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**Background**

Disparities in Mammography Screening

- **Disparate rates**
  - Convergence of breast cancer incidence rates for white women and African American women; however, incidence of later stage cancer has increased among African American women, which may be attributed to
    - Less access to mammography
    - Lower quality of mammography services

- **Diagnosis at later stages**
  - As compared to non-Hispanic white women, African American women are more likely to receive late-stage breast cancer diagnosis
    - Leads to worse breast cancer outcomes and poorer survival
    - Mortality rate of Hispanic women is lower than that of non-Hispanic white women

- **Delay**
  - “Studies examining the time from symptoms to diagnosis and diagnosis to initial treatment among patients with breast cancer indicate that African American patients are more likely to experience diagnostic and treatment delays, which are [...] associated with worse survival outcomes” (Fedewa et al., 2010)

- **Decrease** the time between detection and diagnosis, as well as between diagnosis and treatment

Background

Continuum of Care & Timely Follow-Up

Quality Metrics:
- Cancer Detection Rate
- Proportion Minimal
- Proportion Early Stage
- Biopsy Recommendation Rate
- Cancer Among Abnormal Screens (PPV1)
- Cancer Among Biopsied (PPV3)
- Recall Rate
- Timely Follow-Up Imaging
- Follow-Up Imaging in 12mo
- Timely Receipt of Biopsy
- Biopsy Received in 12mo

(ACS, 2015) (Burnside et al., 2012)
Specific Aims & Hypotheses

- **Aim I**: Assess the trends in timeliness-related quality metrics
  - Hypothesis I: If timeliness-associated quality metrics are evaluated for trend, then both timely follow-up imaging and timely receipt of biopsy will improve between 2010, 2011, and 2013 among participating facilities.

- **Aim II**: Determine if safety net institutions met benchmarks for timeliness quality metrics
  - Hypothesis II: If a facility has a safety net designation then it will not meet the 12-month follow-up and biopsy benchmarks as compared to the non-safety net institutions.

- **Aim III**: Identify potential barriers to care
  - Hypothesis III: If a facility has a safety net designation then it will offer less services and contact its patients less than a non-safety net site.
**Methods**

Metropolitan Chicago Breast Cancer Task Force & Consortium

Derivation of Analytic Sample

Geographic Distribution of Participating Facilities

- 2006: 48 facilities
- 2009: 52 facilities
- 2010: 53 facilities
- 2011: 123 facilities
- 2012: No survey
- 2013: 151 facilities

39 facilities participating for 3 years of data collection

Inclusion of environmental scan data from 2011

n = 100 observations

(Metropolitan Chicago Breast Cancer Task Force & Consortium, 2016)
## Methods

### Study Design & Data Collection

- Serial cross-sectional study of facility performance
- Inclusion criteria
  - Surveys distributed in 2010, 2011, & 2013 to facilities
  - Participation in data submission over these 3 years
- Derivation of quality metrics
- Odds ratios as measure of association

### Statistical Analysis

- STATA 14
- Validation and missingness
- Shapiro-Wilk test for normality
- $X^2$ tests and ptrend
- Kruskal-Wallis test by ranks
- Percent & annual percent change
- Linear & logistic regression with bootstrapping

(StataCorp, 2015) (Metropolitan Chicago Breast Cancer Task Force & Consortium, 2014)
Outcomes of Interest
Facility Care Process Quality Metrics Associated with Timeliness

Methods

- **Timely follow-up imaging** = [Timely Imaging/Screened within 12mo]
  - Timely imaging defined as women screened within the 45-day (2010 and 2011) or 30-day (2013) period
  - Raised standards by lowering timeframe from 45 to 30 days
  - Benchmark ≥ 90%
- **Follow-up imaging** = [Imaged within 12mo/Abnormal Recall Screens]
- **Timely receipt of biopsy** = [Timely Biopsy/Biopsied within 12mo]
  - Timely biopsy defined as women biopsied within 60 days from abnormal diagnostic screen
  - Benchmark ≥ 90%
- **Receipt of biopsy** = [Biopsied within 12mo/Biopsy Recommended]
## Results

### Distribution of Screening Mammography, 2010, 2011, & 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Participated</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Screens</strong></td>
<td>173,539</td>
<td>261,474</td>
<td>222,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BI-RADS 0: Incomplete</strong></td>
<td>17,904</td>
<td>28,414</td>
<td>26,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BI-RADS 1: Negative</strong></td>
<td>68,216</td>
<td>90,964</td>
<td>79,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BI-RADS 2: Benign</strong></td>
<td>85,476</td>
<td>140,400</td>
<td>115,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BI-RADS 3: Probably Benign</strong></td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>1,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BI-RADS 4: Suspicious</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BI-RADS 5: Malignancy</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Specific Screening Classifications**...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening BI-RADS (0, 1, 2)</td>
<td>171,596</td>
<td>259,778</td>
<td>220,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misclassified BI-RADS (3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>1,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall (0, 4, 5)</td>
<td>18,146</td>
<td>28,790</td>
<td>26,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal Screens (0, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>19,416</td>
<td>30,092</td>
<td>28,173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Among 39 Facilities Participating in Screening & Environmental Scan Data Submission

n = 657,440 screens

Years

Frequency of Screens

Abnormal Recall Screens (0, 4, 5)  Total Screens

2010 (24 sites)  2011 (39 sites)  2013 (37 sites)

18,146  28,790  26,726

261,474

222,427
Aim I Results: Screening

Timely Follow-Up Imaging [Timely Imaging/Screened within 12mo]

Among 39 Facilities Participating in Screening & Environmental Scan Data Submission (n = 100), 2010, 2011, & 2013

Rate of Timely Follow-Up Imaging per Facility (%)

Years

2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014

PC = -10.34% APC = -5.40% [-16.73%, 7.49%]

adjusted $\beta_1 = -2.99$ [-6.77, 0.80]

After adjusting for total screens, no significant linear trend exists.

