LOW-VALUE CANCER SCREENINGS IN THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

RATES AND FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH OVERUSE OF BREAST, CERVICAL, COLORECTAL, & PROSTATE CANCER TESTING

JANUARY 19TH, 2022 | PACT CYBERSEMINAR SERIES



Linnaea Schuttner, MD, MS

Primary Care Analytics Team Health Services Research & Development, VA Puget Sound Health Care System Department of Medicine, University of Washington School of Medicine

Contributors:

Bjarni Haraldsson, MS; Charles Maynard, PhD; Christian D. Helfrich, PhD; Ashok Reddy, MD, MS; Toral Parikh, MD, MPH; Karin M. Nelson, MD, MSHS; Edwin Wong, PhD



Conflicts of Interest/Disclosures: None

Objectives

- Define low-value cancer screening
- Understand rates of low-value testing
- Clarify factors associated with low-value testing

Associated publication:

Schuttner L, Haraldsson B, Maynard C, et al. Factors associated with low-value cancer screenings in the Veterans Health Administration. *JAMA Network Open*. 2021;4(19):e2130581. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.30581



Defining Low-Value Healthcare

Healthcare that....

does not provide a benefit

OR

Where potential harms outweigh benefits



Low-Value Cancer Screenings

Screening patients when **potential benefit** from diagnosis of cancer exceeds **potential harm** from procedure, short-term risks from testing, or complications, such as:

- Life expectancy shorter than time for cancer to develop
- Illness burden raises risk of complications
- Testing unacceptable for patient
- Downstream harms from testing "cascades"



Acknowledgements

Goal is care quality (safe, timely, appropriate, beneficial, and patient-centered)

- Nuanced conversation
- Finite resources
- Exacerbation of health inequities
 - May divert from underscreened patients that could benefit
 - Harms may compound injury or burden to already disadvantaged groups



Scope of Low-Value Cancer Screening

- National survey of Medicare patients¹
 - Should be screened (65-75y with LE > 10y): 40% not up to date
 - 40% of adults \geq 85y recently screened for CRC
 - 49% with LE < 5 years recently screened
- 18% of Veterans > 75y receive low-value PSA testing²



Scope of Low-Value Cancer Screening

Survey (2000 – 2010) of 27,000 patients:





Royce et al., JAMA IM, 2014

Summa	ary of Cancer	Screening Ri	isks/Benefits	8
	Time to develop	Lifetime ca. risk	Screen risks	
Breast	8-20y	12.9%	Overdiagnosis (0-54%) False-positives (14-27%)	
Cervical	10-15y	0.6%	Discomfort/anxiety/trauma False-positives Pregnancy adverse outcomes	
CRC	10-15y	4.1%	Anxiety Electrolyte dysfunction & falls from pre Sedation, Perforation (1%/year of age),	p,
Prostate	12y	12.5%	Anxiety Overdiagnosis (23-50%) Biopsy complications (2%)	

Cancer	Organization	When to stop	9
Droost	USPSTF, ACOG, ACP	Age <u>></u> 75	
Dreast	ACS, ACOG	< 10y life expectancy	
Comicol	USPSTF	Age > 65 if adequate testing, hysterectomy with cervix removed	
Cervical ACS, ACF Colposed	ACS, ACP, Am Society for Colposcopy	Age > 65 if adequate testing	
Coloroctal	USPSTF	Age > 85	
Colorectai	ACP	Age > 75 or < 10y life expectancy	
	USPSTF	Age <u>></u> 70	
Prostate	ACS, Society Clinical Oncology	< 10y life expectancy	
	American Urologic Association	Age <u>></u> 70 or < 10-15y life expectancy	

ACOG = American College Obstetricians and Gynecologists, ACP = American College of Physicians, ACS = American Cancer Society, USPSTF = US Preventative Services Task Force







