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Studying Breast Cancer in Vermont

• 61% of Vermont’s population lives in rural areas as defined by US Census
  – 2\textsuperscript{nd} in US only to Maine

• Adult female population \(~240,000\)
  – About 500 breast cancers diagnosed per year
Among women diagnosed with breast cancer in Vermont, those living in isolated rural areas of Vermont had 44% increased risk of breast cancer death compared to women living in urban areas.

KC Bolton, unpublished findings.
The Vermont Breast Cancer Surveillance System

- Statewide medical records registry for all women undergoing breast imaging at Radiology facilities in Vermont
  - Established in 1993
  - Funded by research grants from NCI, PCORI

- Data sources
  - 15 breast imaging facilities
  - 10 pathology facilities
    - Abstraction from path reports
  - Linkage to Vermont Cancer Registry and state vital records
  - Algorithms to ensure patient matching across data streams
Data Collection

ANCILLARY STUDIES
- Radiologic images
- Tissue specimens
- Patient surveys
- Provider surveys
The Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium (BCSC)

The nation’s largest longitudinal collection of mammography data from breast cancer screening in community practice (13 million mammograms, 3 million women)
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The Cancer Control Continuum
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• Prevention
• Detection
  – Access to screening & diagnostic imaging
  – Quality of imaging interpretation
• Diagnosis
  – Access to biopsy services
  – Timeliness of diagnosis
• Treatment
  – Access and adherence to treatment
• Survivorship
Screening Utilization in Vermont

- Persistent decline in Vermont women adhering to screening recommendations

Percent of Vermont Women Screened in the Past 2 Years

Beaudet, manuscript in preparation
Screening

- National studies report that women living in rural areas have slightly lower utilization of breast cancer than women in urban areas.

- Women living in counties with few or no mammography machines have lower screening rates.
  - Need mobile vans, subsidies for purchase of machines, increased reimbursement, incentives for providers to practice in underserved areas.

Tran & Tran, 2019 *Cancer Causes and Control* 30:1045-1055
Elkin et al., 2010 *Medical Care* 48:349-356
Detection: Mammography Interpretive Performance

• Mammography screening performance varies across providers in Vermont
  – 15 Vermont facilities
    • sensitivity 75-93%
    • specificity 79-95%
  – 51 Vermont radiologists
    • sensitivity 71-98%
    • specificity 73-97%
Detection: Mammography Interpretive Performance

• BCSC studies have shown that mammographic accuracy is lower among:
  – General radiologists vs. breast specialists
  – Low volume vs. high volume readers
  – Radiologists with less years of experience

• Many rural facilities are served by general radiologists who read low volume of mammograms
  – 70% of rural physicians interpret <1000 mammograms per year (vs. 55% urban)

• 23% of rural facilities performed <1000 mammograms per year

Smith-Bindman 2005 *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 97:358-367
Smith-Bindman 2008 *American Journal of Roentgenology* 190:526-532
BCSC analyses of screening mammography performance at 151 facilities

- No difference in sensitivity or specificity at rural vs. urban facilities after adjusting for patient-level factors (age, time since last mammogram, etc.)
- Timeliness of follow-up with additional imaging after abnormal screen is comparable at rural vs. urban facilities.

Goldman 2008 Medical Care 46:701-708
Rosenberg 2011 Radiology 261:404-413
Mammography Interpretive Performance

- BCSC analyses of **diagnostic** mammography
  - Comparable sensitivity at rural vs. urban facilities
  - Poorer specificity at rural facilities, corresponding to a **55%** higher false positive rate
  - Unnecessary additional imaging and biopsies

Goldman 2013 *Medical Care* 51:307-314
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- **Prevention**
- **Detection**
  - Access to screening & diagnostic imaging
  - Quality of imaging interpretation
- **Diagnosis**
  - Access to biopsy services
  - Timeliness of diagnosis
- **Treatment**
  - Access and adherence to treatment
- **Survivorship**
Diagnosis of Breast Cancer

• Use of needle biopsy rather than surgical biopsy is a Quality of Care measure from the Commission on Cancer
  – Rate of needle biopsy should meet or exceed 90%

• Surgical biopsy
  – Increased patient discomfort, increased risk for wound complications
  – Prolonged recovery compared to MIBB
  – Disruption of tumor margins

• Needle biopsy
  – Less unlikely to have unnecessary surgery
  – More likely to have negative margins at time of first surgery
  – Allows for neo-adjuvant therapy
Breast Biopsy in Vermont

- Open surgical excision was nearly one-third of the biopsies performed in Vermont in the year 1999.
- Large disparity in biopsy type for rural vs. urban residents has essentially been erased.
- By 2013, the needle biopsy rate exceeded 90% for rural women in Vermont.

