

# COVID-19 and cancer in the UK: which will prove to be the lesser of two evils?

Ajay Aggarwal <sup>1</sup>, Katie Spencer,<sup>2</sup> Richard Sullivan<sup>3</sup>

**To cite:** Aggarwal A, Spencer K, Sullivan R. COVID-19 and cancer in the UK: which will prove to be the lesser of two evils? *BMJ Oncology* 2023;2:e000012. doi:10.1136/bmjonc-2022-000012

We write this editorial some 2.5 years after the first national COVID-19 lockdown was announced in the UK on 17 March 2020. We reflect on the reality of how the pandemic and the national response to the pandemic affected a cancer care system that was already under severe strain.<sup>1</sup> In their recent report on National Health Service (NHS) Cancer Services in April 2022,<sup>2</sup> the House of Commons Health and Social Care Select Committee acknowledged gravely that the COVID-19 pandemic had a significant negative impact on cancer care, which is likely to result in a substantial loss of life-years.<sup>3 4</sup>

At the time of writing over 28 000 patients have been waiting more than 62 days on a suspected cancer pathway compared with 14 000 on average pre pandemic.<sup>5</sup> All this means worsening survival outcomes as patients present with more advanced disease and are more deconditioned at presentation.<sup>6 7</sup> The cost of this to the healthcare system is also expected to be huge; patients presenting with later stage cancer are far more costly to manage than those with stages I and II disease.<sup>8</sup>

The NHS has not managed to fully recover to pre-pandemic levels of NHS activity and worryingly there is no evidence that the ‘missing cancer patients’ (the shortfall in cancer diagnoses during the pandemic based on annual incidence rates) will ever come forward. For example, nearly 14 000 men with prostate cancer remain unaccounted for.<sup>9</sup> Conversely, the use of private sector care is increasing as the more affluent exit the public system to receive quicker access, particularly diagnostics, further widening existing inequalities.<sup>10–12</sup>

## HOW DID THIS CRISIS IN THE UK UNFOLD?

At the start of the first lockdown the public health messaging was clear. Stay at home, save lives, protect the NHS. Cancer screening was suspended, routine referrals for diagnostic investigation deferred or cancelled and

large declines in the 2-week wait (ww) urgent referrals for diagnostic workup of suspected cancers were almost immediately evident.<sup>13</sup> For example, in England, between March and November 2020, there were 18 000 fewer referrals for suspected lung cancer (down to 35% of prelockdown referrals).<sup>7 14</sup> Fewer diagnostic investigations were also seen across all types of cancer.<sup>7 9 15 16</sup>

The impact of such profound changes to patterns of patient presentation as well as delays in the diagnostic and treatment pathway, was considered in four major modelling studies published within 3 months of the first lockdown.<sup>4 17–19</sup> It was estimated that 60 000 years of life would be lost for only four cancers assuming disruption of diagnostic services for 3 months with no further pandemic waves and complete recovery of diagnostic services.<sup>4</sup> These figures are conservative as the complete recovery of diagnostic and treatment services has not materialised, they do not consider the effect of any treatment delay, nor specifically the impact of delay in stage IV disease, which resulted in some patients not receiving any treatment. However, there is an urgent need to deliver these analyses based on observed data in order to be in a position to understand exactly how different the situation is from that predicted, and to also learn from the pandemic experience.

Once diagnosed, treatment delays became a major concern as surgical activity nearly ground to a halt in many centres for the first few weeks,<sup>20</sup> despite attempts to establish COVID-19-free or ‘cold’ sites.<sup>21 22</sup> Part of the reluctance to perform surgery was based on data suggesting that rates of peri-operative mortality were significantly higher<sup>23</sup>—claims that were disproven when considering elective care.<sup>20</sup> In addition, there were concerns that patients with cancer in general were likely to be more vulnerable. However, the initial evidence was flawed with limited evaluation of other case mix criteria.<sup>24 25</sup>



© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2023. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Health Services Research and Policy, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Health Sciences, University of Leeds Faculty of Medicine and Health, Leeds, UK

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Cancer Policy, King's College London Faculty of Life Sciences and Medicine, London, UK

### Correspondence to

Dr Ajay Aggarwal;  
ajay.aggarwal@lshtm.ac.uk

In the early stages of the pandemic, national guidance was also being released by professional bodies in an attempt to support safe delay of some cancer surgeries including colorectal and oesophageal cancer for up to 12 weeks.<sup>26</sup> In response to this, Hanna *et al*<sup>8</sup> rapidly published a systematic review and meta-analysis in September 2020, which showed there was no evidence for assuming that there was any 'safe' period of delay for cancer care. They found that across all three major treatment modalities that a treatment delay of 4 weeks is associated with an increase in the risk of death. For example for breast surgery there is a 6%–8% increase in death for every 4-week delay and a 12-week delay would increase the risk by 26%. While the included studies are likely to be at risk of unobserved confounding, these findings do question who was responsible for rapid appraisal and evidence reviews during the pandemic that were necessary to support and implement best practice.