Kerr et al., JAMA IM, 2020

Kerr et al., recommendations

	Breast	Cervical	Colorectal	Prostate 11
Action	Do not do screening mammography	Do not perform cervical cancer screening (cervical cytology or HPV testing)	Do not do screening colonoscopy, screening sigmoidoscopy, FIT, or FOBT	Don't screen for prostate cancer using prostate specific antigen
Among	Average-risk women < 40y or with a life expectancy < 10y	Women < 21y, > 65y and at low risk, or with prior total hysterectomy for benign disease	Average-risk adults < 50y or with a life expectancy < 10y	Men < 50, > 69, or with a life expectancy of <15y
Exclusions		Prior history of exposure to DES, HIV, a weakened immune system, high-grade precancerous lesion, or cervical cancer		African Americans* and men with a family history of prostate cancer
Definitions	Average-risk: No personal history of breast cancer, a genetic mutation known to increase risk of breast cancer [e.g., BRCA], or a history of previous radiotherapy to the chest at a young age	Low risk: no history of a high- grade precancerous lesion and either [(3 negative Pap test results in a row) or (2 negative co-test results in a row), with the most recent test performed after age 60] High-grade: CIN 2, CIN 3, or	Average-risk: (1) no prior colectomy; (2) no history of colorectal cancer; (3) no history of colon polyps; (4) no history of inflammatory bowel disease; and (5) no family history of colorectal cancer	
Validity	8.5	8	8	8.5
Source	American College of Physicians	USPSTF	American College of Physicians	American College of Physicians

*Exclude AA/Black men: individualize screening 40-54y based on increased risk

Kerr et al., 2020

12 Defining Low-Value for Cancer Screenings: Our definitions Definition Average-risk patient tested outside of age range or Numerator mortality risk > 50% in 1 year (by CAN score) All average-risk patients with CPT or ICD-defined **Denominator** screening in FY17 **Repeat procedures** Most recent as index Family history of cancer, recent symptoms (e.g., for 12 months prior to test), personal history of cancer, **Exclusion by risk or history** other life factors in past 10-14 years prior to test

Defining Low-Value for Cancer Screenings: Our definitions

	Breast	Cervical	Colorectal	Prostate
Numerator (i.e. low-value screening)	Average-risk females < 40 years or LE < 1 year	Average-risk females < 21 years, > 65 years with prior adequate screenings, ^a or with prior hysterectomy	Average-risk adults < 50 years or LE < 1 year	Average-risk males, age < 50 years, > 69 years, or LE < 1 year
Denominator	Average-risk females <u>></u> 18 years with screening mammography	Average-risk females <u>></u> 18 years with screening PAP and/or high-risk HPV testing	Average-risk adults <u>></u> 18 years with screening colonoscopy, sigmoidoscopy, or fecal occult home test	Average-risk males <u>></u> 18 years with screening PSA
Repeat procedure logic	Included only if no prior mammography in prior 11 months (presumed repeat was diagnostic)	PAP and HPV occurring on separate dates within a 90-day window counted as single index event in FY17	Only most recent screen over 12 months of FY17 (repeat presumed due to incomplete colonoscopy)	Only most recent PSA included over 12 months of FY17
Exclusions (from both numerator and denominator)	Family history of breast cancer, personal history of genetic carrier risk, breast cancer, breast mass, or received radiation in past 10 years.	HIV/AIDS, history of exposure to diethylstilbestrol before birth, abnormal PAP smear, or cervical cancer in past 10 years.	Personal history of colectomy; colorectal cancer; colon polyps; inflammatory bowel disease; or family history of colorectal cancer in past 14 years. Gastrointestinal symptoms in 12 months prior to the index screening.	African American race/ethnicity*; family history of prostate cancer; personal history of prostate cancer in prior 10 years. Urinary or prostate-related symptoms in 90 days prior to index PSA.

