# Best Practices in Cancer Screening and Early Detection Across Cancer Types and Across Healthcare Systems

Jasmin Tiro, PhD Professor, Population & Data Sciences Associate Director, Community Outreach, Engagement, & Equity

October 6, 2021



### **Implications of Precision Cancer Screening on Diagnostic Evaluation**





Loomans-Kropp & Umar, npj Precision Oncology, 2019.

### **PROSPR Consortium's Screening Process Model highlights transition to surveillance...**



### **PROSPR Consortium data documents the challenges in assessing risk**



## **Challenge of Managing Abnormal Cervical Screening Results**

#### Vignette:

37 year old woman who had a colposcopy/biopsy confirmed LSIL in the past 3 years. Current co-test found NILM cytology and HPV 16/18 positive.

Provider recommended an immediate colposcopy. Patient did not show up for her appointment.

6 months later, still no follow-up. **Why?** 

### Vignette:

28 year old woman with a NILM/HPV positive co-test 3 years ago. Current screen found LSIL, HPV not done.

Provider recommended co-test in 1 year. Co-test was never scheduled.

Why?

### Differences in time-to-colposcopy after high-grade abnormal screen by PROSPR site (N=4,311) – Problem tracking referrals

#### Vignette:

37 year old woman who had a colposcopy/biopsy confirmed LSIL in the past 3 years. Current co-test found NILM cytology and HPV 16/18 positive.

Provider recommended an immediate colposcopy. Patient did not show up for her appointment.

6 months later, still no follow-up. **Why?** 



Time (Months)

High-Grade Abnormal includes HSIL, AGC, ASC-H, & suspicious for cancer (regardless of HPV test result)

#### **Representative quotes:**

Where they fall through is actually once the referral is made... it's the specialist's responsibility to reach out and schedule that appointment. And then if they're unable to do so, then the referral gets returned to the primary care's office after three attempts to close the loop and follow up... sometimes, there's a misunderstanding and they reach out and cancel the referral... they felt the referral actually was incorrect or wasn't needed... And so we may not catch that until a few months later." - UT PCP (Int 11)

"Let's say [patients] make an appointment and then cancel it... the ones who say, "I'm not coming and I don't want to reschedule," we don't have a track for that. They get eliminated from some list, and we don't have a [tracking] system. So we do lose follow-up that way."

- MGB Int Med 12



# Interview data: Patients do not understand reason for & importance of referral

### Vignette:

37 year old woman who had a colposcopy/biopsy confirmed LSIL in the past 3 years. Current co-test found NILM cytology and HPV 16/18 positive.

Provider recommended an immediate colposcopy. Patient did not show up for her appointment.

6 months later, still no follow-up. **Why?** 



Time (Months)

High-Grade Abnormal includes HSIL, AGC, ASC-H, & suspicious for cancer (regardless of HPV test result)

#### **Representative quotes:**

"Most of the time the patient doesn't understand why she's being referred. It is a gap of information from the PCP or the clinic to the patient. Sometimes we have patients calling us very upset, like why they have to have this appointment if they already had a Pap smear. [I tell them:] 'This is not just a [Pap]. This is GYN Oncology. And you're being referred because A, B, and C.' [And they say:] 'Oh, nobody told me that.'... a lot of patients skip appointments because they don't have that clinical information between one clinic to another." - MGB Int 20

"People have chaotic lives, a lot going on, poverty, insurance that changes constantly." - KP Int 17



## **Best Practice: Patient-Centered, Closed Loop Communication**

### Execution of diagnostic care steps:

- Screening result reporting
- Referral & scheduling
- Diagnostic Result reporting

Multiple communication exchanges are needed among 4 groups:

- Patient
- Performing provider/ team
- Specialty provider/ team
- Lab



Sender initiates a message

Using name if possible

Receiver acknowledges the message

 By paraphrasing (repeating the main part of the message)

Sender verifies the message

Cannot implement automated, health IT solutions when teams do not share clinical information systems and results are not in structured fields



# Differences in time-to-colposcopy by age

#### Vignette:

37 year old woman whohad a colposcopy/biopsyconfirmed LSIL in the past3 years. Current co-testfound NILM cytology andHPV 16/18 positive.

Provider recommended an immediate colposcopy. Patient did not show up for her appointment.

