

Table S1 – Included studies (n=39)

Paper	Country	Data Source (s)	N	Years of Diagnosis	Outcome - stage at diagnosis/Interval/ proxy measure	Comparison	Measure of SEP	N of SEP groups	Multivariable analysis?	Quality Score
Abel et al (2015)	England	National Cancer Data Repository	162543	2006-2010	emergency presentation	likelihood of emergency presentation in lower compared to high SEP	IMD 2010, income domain	5	Yes	2
Beckett et al* (2012)	England	LUCADA	100884	NR	acute presentation	likelihood of acute presentation in lower compared to high SEP	IMD	5	Yes	7
Beckett et al (2014)	England	LUCADA	133530	2006-2011	acute presentation	likelihood of acute presentation in higher compared to low SEP	IMD	5	Yes	7
Berglund et al (2010)	Sweden	RLCR- Sweden, Cause of Death Register and LISA (insurance and demographics)	3369	1996-2004	referral to diagnosis, stage at diagnosis	waiting time in highest and lowest SEP	SEI, household income, education level	3	No	2
Berglund et al (2012)	England	Thames Cancer Registry	15582	2006-2008	stage at diagnosis	odds of early stage disease in lower compared to high SEP	IMD 2007, income domain	5	Yes	8
Booth et al (2010)	Canada	Ontario Cancer Registry	12276	2003-2007	Stage at diagnosis	Proportion with stage I and stage IV, in lower compared to highest SEP	Community median household income	5	No	2
Brewster et al (2001)	Scotland	Scottish Cancer Registry and medical records	3855	1999	Stage at diagnosis	% with localised, regional and distant stage in affluent (1-2), middle (3-5) and deprived (6-7) patients	Carstairs Index	3	No	2
Campbell et al (2002)	Scotland	Scottish Cancer Registry and hospital case notes	653	1995-1996	first referral to first treatment	HR of quicker treatment in lower compared to highest SEP	Carstairs Index	5	Yes	6
Cheyne et al (2013)	England	Leeds Teaching Hospital NHS Trust e-health records	1432	2008-2010	stage at diagnosis	proportion in each stage, by SEP	IMD and ACORN tool	5	No	1
Dalton et al (2011)	Denmark	Danish Lung Cancer Registry	16713	2001-2008	referral to diagnosis, stage at diagnosis	likelihood of diagnosis >28 days after referral (or of later stage at diagnosis) in higher compared to low SEP	education or income	3	Yes	7

Deepak et al * (2012)	USA	SEER-linked Medicare	NR	2001-2005	stage at diagnosis	likelihood of late stage at diagnosis in low v high SEP patients	census tract level median household income	3	No	2
Forrest et al (2013)	England	NYCRIS cancer registry, HES and LUCADA	28733	2006-2010	Stage at diagnosis	likelihood of late stage diagnosis in lower compared to high SEP	income domain of IMD 2004 & 2007	5	No	2
Forrest et al (2014)	England	NYCRIS cancer registry, HES and LUCADA	28733	2006-2010	referral to FHA, referral to diagnosis, referral to treatment, FHA to diagnosis, diagnosis to treatment	likelihood of referral, diagnosis and treatment within target time for interval, in low compared to highest SEP	income domain of IMD 2004 & 2007	5	Yes	8
Ghorani et al*(2012)	England	LUCADA (1 East London hospital)	460	2005-2011	stage at diagnosis	likelihood of late stage diagnosis in lower compared to high SEP	Income domain of IMD 2010	5	No	2
Gong et al (2012)	USA	Texas Cancer Registry	NR	1997-2003	stage at diagnosis	stage at diagnosis by county WI	Wellbeing Index	NR	Yes	1
Haas et al (2008)	USA	SEER linked to Medicare	81508	1992-2002	stage at diagnosis	early stage diagnosis by SEP area, in black compared to white	Area-based measure of segregation and income	4	Yes	3
Halpern et al (2012)	USA	SEER-Medicare claims data	32899	2000-2002	diagnosis to first treatment	likelihood of being in top 5% of time from diagnosis to first treatment	median household income (ZIP code)	NR	No	1
Hui et al (2005)	Australia	NSW Cancer Registry	476	1996	stage at diagnosis	% with late (3B/4) stage at diagnosis	SEIFA IRSD (socio-economic index for areas 1996 index of relative socio-economic disadvantage)	5	No	2
Johnson et al (2014)	USA	Georgia Comprehensive Cancer Registry	57120	2000-2009	Stage at diagnosis	Likelihood of late stage at diagnosis	Composite measure of economic deprivation and educational attainment	4	Yes	2
Jones et al (2010)	England	NYCRIS Cancer Registry	36947	1994-2002	diagnosis at death	OR of diagnosis at death as deprivation increased	IMD (with access to services 'geographical barriers' sub domain removed)	1	Yes	6

