106
5.2.1	Biennial screening	106
5.2.2	Annual screening.....	107
5.2.3	Comparison with other studies.....	108
5.3	The benefits of FOBT screening for screening participants	109
5.4	The benefits of FOBT screening over time	110
5.5	Suitability of FOBT screening for government funding.....	111
5.6	Other faecal occult blood tests	112
5.6.1	Rehydrated guaiac FOBT	112
5.6.2	Immunochemical FOBT.....	112
5.7	Combining FOBT and sigmoidoscopy	113
5.7.1	Costs and benefits of population screening.....	113
5.7.2	The benefits to screening participants.....	115
5.8	Sensitivity analyses	115
5.8.1	Disease model parameters	115
5.8.2	Screening model parameters	116
5.8.3	Screening costs and benefits	117
5.9	Tables.....	118
5.10	Figures.....	125

6	Screening with other modalities	130
6.1	Introduction.....	130
6.2	Screening with colonoscopy.....	131
6.2.1	Population based mass screening	131
6.2.2	The benefits of colonoscopy screening for screening participants....	133
6.2.3	The benefits of colonoscopy screening over time	133
6.3	Screening with sigmoidoscopy	134
6.3.1	Population based mass screening	134
6.3.2	The benefits of sigmoidoscopy screening for screening participants	136
6.3.3	The benefits of sigmoidoscopy screening over time	136
6.4	Sensitivity analyses	136
6.5	Tables.....	138
6.6	Figures.....	142
7	Targeting people at high risk of colorectal cancer	152
7.1	Introduction.....	152
7.2	Modelling parameters.....	154
7.3	Results	156
7.4	Sensitivity analyses	157
7.5	Tables.....	159
7.6	Figure.....	162
8	Conclusions	163
8.1	A population FOBT screening programme.....	163
8.1.1	Standard guaiac FOBT screening using unhydrated slides.....	163
8.1.2	Other FOBT screening programmes.....	164
8.2	Population screening programmes based on colonoscopy and sigmoidoscopy	165
8.3	Screening people at high risk of colorectal cancer	167
8.4	Conclusions and future directions	168
	References.....	171
	Appendix A: The computer program	185
	Appendix B. The pseudo-random number generator	201