*Exclude AA/Black men: individualize screening 40-54y based on increased risk

Selecting the Cohort for This Study













Statistical Analysis: Associated Factors

Multivariate models including three sets of multilevel factors:

Patient:

- Sex (for colon cancer only)
- Race (Black, White, Other)*
- Gagne categorical (Low 0-1 vs. High <u>></u> 2) – Q4FY16
- JFI Frailty categorical (< 3, <u>></u> 3) – Q4FY16
- Med household income by zip code, 2017
- High school grad rate by zip code, 2017
- Copay exemption
- [Sensitivity analysis: Agent orange exposure flag (prostate cohort)]

Ordering clinician:

- Physician vs. NP/PA
- Age
- Gender
- Patient's usual provider (by quarter – matched to PCMM)
- FTE

Facility (sta5a level, Q4FY16):

- VAMC/CBOC
- Average FTE providers
- Average panel size (adjusted MD/NP)
- Geographic region
- Rural/urban status
- Complexity level
- Academic affiliation

Organizational:

- Team-based care
- Continuity
- Access

Data excluded if missing: patient (7-15%), clinic (4-15%), clinician (18-82%) SE Heteroskedastic robust, account for clustering within clinic



*We acknowledge that our use of constructed categories of race and ethnicity necessitates interpretation of s our findings within the context of ancestral, structural, cultural, socioeconomic, and other factors not represented in our study.

Part I: Describing the State of Low-Value Care







Breast Cancer: Demographics

of Veterans Affairs

	Screened n = 21,930	Received low-value test n = 633
Age, mean y (SD)	55 (9)	35 (3)
Race and ethnicity, %		
Black, non-Hispanic	37	36
Hispanic/other/unknown*	8	8
White, non-Hispanic	55	55
High comorbidity, %	7	4
High frailty score, %	57	50
Pay a copay for VA care, %	4	2
HS diploma/by county, %	58	58
Median income/by county	58k	59k
A of Veterans Affairs		

*Other: Hispanic, American Indian, AK Native, Asian, Pacific Islander, multiracial, Native Hawaiian, and 23 other race/ethnicities

Facility Variation: Low-Value Breast Cancer Tests





Cervical Cancer: Demographics

	Screened n = 65,511	Received low-value test n = 630
Age, mean y (SD)	44 (13)	70 (4)
Race and ethnicity, %		
Black, non-Hispanic	36	18
Hispanic/other/unknown	10	7
White, non-Hispanic	54	76
High comorbidity, %	5	12
High frailty score, %	50	64
Pay a copay for VA care, %	4	8
HS diploma/by county, %	58	58
Median income/by county	59k	57k

Facility Variation: Low-Value Cervical Cancer Tests





Colorectal Cancer: Demographics

	Screened n = 299,765	Received low-value test n = 6,790
Female sex, %	6	12
Age, mean y (SD)	64 (8)	42 (8)
Race and ethnicity, %		
Black, non-Hispanic	20	28
Hispanic/other/unknown	7	9
White, non-Hispanic	73	63
High comorbidity, %	8	5
High frailty score, %	46	50
Pay a copay for VA care, %	7	5
HS diploma/by county, %	58	57
Median income/by county	56k	57k

Facility Variation: Low-Value Colon Cancer Tests





Prostate Cancer: Demographics

	Screened n = 903,612	Received low-value test n = 350,705
Age, mean y (SD)	66 (10)	70 (13)
Race and ethnicity, %		
Black, non-Hispanic	_	
Hispanic/other/unknown	4	5
White, non-Hispanic	96	96
High comorbidity, %	10	10
High frailty score, %	50	49
Pay a copay for VA care, %	8	11
HS diploma/by county, %	59	59
Median income/by county	57k	57k

Facility Variation: Low-Value Prostate Cancer Tests





Summary of Part I Findings

- Rare low-value testing for 3 cancers
 - < 3% of all screenings
- EXCEPT for prostate cancer
 - 8% of all average-risk men \geq 18 years
 - 39% of all screenings
- Wide facility-level variation in where low-value testing occurred



Part II: Factors Associated With Low-Value Care



Probability of Receipt of Low-Value Test Among Screened

30

	Breast	Cervical	Colorectal	Prostate
Patient factors	2.8 (2.4-3.3)	1.1 (0.8-1.4)	2.2 (2.0-2.4)	38.1 (37.3-38.9)
+ clinic/org.	2.8 (2.4-3.2)	1.2 (0.9-1.4)	2.2 (2.0-2.4)	38.2 (37.4-39.0)
+ clinician	2.2 (1.9-2.6)	0.8 (0.6-1.0)	1.7 (1.5-1.9)	37.8 (36.9-38.6)





