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Background

• The US Preventive Services Task Force recommends routine colorectal cancer screening for individuals aged 50 – 75.

• Screening rates are suboptimal particularly in priority populations
Primary Aims

• How effective is a direct-mail fecal testing program implemented in busy community clinics (FQHCs) as part of standard care?

• To report the adoption, reach, level of implementation, and maintenance of an electronic health record (EHR)—embedded program to directly mail fecal tests to patients due for colorectal cancer screening.
Design, Setting, Participants

• Types 2 Hybrid Study – Effectiveness and Implementation outcomes were equally important
• 8 Community Health Centers (FQHCs)– 26 Individual Clinics
• Cluster trial 13 Intervention and 13 Control clinics
• Broad eligibility
  – Clinic visit in the past year, address in the EHR
  – Eligibility, 50-75, not current for CRC screening
  – Other than this, only other ineligibility was prior CRC, inflammatory bowel disease, end stage renal disease
• 41,000 patients
Participating clinics*

Open Door Community Health Centers (4)
Multnomah County Health Department (6)
La Clinica del Valle (3)
Mosaic Medical (4)
Virginia Garcia Memorial Health Center (2)
Community Health Center Medford (3)
Benton County Health Department (2)
Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU) (2)

*Overall: colonoscopy screening in past 10 years: 5%;
fecal testing in past year: 7.5%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Level of Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment and engagement of patients/subjects</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of clinicians and Health Systems</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and merging datasets</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory issues (IRBs and consent)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability of control intervention</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing/Delivering Intervention Across Healthcare Organizations</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = little difficulty  
5 = extreme difficulty
STOP CRC intervention
Lessons learned = local adaptations

Step 1: Mail Introductory letter

Step 2: Mail FIT kit

Step 3: Mail Reminder Postcard
Implementation support

• Real time EHR tools to identify patients eligible for each intervention step
• Training in the EHR tools
• Monthly meetings with EHR site specialists from each health center
• Leadership meeting to launch Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle
• Annual in-person meeting and quarterly WebEx meetings of advisory board
Lesson Learned = Data

• Excellent Primary Care Data
  – Lab feeds for fecal testing
  – Phenotype data (income, language)

• Challenges
  – Specialty procedures (colonoscopy)
Baseline clinic-level characteristics of eligible adults in analysis sample (n = 41,193)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intervention clinics (n = 13)</th>
<th>Usual care clinics (n = 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median clinic % a (range)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (50-64)</strong></td>
<td>80 (73-85)</td>
<td>83 (72-88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender (Female)</strong></td>
<td>44 (38-56)</td>
<td>45 (35-51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity (% Hispanic)</strong></td>
<td>8 (1-33)</td>
<td>15 (2-36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>90 (41-99)</td>
<td>86 (53-99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4 (0-26)</td>
<td>12 (1-31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0-48)</td>
<td>1 (0-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>36 (20-51)</td>
<td>35 (25-54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>24 (20-37)</td>
<td>23 (15-36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninsured</td>
<td>26 (3-40)</td>
<td>27 (2-38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>10 (1-49)</td>
<td>11 (1-39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal poverty level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100%</td>
<td>47 (13-61)</td>
<td>45 (19-64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-150%</td>
<td>19 (6-31)</td>
<td>18 (14-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 - 200%</td>
<td>9 (2-14)</td>
<td>9 (5-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201+</td>
<td>10 (3-26)</td>
<td>10 (2-36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown</strong></td>
<td>17 (3-76)</td>
<td>21 (1-36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson learned = delays impacted the primary outcome

Primary outcome – FIT completion

• Year 01 intervention interval: February 4, 2014 – February 3, 2015

• Year 01 evaluation interval: February 4, 2014 -- August 3, 2014

EHR update delayed implementation start for all intervention clinics

• Lagged data interval: June 4, 2014 – August 3, 2015
Colorectal cancer screening completion, by intervention and usual care arm

**Primary Dataset**

- Completed FIT: Intervention (21,134) vs. Usual Care (20,059)
  - P = .105
- Any CRC screening: Intervention (21,134) vs. Usual Care (20,059)
  - P = .046

**Lagged Dataset**

- Completed FIT: Intervention (15,763) vs. Usual care (14,904)
  - P = .026
- Any CRC screening: Intervention (15,763) vs. Usual care (14,904)
  - P = .014

Differences ranged from 3.8% for FIT completion in primary dataset to 5.8% for any CRC screening in lagged dataset.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Center</th>
<th>Differences in FIT completion*</th>
<th>% eligible patients mailed FIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Center 1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center 2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center 3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center 4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center 5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center 6</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center 7</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center 8</td>
<td>-11.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comparing intervention and usual care clinics within health center; unadjusted primary dataset correlation = .89; lagged dataset correlation = .87
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Efficacy-Effectiveness gap
Lessons Learned = Led to New Grants

• We are conducting additional research that addresses STOP CRC challenges

  – BeneFIT  
    CDC U48DP005013.
    • Working with 2 large Medicaid Health Insurance Plans who provide full coverage for CRC testing and follow-up
    • Mailing vendors are used to take the workload off primary care.

  – PreCISE  
    NCI R01
    • Strategies for addressing low-full up rates after positive FIT
Lessons learned helped improve implementation and maintain the mailed FIT program

• As of 2018-11/13 intervention and 11/13 control clinic are implementing the mailed FIT program
• 19 new clinics opened after study randomization in 2014

• Of the 47 clinics total
  ❖ 5 clinics are not doing any mailed FIT program
  ❖ 1 clinic is mailing FIT prior to appointments only
  ❖ 11 clinics are partnering with health plans/vendors only (Medicaid/Medicare patients)
  ❖ 13 clinics are both partnering with the health plans/vendors plus STOP mailed FIT program for non Medicaid/Medicare insured and uninsured patients
  ❖ 18 are continuing the STOP CRC mailed FIT program as originally designed
Conclusions

- An efficacious CRC screening strategy can be effective in a real-world, community health center setting.
- Barriers to implementation limited overall effectiveness.
- After accounting for implementation delays, which were experienced by all participating clinics, we found 5.6% higher FIT completion rates in clinics that received tools and training for a direct-mail FIT program.
- Low rates of implementation were common and were associated with low levels of effectiveness.
- Lessons learned helped create additional strategies to support program implementation.
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