



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Keeping the Customer Satisfied #3 It's OK to ask - who are we asking? Variations by type of cancer further findings from the National Cancer Patient Experience Survey*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/90675/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Proceedings Paper:**

Stephens, R, Morris, C, West, R et al. (7 more authors) (2015) Keeping the Customer Satisfied #3 It's OK to ask - who are we asking? Variations by type of cancer further findings from the National Cancer Patient Experience Survey. In: European Journal of Cancer Care. National Cancer Intelligence Network Cancer Outcomes Conference 2015, 08-10 Jun 2015, Belfast. Wiley , 69 - 69.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/ecc.12330>

---

**Reuse**

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Accepted April 10th 2015

Published June 3<sup>rd</sup> 2015

European Journal of Cancer Care 2015 John Wiley & Sons Ltd Vol 24 (Suppl. 1); June 2015; 68 – 70

Keeping the Customer Satisfied #3 It's OK to ask – who are we asking? Variations by type of cancer further findings from the National Cancer Patient Experience Survey

Richard Stephens<sup>1</sup>, Carolyn Morris<sup>1</sup>, Robert West<sup>2</sup>, Matthew Baker<sup>1</sup>, Ekaterini Blaveri<sup>3</sup>, Rachal Brannen<sup>3</sup>, Sheila Fisher<sup>5</sup>, Jane Hanson<sup>4</sup>, Sue Pavitt<sup>2</sup>, Reg Race<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>NCRI Consumer Liaison Group

<sup>2</sup>Leeds Institute of Health Sciences, University of Leeds

<sup>3</sup>National Cancer Intelligence Network

<sup>4</sup>NIHR Local Clinical Research Network: Kent Surrey Sussex

<sup>5</sup>NIHR Clinical Research Network Cancer

<sup>6</sup>Quality Health

**Background:** The National Cancer Patient Experience Survey (NCPES) 2013 includes data on 68 737 patients from English NHS Trusts providing acute cancer services – a response rate of 64%. Patient responses are grouped, inter alia, by 14 types of cancer. NCPES 2013 asked about the patient experience of cancer research. We wanted to identify if opportunities to participate in research vary according to their type of cancer.

**Method:** One of the research questions was “Since your diagnosis has anyone discussed with you whether you would like to take part in cancer research?” The Chi-squared test was used to test for association between cancer site and reporting a discussion about research.

**Results:** All cancers: Don't know 5.3%, No 64.6%, Yes 30.1%. Results for 14 Tumour sites: YES Urological Cancers 15%, Skin 17%, Gynaecological 27%, Head & Neck 27%, Lung 30%, Colorectal & Lower GI 31% Other 31%, Sarcoma 32%, Prostate 33%, Upper GI 33% Haematological 34% Breast 35%, Brain & CNS Cancers 36%, variations significant at the  $P < 0.001$  level.

**Conclusion:** Patients' opportunities to participate in research vary according to their type of cancer. Skin and urological cancer patients are asked significantly less often than others. These findings prompt the question: how far do these variations reflect variations in the NIHR CRN Cancer portfolio or other types of research eg tissue banking? We have demonstrated elsewhere (abstract “Keeping the Customer Satisfied” #1) significant association between having a discussion and patients' rating of their care. So a further question arises: what more can be done to widen access to research to those groups with less access? Inequalities between cancer types are likely to attract interest from the new Local Clinical Research Networks, from Clinical Studies Groups, from Patient Groups & Cancer Charities, and from Commissioners and Cancer Peer Reviewers.