Breast Cancer



Less likely to receive low-value breast cancer test, if screened:

- Higher comorbidity
- Greater frailty
- Higher income/service connection (have a copay)

Not significant: Race, % HS diploma, median household income



Cervical Cancer

33



Less likely to receive low-value cervical cancer test, if screened:

- Black, non-Hispanic or Hispanic/other/unknown race and ethnicity
- Lower comorbidity
- Lower frailty
- Lower income/service connection (no copay)

Not significant: % HS diploma, median household income

Factors	OR (95% CI)	Favors low risk
Patient factors		
Race (vs White)		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Colorectal cancer	1.70 (1.47-1.95)	
Prostate cancer	NA ^a	
Hispanic, other, or unkno	own	
Colorectal cancer	1.34 (1.21-1.49)	
Prostate cancer	0.82 (0.79-0.85)	
High comorbidity		
Colorectal cancer	0.59 (0.53-0.66)	-
Prostate cancer	1.06 (1.03-1.08)	
High frailty		
Colorectal cancer	1.25 (1.17-1.34)	
Prostate cancer	0.98 (0.96-0.99)	
% With HS diploma (by cou	unty)	
Colorectal cancer	0.99 (0.97-1.00)	
Prostate cancer	1.00 (0.99-1.00)	
Median household income	(county)	
Colorectal cancer	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	
Prostate cancer	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	
Has copay		
Colorectal cancer	0.63 (0.54-0.72)	
Prostate cancer	1.70 (1.64-1.75)	

Favors

-

high risk

Colorectal cancer



Less likely to receive low-value colorectal cancer test, if screened:

- White, non-Hispanic
- Higher comorbidity
- Lower frailty
- Higher income/service connection (have copay)

Not significant: % with HS diploma, median household income



Prostate Cancer

Factors	OR (95% CI)	Favors low risk	Favors high risk
Patient factors	× /		J
Race (vs White)			
Hispanic, other, or unkr	iown		
Prostate cancer	0.82 (0.79-0.85)		
High comorbidity			
Prostate cancer	1.06 (1.03-1.08)		
High frailty			
Prostate cancer	0.98 (0.96-0.99)		
Has copay			
Prostate cancer	1.70 (1.64-1.75)		
	1	· · · · · · · · · ·	
		0.2 OR (9	1 5% CI)

Less likely to receive low-value prostate cancer test, if screened:

- Hispanic/other/unknown (vs White, non-Hispanic)
- Lower comorbidity
- Higher frailty

5

• Lower income/service connection (no copay)

Not significant: % HS diploma, median household income

actors	OR (95% CI)	Favors low risk	Favors high risk
linical factors			
Hospital clinic			2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
Breast cancer	1.08 (0.68-1.71)		
Cervical cancer	0.57 (0.20-1.61)		
PCP FTE per clinic			• • • • •
Breast cancer	0.99 (0.97-1.01)		-
Cervical cancer	0.97 (0.95-1.00)		
Average panel size			- - - - - - - -
Breast cancer	1.00 (1.00-1.00)		
Cervical cancer	1.00 (1.00-1.00)		
Region (vs West)			- - - - - - -
Midwest			2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
Breast cancer	1.40 (0.83-2.38)		
Cervical cancer	0.61 (0.28-1.31)		
Northeast			- - - - - - - -
Breast cancer	1.24 (0.82-1.87)		
Cervical cancer	0.89 (0.47-1.71)		-
Southeast			2
Breast cancer	1.48 (1.01-2.17)		
Cervical cancer	0.98 (0.52-1.85)		
Urban clinic			* * * * *
Breast cancer	NA ^b		8 8 9 8 8 8 8 8 8
Cervical cancer	0.81 (0.38-1.71)		
High complexity facility			•
Breast cancer	3.29 (0.64-16.82)		
Cervical cancer	1.14 (0.55-2.38)		
Academic facility			-
Breast cancer	0.93 (0.51-1.71)		
Cervical cancer	1.64 (0.59-4.59)		
Team care (top 25%)			• • • • •
Breast cancer	0.94 (0.57-1.57)		
Cervical cancer	1.60 (0.87-2.95)	_	
Continuity (top 25%)			-
Breast cancer	0.46 (0.27-0.78)	_	- - - - - - - - - - - - -
Cervical cancer	1.02 (0.39-2.66)		
Access (top 25%)			- - - - -
Breast cancer	0.84 (0.55-1.28)		
Cervical cancer	1.54 (0.94-2.53)	-	
	Г		
	0.2		1
		OR (9	5% CI)