6 months later, still no follow-up. **Why?** 



Time (Months)

High-Grade Abnormal includes HSIL, AGC, ASC-H, & suspicious for cancer (regardless of HPV test result)





»)

### **Best Practice: Calculate Timeliness Quality Metrics for each Cancer Type**

Metric	Breast	Cervical	Colorectal	Lung
Proportion of those with a positive screening test/procedure who received follow-up within a defined time period <sup>e</sup> (Timeliness Metric #3)	Proportion of females screened within the measurement year with a BI- RADS 3 finding who receive short interval follow-up mammograms or DBTs within a defined time period Proportion of screened females with a BI-RADS 4A, 4B, or 4C finding who receive a tissue sampling procedure within a defined time period Proportion of screened females with a BI-RADS 5 finding who receive a tissue sampling procedure within a defined time period	Proportion of females screened within the measurement year with an abnormal Pap and/or positive HPV test who receive a co-test, colposcopy, or cervical biopsy within a defined time period per the ASCCP Risk-Based Management Consensus Guidelines	Proportion of individuals screened within the measurement year with an abnormal FIT, gFOBT, stool DNA test, sigmoidoscopy, or CT colonography who receive a diagnostic colonoscopy within a defined time period	Proportion of individuals screened within the measurement year with a Lung- RADS 3 finding who receive an LDCT at 6 months Proportion of individuals screened within the measurement year with a Lung- RADS 4A finding who receive an LDCT at 3 months; PET/CT may be used when there is a ≥8mm solid component Proportion of individuals screened within the measurement year with a Lung- RADS 4B or 4X finding who receive a chest CT with or without contrast, PET/CT, and/or tissue sampling within a defined time period

# **Provider survey highlights confusion & lack of confidence**

### Vignette:

28 year old woman with a NILM/ HPV positive co-test 3 years ago. Current screen found LSIL, HPV not done.

Provider recommended co-test in 1 year. Co-test was never scheduled.

Why?

646 primary care & OBGYN clinicians chose:

### 69% Colpo immediately

18% Co-test in 1 year 12% Pap in 1 year

**Only 42%** reported being very confident in selecting the management plan

### **Representative quote:**

"A lot of times they're just getting another Pap. So the doctor comes, the doctor does not know the management guidelines, so the patient has an abnormal Pap, and rather than sending her for a colpo, for whatever reason [the doctor] just repeats the Pap. So the patients get something, but it's the wrong something." - MGB Int 12



## **Poor follow-up over multiple rounds**

#### Vignette:

28 year old woman with a NILM/ HPV positive co-test 3 years ago. Current screen found LSIL, HPV not done.

Provider recommended co-test in 1 year. Co-test was never scheduled.

Why?

We monitored 7,493 women with NILM /HPV positive results over 2 rounds of potential follow-up. During subsequent rounds:

5% progressed to ASC-US or worse cytology
19% NILM/ HPV negative
9% continued NILM/ other HPV positive
56% failed to have a surveillance co-test after 18 months

**Only 213** women had 2 consecutive NILM/HPV negative results after 3 years and could be returned to an average risk schedule.

### System perspective:

If schedules are not open 1 year in advance, staff have to re-contact and schedule these patients.



### Best Practice: Surveillance Registries & Population Health Management Teams

- Provide decision support for clinicians given complex guidelines and ease their workload
- Enable outreach to patients for scheduling and dissemination of clear, understandable information about results and recommendations
- Generate metrics to monitor quality

NEED

**Stakeholder buy-in** 

and resources



# Resources limited in safety-net health care settings: inconsistent availability public payor program by cancer type, Texas

	Organ site				
Public Program	Breast	Cervical	Colorectal	Lung	
Medicaid	TX did <b>not</b> expand***				
Family Planning block grants (Title V, X, XX)	X	Screening only	X	X	
National Breast & Cervical Early Detection Program	Covers screening & diagnostic services		X	X	
Cancer Prevention & Research Institute of TX	Screening & diagnostic services available for subset of TX counties with CPRIT grant recipient				
County tax-supported medical assistance	Only for Dallas (Parkland), Tarrant (JPS)				

\*\*\*Presumptive Medicaid coverage for breast & cervical cancer treatment if initial screen by NBCCEDP.

# **Questions?**

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_2.jpeg)