Conversely the radiotherapy community aided by randomised control trial evidence were able to adopt guidelines supporting shorter and equally effective radiotherapy regimens.<sup>27</sup> This made a significant difference to preserving capacity and minimising hospital attendances for breast cancer and a range of other tumour types.<sup>28</sup> Radiotherapy was also used as a substitute for bladder and oesophageal cancer surgery.<sup>29</sup> The omission of systemic agents with some radiation regimens, instituted to improve safety is, however, expected to diminish their efficacy.<sup>30</sup>

With respect to systemic therapy, strategies tended to be built around the precautionary principle, with first-line treatment in metastatic disease and curative/adjuvant treatments taking priority.<sup>31</sup> Interim guidance and funding also supported utilisation of regimens associated with lower toxicity and reduced frequency of administration, although it is not clear for some regimens whether there is likely to be a reduction in treatment efficacy overall.<sup>32</sup> Broadly though the NHS was able to maintain systemic therapy services<sup>33</sup> during this period with no evidence for increased mortality for those undergoing chemotherapy or immunotherapy infected with COVID-19.<sup>34</sup>

By December 2020, NHS England had set out their recovery plan for cancer services, which prioritised the NHS long-term plan commitments such as the use of rapid diagnostic centres, targeted lung health checks and bowel screening.<sup>35</sup> Engagement work with charities sought to encourage patients to come forward and specific guidance was provided to NHS Trusts to ensure patients with particularly long waits were tracked particularly those from low socioeconomic groups. The increased use of faecal immunochemical testing for colorectal screening was strongly supported.

The NHS in the early stages of the pandemic ring-fenced private sector capacity including staff and theatre space to be used for the most urgent NHS cases. However, utilisation of private sector capacity was inefficient,<sup>36</sup> with a 43% reduction in NHS activity within the private sector compared with the year before, despite the government

contributing up to 100% of the operating costs as part of the partnership. The deal ended in August 2020; the point at which this additional capacity could have been used to start to address the backlog.

After August 2020, negotiations with the private sector for use of their capacity was expected to be undertaken at a regional level but was inequitably implemented. For example in London, patients had NHS cancer pathway operations cancelled yet the same NHS surgeons were able to operate in the private sector for those who could afford to pay.<sup>37</sup> The two tier system the NHS has fought so hard to avoid, developed at pace during the pandemic and continues even during the present recovery period as the backlogs lengthen.

As predicted earlier on in the pandemic, excess deaths from non communicable disease are on the rise. Since April 2022, there have been 22 500 more deaths than expected, the majority unrelated to COVID-19.<sup>38 39</sup> We must reflect whether we could have done anything different and whether cancer services—the single largest cause of death in the UK<sup>40</sup>—were adequately prioritised?

At the start of the pandemic, the focus was on managing and prioritising patients under conditions of great uncertainty, which meant deployment of services towards acute care. However, there was a failure to provide public health messaging that conveyed accurately the magnitude of risks of severe illness from SARS-CoV-2 infection compared with the risks of not seeking healthcare-advice if symptomatic from cancer or other conditions. In addition, clinicians needed information to support and manage the risks of undertaking diagnostic and surgical procedures during the pandemic and which patients were at higher risks of COVID-19-related death or indeed which procedures conferred greater risks to themselves. Any undue risk aversion could result in considerable delays for patients and it was not until December 2020 when the first models were available.<sup>41</sup>

In July 2020, the UK Office for National Statistics (ONS) published their estimates of the indirect impacts of the pandemic on other health conditions.<sup>42</sup> They estimated that the indirect effects of the pandemic and non-pharmaceutical interventions, during the first 6 months, would result in the loss of 1400 lives and 3500 quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs) across eighteen cancers over 5 years. The ONS figures were a woeful underestimate and likely to have been used to justify prioritisation of resources (including staff) and the framing of public health messaging. Of concern is that the methods used, particularly the conceptual framework lacks the requisite detail to enable robust review. Furthermore, the relationship between excess deaths and years of life lost do not align with other studies<sup>4</sup> with the ONS analysis weighting years of life lost per COVID-19 death considerably higher than for cancer, the basis for which is uncertain. For example, a study by Gheorghe *et al*<sup>43</sup> conservatively estimated the loss of QALYs to be 10-fold higher at 33 000 QALYs over 5 years, when considering the impact of

diagnostic delay alone in the first twelve months of the pandemic for just four cancers.