Factors	OR (95% CI)	Favors low risk	Favors high rist 9
Clinical factors			
Hospital clinic			
Colorectal cancer	0.99 (0.72-1.36)		
Prostate cancer	0.98 (0.88-1.09)	-	F
PCP FTE per clinic			
Colorectal cancer	0.99 (0.97-1.00)	-	
Prostate cancer	1.00 (0.99-1.00)		
Average panel size			
Colorectal cancer	1.00 (1.00-1.00)		
Prostate cancer	1.00 (1.00-1.00)		
Region (vs West)			
Midwest			
Colorectal cancer	0.74 (0.57-0.97)	_	
Prostate cancer	0.93 (0.83-1.03)	-=	
Northeast			
Colorectal cancer	0.78 (0.62-0.99)		
Prostate cancer	0.96 (0.85-1.08)		F
Southeast			
Colorectal cancer	1.00 (0.79-1.26)		-
Prostate cancer	1.10 (1.00-1.22)		-
Urban clinic			
Colorectal cancer	1.27 (0.95-1.71)	-	
Prostate cancer	1.02 (0.92-1.13)	-	-
High complexity facility			
Colorectal cancer	0.79 (0.60-1.05)		
Prostate cancer	0.99 (0.90-1.09)	-	F
Academic facility			
Colorectal cancer	1.16 (0.86 -1.58)	_	
Prostate cancer	0.97 (0.89-1.06)	-	F.
Team care (top 25%)			
Colorectal cancer	1.07 (0.82-1.40)		— —
Prostate cancer	1.09 (1.01-1.18)		
Continuity (top 25%)			
Colorectal cancer	0.80 (0.58-1.11)		_
Prostate cancer	0.96 (0.87-1.06)	-	F
Access (top 25%)			
Colorectal cancer	1.11 (0.92-1.33)	_	
Prostate cancer	1.07 (1.00-1.15)		-
	0.2	: 1	L

OR (95% CI)

Remaining Findings Not Significant, Except:

- Continuity: Breast cancer OR 0.46 (0.27-0.78)
- Team based care: Prostate cancer OR 1.09 (1.01-1.18)



Summary

- Patient characteristics most associated
 - No one factor emerged for all cancers
- Clinician, facility, organizational factors minimally influential
 - Organizational factors
 - ? Continuity and breast cancer
 - ? Team-based care and prostate cancer



Summary

More likely to receive low-value test

- Breast and CRC: lower comorbidity, frailty, and income and/or SC disability (copay)
 - CRC: non-White or Hispanic
- Cervical and prostate: White/non-Hispanic, higher comorbidity, income/SC disability (copay)
 - Cervical: more frail
 - Prostate: less frail



Discussion: General overview

- Rare low-value cervical, CRC, breast cancer screenings overall
 - Few Women Veterans, demographics of Women Veterans younger
 - Capture VHA data only miss community care data, Medicare?
- Important: Race and ethnicity, illness burden, and copay status
 - Parity better in VHA less historic disadvantaged groups underscreened
 - Reliance on VHA more in racial/ethnic minority, less favorable SES, fewer comorbidity
 - Frequency of being seen comorbidity may = opportunity for screening?

Screening mechanism key



Discussion: Breast, Cervical, CRC

Who is getting low-value test

• Breast:

• Off-site mammography harder in sicker women?

• Cervical:

• More clinic attendance in those who are more ill??

• CRC:

• Algorithmic protocols may screen VHA reliant patients more?