Percent of Biopsies that were Needle vs. Surgical

James et al. 2012, *J Am Coll Surg*
Murphy et al., in preparation
Breast Biopsy - results

- 3 of 13 hospitals in Vermont still have needle biopsy rate <90%
  - Some facilities can only perform ultrasound-guided needle biopsy.
  - Do not have equipment for stereotactic (mammography-guided) needle biopsy
    - If lesion is only seen on mammography (not ultrasound) then patient must choose whether to travel for stereotactic biopsy

Murphy et al., in preparation
Diagnosis of Breast Cancer

• BCSC analysis of timeliness of diagnosis after positive diagnostic mammogram
  – Follow-up for biopsy/surgical consultation is slower in rural (38% in 15 days) vs. urban facilities (57% in 15 days).
  • And 5% less likely to follow through with biopsy.

Goldman 2013 *Medical Care* 51:307-314
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• Prevention
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  – Access to screening & diagnostic imaging
  – Quality of imaging interpretation
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  – Access to biopsy services
  – Timeliness of diagnosis
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  – Access and adherence to treatment
• Survivorship
Access to Cancer Care

- Rural women in breast cancer treatment randomized trials have similar outcomes to urban women
  - When treatments are carefully managed/arranged, rural patients have comparable survival

- There are many fewer specialist physicians in rural vs. urban areas
  - Less than 50% of cancer patients living in small and isolated rural areas have a medical or radiation oncologist within 30 miles (compared to >98% for urban patients)

Unger et al., 2018 *JAMA Network Open* 1(4):e181235
Baldwin et al., 2008 *J Rural Health* 24:390-399
Access to Cancer Care

- Median drive times for small town and isolated rural areas:
  - 180 minute drive to the nearest NCI-designated cancer center
  - 105 minutes to academic medical center
  - 59 minutes to any specialized cancer care setting

- Travel time to a facility is associated with treatment choice
  - Choosing “low frequency” service (mastectomy rather than lumpectomy + radiation)

Onega et al., 2008 *Cancer* 112:909-918
Onega et al., 2011 *BCRT* 129:269-275
In Vermont, drive time to the treatment facility is associated with delayed initiation of chemotherapy

- 702 women diagnosed with stage I-III breast cancer in Vermont
- Determined time between date of diagnosis and initiation of chemotherapy
- Multivariable adjustment for stage, surgery type, age, hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drive-Time Group</th>
<th>Mean (weeks)</th>
<th>25th Percentile (weeks) (95% CI)</th>
<th>50th Percentile (weeks) (95% CI)</th>
<th>75th Percentile (weeks) (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15 minutes</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.6 (7.0,8.0)</td>
<td>9.2 (8.7,9.8)</td>
<td>11.5 (11.0,12.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29 minutes</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.0 (5.8,7.1)</td>
<td>9.0 (8.1,9.7)</td>
<td>12.0 (10.4,13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44 minutes</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.5 (6.0,7.4)</td>
<td>9.6 (8.1,10.7)</td>
<td>12.1 (11.0,13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59 minutes</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.4 (5.4,7.8)</td>
<td>9.4 (8.4,10.5)</td>
<td>13.0 (11.8,14.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ minutes</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>8.2 (8.0,9.2)</td>
<td>11.0 (10.1,11.8)</td>
<td>14.2 (13.5,15.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Johnson et al., 2016 J Oncol Pract 12(9):e848-57.
Summary

• Compared to women in urban areas, women in rural areas have:
  – Lower incidence of breast cancer
  – Comparable screening utilization, high quality screening mammography performance
  – Worse performance of diagnostic mammography (higher false positive rate)
  – Delays in biopsy and lower access to needle biopsy
  – Impaired access to treatments
  – Worse survival after diagnosis

• Themes
  – Access to high quality specialized care is a significant challenge
    • Especially care requiring multiple visits
Interventions

• Patient navigation programs
• Transportation assistance programs
• Guest housing near oncology practices
• Expanded services (mammography, chemotherapy, etc.) at local facilities
• Mobile services (mammography, chemotherapy)
• Remote interpretation of diagnostic mammography
• Need subsidies, reimbursement, incentives, etc., for all of the above
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