### COULD THINGS HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY AND LOOKING TO THE FUTURE?

The pervading rhetoric is that hospitals and the NHS had no choice and that cancer care could not have got back on track without managing COVID-19 first. This, however, ignores, despite available evidence, the need for mitigation strategies specific to non-communicable life-threatening diseases such as cancer that are sensitive to system level and behavioural changes. Better public health messaging that encouraged patients with red flag symptoms to come forward were necessary even early on during the pandemic. Beyond this, research is needed to recognise and better understand clinical uncertainties through rapid evidence appraisal (eg, to determine the risk to patients and clinicians from diagnostic and treatment procedures, balanced against the risks of a novel infectious disease) as well as inform behavioural interventions. This is needed both to inform individual clinical decisions but crucially, also to feed into public health messaging and wider system level decision making.

Clearly a good part of the problem is that the NHS had chronic staff and bed shortages even before the pandemic. Consequently, the service was always running 'hot' and needed to prioritise acute emergency cases, redeploying staff to achieve this, but at the cost of providing life-saving care for other diseases. Going forward, greater investment is clearly necessary to ensure resilience in the health system over the next few years, given clear evidence of the impact of previous economic downturns on rising mortality rates from diseases such as cancer.<sup>44</sup> This is not just for diagnostic and treatment services but palliative care services as well which were stretched during the pandemic and needs greater investment.<sup>45</sup> In addition, centralised control of NHS and private sector capacity is necessary to ensure cancer diagnostics and treatments can continue without delays and avoid the inequalities in management that have been observed nationally.

At present the NHS is prioritising 2ww suspected cancer referral pathways, despite approximately 40% of patients with cancer being picked up through routine referral pathways where other pathology is suspected.<sup>46 47</sup> Patients diagnosed through routine referral pathways have a better prognosis than those diagnosed via 2ww referral pathways which account for 30% of all cancer patients diagnosed. Within finite diagnostic capacity a focus on delivery of the 2ww pathway may deprive those referred routinely of timely diagnosis. As such, we risk failure to reverse the expected increase in later stage presentations.

During the pandemic, there was evidence of substitution of surgery for radiotherapy, particularly for bladder and oesophageal cancer due to limited availability of surgical services in some centres but the impact on outcomes remain unclear.<sup>29</sup> We would recommend that resources are provided for trials or observational research

to compare the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of these treatment options to inform future decision making for patients and clinicians.

The steepest fall off in referrals for suspected cancers occurred in the most deprived areas<sup>13</sup> and ongoing analyses must, therefore, be used to inform decision-makers at all levels to guard against inequalities. The recent Health and Social Care Committee report acknowledged the profound impact of the pandemic on cancer outcomes but concluded more innovation is required. We would argue that instead what is required is a greater focus on health system strengthening—governance, financing, workforce, performance and effective implementation of evidence-based therapies<sup>16 48 49</sup>

One of the immediate challenges is to ascertain where the additional capacity is going to come from to manage the backlog and who coordinates this. There is variation in waiting lists regionally, suggesting that better mapping of supply to demand is required. Rather than bridging this gap by encouraging greater patient choice using the 'My planned Care' App, which is due to be rolled out in December, specialist multidisciplinary teams could support what treatments patients should receive but also coordinate where this is delivered on the basis of need and available capacity regionally.<sup>50</sup>

**Twitter** Ajay Aggarwal @AggarwalOnc

**Contributors** AA and RS devised the idea for this article. All authors contributed to developing the first draft and writing of subsequent versions. AA is the guarantor.

**Funding** AA is supported by a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Advanced Fellowship (NIHR300599).

**Disclaimer** The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care.

**Competing interests** None declared.

**Patient and public involvement** Patients and/or the public were involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research. Refer to the Methods section for further details.

**Patient consent for publication** Not applicable.

**Provenance and peer review** Commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

**Data availability statement** No data are available.

**Open access** This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

#### ORCID iD

Ajay Aggarwal <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9645-6659>

#### REFERENCES

- 1 Nuffield Trust. Cancer waiting times. 2022. Available: <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/resource/cancerwaiting-time-targets> [Accessed Sep 2022].
- 2 Health and Social Care Committee. Cancer services: house of commons. 12th report of session 2021-22. 2022. Available: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm5802/cmselect/cmhealth/551/report.html> [Accessed Sep 2022].
- 3 Hanna TP, King WD, Thibodeau S, et al. Mortality due to cancer treatment delay: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2020;371:m4087.