(Kleinbaum et al., 1988) (SEER, 2016)
Aim I Results: Biopsy

Timely Receipt of Biopsy [Timely Biopsy/Biopsied within 12mo]

Among 39 Facilities Participating in Screening & Environmental Scan Data Submission ($n = 100$), 2010, 2011, & 2013

Rate of Timely Receipt of Biopsy per Facility (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>79.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>73.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>70.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted $\beta_1 = -2.51$ [-6.32, 1.31]

After adjusting for screens resolved as BI-RADS 4 and 5, no significant linear trend exists.

PC = -6.38%  
APC = -4.00% [-6.69%, -1.23%]*

*p-value significant at 0.05

(Kleinbaum et al., 1988) (SEER, 2016)
Aims II & III: Safety Net Institutions & Barriers to Care

**Safety net providers** “by mandate or mission offer access to care regardless of a patient’s ability to pay and whose patient population includes a substantial share of uninsured, Medicaid, and other vulnerable patients.”

(IOM, 2000)

“**Barriers to care** include, but are not limited to:
- Lack of availability
- High cost
- Lack of adequate coverage”

(AHRQ, 2008)

**Healthy People 2020** explicates, “access to health services means the **timely** use of personal health services to achieve the best health outcomes.”

(IOM, 1993)

Chicago’s safety net hospitals.

**Aim II Results: Safety Net**

Follow-Up Imaging, Receipt of Biopsy, & Safety Net Facilities
Among 39 Facilities Participating Data Submission ($n = 100$), 2010, 2011, & 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Safety Net</th>
<th>Non-Safety Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>88.46</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>73.08</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safety net facilities have **76% lesser odds** of not meeting the timely follow-up imaging benchmark as compared to non-safety net sites, after adjusting for total screen volume ($adjOR = 0.24^* [0.063, 0.89], p = 0.033$).

Safety net facilities have **93.1% lesser odds** of not meeting the timely receipt of biopsy benchmark as compared to non-safety net sites, after adjusting for those recommended for biopsy ($adjOR = 0.069^* [0.017, 0.28], p = 0.000$).

*Significant at 0.05
Aim III Results: Barriers to Care

Assessed six responses from environmental scan survey data collected in 2011 and compared safety net vs. non-safety net facilities (n = 100)

- Questions included...
  1. Does the breast imaging site offer screening mammogram appointments after 5PM during the week?
  2. In addition to a letter, does the site also call the patient with abnormal findings (BI-RADS 0, 4, & 5) to discuss next steps?
  3. Does the site call patients to remind them of a scheduled diagnostic mammogram appointment?
  4. Does the site call patients who do not show up for their diagnostic mammogram?
  5. For patients with abnormal findings, does the site call to setup the next step appointment for them (ie. biopsy)?
  6. Does the site have a navigator to support breast cancer diagnostic patients?

- Evaluation of crude odds ratios...
  1. crOR 13.44* [4.44, 40.69], p = 0.000
  2. crOR 2.65 [0.92, 7.67], p = 0.072
  3. crOR 0.61 [0.18, 2.10], p = 0.433
  4. crOR 1.50 [0.57, 3.96], p = 0.409
  5. crOR 0.74 [0.21, 2.62], p = 0.646
  6. crOR 1.12 [0.32, 3.86], p = 0.859

*p-value significant at 0.05
**Limitations**

- Data quality
- Facility participation
  - Safety nets
  - Consistency
- Change in timeliness standard
- Non-linear relationships not assessed
- Cell frequency issues in estimating odds ratios

**Bias & Confounding**

- Bias
  - Misclassification
  - Information
- Confounding
  - Lack of covariates
  - Clustering effect
Conclusion & Future Directions

• **Examine** trends in timeliness associated metrics and **explore** how safety net facilities compare in meeting benchmarks
  - During 2009, 2010, and 2013, timely follow-up imaging and receipt of timely biopsy have slightly decreased, yet inconclusive
  - Safety net sites did not meet the follow-up imaging and biopsy benchmarks within the 12-month period as compared to non-safety nets
  - Safety net sites offer less late appointments as compared to their non-safety net counterparts, which elucidates a potential barrier to care

• **Conclusions**
  - Reduce delay and disparity along the breast cancer continuum of care
  - Create equal access to care

• **Future directions**
  - Improve data quality and facility participation
  - Identify factors perpetuating patient delay and system delay
  - Execute qualitative studies which could elucidate barriers
    - Focus groups
  - Actionable change
    - Accessible hours

(Mishra et al., 2012)
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