Lyratzopoulos et al (2012)	England	Eastern Cancer Registry and Information Centre (ERCIC)	13286	2006-2009	stage at diagnosis	Likelihood of advanced stage at diagnosis in lower compared to high SEP	Income domain of IMD 2004	5	Yes	7
Lyratzopoulos et al (2013)	England	Eastern Cancer Registry and Information Centre (ERCIC)	16714	2006-2010	stage at diagnosis	Likelihood of advanced stage at diagnosis in lower compared to high SEP	income domain of IMD 2004	5	Yes	7
McPhail et al (2013)	England	Eastern Cancer Registry and Information Centre (ERCIC)	9601	2006-2008	emergency presentation	likelihood of emergency presentation in lower compared to high SEP	income domain of IMD 2007	5	Yes	7
Mor et al (1990)	USA	hospital records/database and patient interview	97	1984-1986	patient (symptom recognition to first presentation)	% of patients delaying for longer than 3 months in low and high SEP and by education	SEP (low and middle/high) and education (4 categories)	2	No	2
Neal et al (2005)	England	National Survey of NHS patients: Cancer	3260	2002?	total (symptom to diagnosis), pre-hospital(symptom to GP), referral (GP to FHA), secondary care (FHA to diagnosis)	mean delay (sd) in each SEP group	Registrar General classification: Prof, Man/Tech, skilled non-man, skilled man, part skilled, unskilled, armed forces, never worked	8	Yes	3
Niu et al (2010)	USA	New Jersey State Cancer Registry	64206	1986-1999	stage at diagnosis	% with local stage at diagnosis by sex, and within this by poverty level (for 2 time periods)	residence census tract poverty rate	4	No	2
Pagano et al (2010)	Italy	Piedmont Cancer Registry of Turin	2259	2000-2003	stage at diagnosis	N (%) of early or late stage at diagnosis, by education level	education level	3	No	2
Pollock&Vickers (1998)	England	HES FCEs	38668	1992-1995	Emergency admission	OR of emergency admission in lower compared to highest SEP	Townsend	10	Yes	4
Raine et al (2010)	England	HES FCEs	186741	1999-2006	emergency admission	OR of emergency admission in higher compared to lowest SEP	IMD	5	Yes	5
Saint-Jacques et al (2008)	Canada	Nova Scotia Cancer Registry database (Oncology Patient Information Centre)	108	2005	detection to surgery, detection to surgery consult, surgery to adjuvant	wait time in low and high education/income groups	Education and income	2	Yes	6

					chemo, detection to adjuvant chemo					
Schwartz et al (2003)	USA	Metropolitan Detroit Cancer Surveillance System (MDCSS) cancer registry (SEER)	12895	1988-1992	stage at diagnosis	likelihood of non-localised stage in higher compared to low SES	SEP (aggregate variable using occupation, poverty, education and age)	4	Yes	6
Shin et al (2013)	Korea	Korean Central Cancer registry (KCCR)	398	2003-2005	diagnosis to surgery	HR of delayed time to surgery in higher compared to low income, for early stage NSCLC patients	income status	3	Yes	7
Silverstein et al (2002)	USA	Savannah River Regional Health Information System (SRRHIS) cancer registry	3477	1991-1995	stage at diagnosis	likelihood of distant stage at diagnosis in lower compared to high SEP	per capita income and education	2	Yes	6
Slatore et al (2011)	USA	Vitamins and Lifestyle (VITAL) prospective cohort study and SEER data	612	2000-2007	stage at diagnosis	likelihood of advanced stage at diagnosis compared to early stage, by SEP	education and income	2	Yes	2
Smith et al (2009)	Scotland	3 Scottish hospitals	360	2004-2006	patient defined first symptom to first consult, earliest checklist symptom to first consult	number of times longer to consult GP in lower SEP compared to high	Carstairs Index (and education)	5	Yes	4
Starr et al (2013)	Denmark	Danish Lung Cancer Register linked to Integrated Database for Labour Market research and the Danish Hospital Discharge Register	5538	2001-2008	referral to diagnosis, stage at diagnosis	N and % with time between referral and diagnosis <= 28 days, and >28 days, in short, medium and high education	education	3	No	2
Stevens et al (2008)	New Zealand	regional hospital and oncology databases checked against NZ Cancer Registry data	565	2004	Stage at diagnosis	likelihood of having localised disease in high compared to low deprivation	NZ Deprivation Index 2001	5	Yes	7

Tweed et al* (2012)	Scotland	Scottish Cancer registry	1190	2009-2010	Stage at presentation	stage at presentation in lower compared to high SEP	DEPCAT index of deprivation	3	No	2
Yorio et al (2009)	USA	University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center	482	2000-2005	image to diagnosis, diagnosis to treatment, image to treatment, diagnosis to death	median time (IQR) in each income and education quartile	Income and education	4	Yes	6

\* Conference abstract only, not full paper

ACORN = A Classification of Residential Neighbourhoods, HES = Hospital Episode Statistics, HES FCEs = HES finished consultant episodes, HR = hazard ratio, IMD = Index of Multiple Deprivation, LUCADA = Lung cancer audit data, NHS = National Health Service, NR = not reported, NSW = New South Wales, NYCRIS = Northern and Yorkshire Cancer Registry and Information Service, NZ = New Zealand, OR = odds ratio, RLCR = Regional Lung Cancer Register, SD = standard deviation, SEER = Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results programme, SEI = Socioeconomic Index, SEP = socio-economic position, WI = Wellbeing Index