- 4 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;21:1023–34.
- 5 NHS England. Backlog of patients waiting longer than 62 days from urgent GP referral for suspected cancer. 2022. Available: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/cancer-waiting-times/management-information-on-cancer/> [Accessed Sep 2022].
- 6 Purushotham A, Roberts G, Haire K, *et al*. The impact of national non-pharmaceutical interventions ('lockdowns') on the presentation of cancer patients. *Ecancermedicalscience* 2021;15:1180.
- 7 Royal College of Physicians. *National lung cancer audit annual report (for the audit period 2019 England, Wales and Guernsey and 2020 England only)*. Physicians LRCo, 2022.
- 8 Sun L, Legood R, Dos-Santos-Silva I, *et al*. Global treatment costs of breast cancer by stage: a systematic review. *PLoS One* 2018;13:e0207993.
- 9 Nossiter J, Morris M, Parry MG, *et al*. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the diagnosis and treatment of men with prostate cancer. *BJU Int* 2022;130:262–70.
- 10 Iacobucci G. Pandemic has accelerated demand for private healthcare, report finds. *BMJ* 2022;376:o566.
- 11 Exarchakou A, Rached B, Belot A, *et al*. Impact of national cancer policies on cancer survival trends and socioeconomic inequalities in England, 1996–2013: population based study. *BMJ* 2018;360:k764.
- 12 Spencer A, Watermeyer B, Rogers A. The importance of tackling the social determinants of health to address the unmet need within cancer services. reflections from build back fairer: the COVID-19 marmot review. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)* 2022;34:145–7.
- 13 Watt T, Sullivan R, Aggarwal A. Primary care and cancer: an analysis of the impact and inequalities of the COVID-19 pandemic on patient pathways. *BMJ Open* 2022;12:e059374.
- 14 Greenwood E, Swanton C. Consequences of COVID-19 for cancer care—a CRUK perspective. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol* 2021;18:3–4.
- 15 Rutter MD, Brookes M, Lee TJ, *et al*. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on UK endoscopic activity and cancer detection: a national endoscopy database analysis. *Gut* 2021;70:537–43.
- 16 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;6:199–208.
- 17 Sud A, Torr B, Jones ME, *et al*. Effect of delays in the 2-week-wait cancer referral pathway during the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer survival in the UK: a modelling study. *Lancet Oncol* 2020;21:1035–44.
- 18 Sud A, Jones ME, Broggio J, *et al*. Collateral damage: the impact on outcomes from cancer surgery of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Ann Oncol* 2020;31:1065–74.
- 19 Lai AG, Pasea L, Banerjee A, *et al*. Estimated impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer services and excess 1-year mortality in people with cancer and multimorbidity: near real-time data on cancer care, cancer deaths and a population-based cohort study. *BMJ Open* 2020;10:e043828.
- 20 Kuryba A, Boyle JM, Blake HA, *et al*. Surgical treatment and outcomes of colorectal cancer patients during the COVID-19 pandemic: a national population-based study in England. *Ann Surg Open* 2021;2:e071.
- 21 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;23:1733–44.
- 22 Glasbey JC, Nepogodiev D, Simoes JFF, *et al*. Elective cancer surgery in COVID-19-free surgical pathways during the SARS-cov-2 pandemic: an international, multicenter, comparative cohort study. *J Clin Oncol* 2021;39:66–78.
- 23 Lei S, Jiang F, Su W, *et al*. Clinical characteristics and outcomes of patients undergoing surgeries during the incubation period of COVID-19 infection. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020;21:100331.
- 24 Freeman V, Hughes S, Carle C, *et al*. Are patients with cancer at higher risk of COVID-19-related death? A systematic review and critical appraisal of the early evidence. *J Cancer Policy* 2022;33:100340.
- 25 Carle C, Hughes S, Freeman V, *et al*. The risk of contracting SARS-cov-2 or developing COVID-19 for people with cancer: a systematic review of the early evidence. *J Cancer Policy* 2022;33:100338.
- 26 NHS England. Clinical guide for the management of essential cancer surgery for adults during the coronavirus pandemic. 2020. Available: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/wp-content/uploads/sites/52/2020/04/C0239-Specialty-guide-Essential-Cancer-surgery-and-coronavirus-v1-70420.pdf> [Accessed Sep 2022].
- 27 Murray Brunt A, Haviland JS, Wheatley DA, *et al*. Hypofractionated breast radiotherapy for 1 week versus 3 weeks (FAST-forward): 5-year efficacy and late normal tissue effects results from a multicentre, non-inferiority, randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2020;395:1613–26.
- 28 Royal College of Radiologists. Coronavirus (COVID-19): cancer treatment documents. 2020. Available: <https://www.rcr.ac.uk/college/coronavirus-covid-19-what-rcr-doing/clinical-information/coronavirus-covid-19-cancer> [Accessed Sep 2022].
- 29 Spencer K, Jones CM, Girdler R, *et al*. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on radiotherapy services in England, UK: a population-based study. *Lancet Oncol* 2021;22:309–20.
- 30 Aupérin A, Le Péchoux C, Rolland E, *et al*. Meta-Analysis of concomitant versus sequential radiochemotherapy in locally advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2010;28:2181–90.
- 31 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. COVID-19 rapid guidelines: delivery of systemic anticancer treatments. 2020. Available: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng161>
- 32 NHS England. NHS England interim cancer treatment options funded during the COVID-19 pandemic. 2020. Available: [https://www.theacp.org.uk/userfiles/file/resources/covid\\_19\\_resources/nhs-england-interim-treatment-options-during-the-covid19-pandemic-pdf-8715724381-6-jan-2021.pdf](https://www.theacp.org.uk/userfiles/file/resources/covid_19_resources/nhs-england-interim-treatment-options-during-the-covid19-pandemic-pdf-8715724381-6-jan-2021.pdf) [Accessed Sep 2022].
- 33 Clark JJ, Dwyer D, Pinwill N, *et al*. The effect of clinical decision making for initiation of systemic anticancer treatments in response to the COVID-19 pandemic in England: a retrospective analysis. *Lancet Oncol* 2021;22:66–73.
- 34 Várnai C, Palles C, Arnold R, *et al*. Mortality among adults with cancer undergoing chemotherapy or immunotherapy and infected with COVID-19. *JAMA Netw Open* 2022;5:e220130.
- 35 NHS England. COVID-19 cancer services recovery plan 14 December 2020. 2020. Available: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/publication/cancer-services-recovery-plan/> [Accessed Sep 2022].
- 36 Limb M. Covid-19: private hospitals “fell well short” in delivering care during the pandemic, says report. *BMJ* 2021;375:n2471.
- 37 Dunhill L. *Medical leaders seek to ‘shame’ private hospitals and their staff into supporting NHS*. HSJ, 2021.
- 38 Murugesu J. *There are thousands more UK death than usual and we don't know why*. new scientist. 2022.
- 39 COVID-19 Excess Mortality Collaborators. Estimating excess mortality due to the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic analysis of COVID-19-related mortality, 2020–21. *Lancet* 2022;399:1513–36.
- 40 Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. GBD compare. 2021. Available: <https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare/> [Accessed Sep 2022].
- 41 Cliff AK, Coupland CAC, Keogh RH, *et al*. Living risk prediction algorithm (QCOVID) for risk of hospital admission and mortality from coronavirus 19 in adults: national derivation and validation cohort study. *BMJ* 2020;371:m3731.
- 42 Office for National Statistics. *Direct and indirect impacts of COVID-19 on excess deaths and morbidity: executive summary*. Department of Health and Social Care, 2020.
- 43 Gheorghie A, Maringe C, Spice 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;152:233–42.
- 44 Maruthappu M, Watkins J, Noor AM, *et al*. Economic downturns, universal health coverage, and cancer mortality in high-income and middle-income countries, 1990–2010: a longitudinal analysis. *Lancet* 2016;388:684–95.
- 45 Chalk D, Robbins S, Kandasamy R, *et al*. Modelling palliative and end-of-life resource requirements during COVID-19: implications for quality care. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e043795.
- 46 Elliss-Brookes L, McPhail S, Ives A, *et al*. Routes to diagnosis for cancer-determining the patient journey using multiple routine data sets. *Br J Cancer* 2012;107:1220–6.
- 47 NHS Digital. Routes to diagnosis 2018. 2022. Available: <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/routes-to-diagnosis/2018> [Accessed 2 Jan 2023].
- 48 Aggarwal A, Lievens Y, Sullivan R, *et al*. What really matters for cancer care - health systems strengthening or technological innovation? *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)* 2022;34:430–5.
- 49 Morris M, Landon S, Reguilon I, *et al*. Understanding the link between health systems and cancer survival: a novel methodological approach using a system-level conceptual model. *Journal of Cancer Policy* 2020;25:100233.
- 50 Aggarwal A, Walter FM, Sullivan R, *et al*. “Shopping around” for treatment is not a solution to cancer backlog. *BMJ* 2022;379:e071967.