Breast: lower comorbidity, frailty, and income and/or SC disability (copay)

Cervical: White/non-Hispanic, higher comorbidity and frailty, income/SC disability (copay)

CRC: non-White/Hispanic, lower comorbidity, frailty, and income and/or SC disability (copay)



Discussion: Prostate Cancer

- Overall decline since 2012 (when made USPSTF Grade D)
- High rates corroborated in other studies
 - O'Neil et al. 30% of screenings are low value
 - Radomski et al. 18% of VHA men > 75y (eligible population, though, not just among screened patients)



Radomski et al., JAGS, 2019 O'Neil et al., Cancer Epi., 2018

Discussion: Prostate Cancer

- PSA = intensity of health care receipt¹
 - More care concentrated in White, non-Hispanic, greater income
- Decision fatigue and "defaults"²
 - May depend on what providers think is the default setting
- Clinical inertia, patient demand³
 - Request, level of worry most influential ages 40-70⁴
- PSA test easy to obtain as blood test

Prostate: White/non-Hispanic, higher comorbidity, less frailty, income/SC disability (copay)



1. Kressin and Groeneveld, Milbank Quarterly, 2015; 2 Hunt et al., Cancer, 2021; 3 Oswald et al., Cancer Epi., 2020 4 Hayat et al., Acta Oncologica, 2013

Prostate cancer and Agent Orange exposure in the VHA

- Known carcinogen for prostate cancer
- 233,314 Vietnam-era Veterans with exposure status known
- Exposure OR, 0.95 [95% CI, 0.92-0.99]



Limitations

- Tests among SCREENED patients, not eligible
- VHA data miss community care referrals?
- Generalizability
- Encounter time, patient request, individual attitudes not captured



Take-Aways & Future Work for Clinicians

- Physician recommendation matters
- Consider individualizing screening recommendations
 - Useful tools: https://eprognosis.ucsf.edu/
- PSA tests offers little benefit, may have harms





Take-Aways & Future Work for Research & Policy-Makers

50

- Standardizing definitions important
- Patient characteristics strongest predictors
- PSA tests high-yield by volume



Acknowledgements & Funding

This work was undertaken as part of the Veterans Administration's Primary Care Analytics Team (PCAT), supporting and evaluating VA's transition to a patient-centered medical home. Data for this evaluation were developed by the national evaluation team of PCAT. Funding for PCAT is provided by the VA Office of Primary Care.

Additional support for L.S. was from grant number K12HS026369 from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ).

Funding agencies had no role in the study's design, conduct, or reporting.

We thank Eve Kerr, MD, MPH, Sameer Saini, MD, MS, and Thomas Radomski, MD, MS for their assistance with this work.



- Hayat Roshanai A, Nordin K, Berglund G. Factors influencing primary care physicians' decision to order prostate-specific antigen 52 (PSA) test for men without prostate cancer. Acta Oncol. 2013;52(8):1602-1608. doi:10.3109/0284186X.2012.762998
- Hebert PL, Batten AS, Gunnink E, et al. Reliance on Medicare providers by veterans after becoming age-eligible for Medicare is associated with the use of more outpatient services. Health Serv Res. 2018;53(S3):5159-5180. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.13033
- Hunt TC, Ambrose JP, Haaland B, et al. Decision fatigue in low-value prostate cancer screening. Cancer. 2021;127(18):3343-3353. doi:10.1002/cncr.33644
- Kerr EA, Klamerus ML, Markovitz AA, et al. Identifying recommendations for stopping or scaling back unnecessary routine services in primary care. JAMA Intern Med. 2020;180(11):1500. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.4001
- Kressin NR, Groeneveld PW. Race/Ethnicity and overuse of care: a systematic review. Milbank Q. 2015;93(1):112-138. doi:10.1111/1468-0009.12107
- O'Neil B, Martin C, Kapron A, et al. Defining low-value PSA testing in a large retrospective cohort: Finding common ground between discordant guidelines. Cancer Epidemiol. 2018;56:112-117. doi:10.1016/j.canep.2018.08.003
- Oswald N, Lin T, Haaland B, et al. Factors associated with appropriate and low-value PSA testing. Cancer Epidemiol. 2020;66:101724. doi:10.1016/j.canep.2020.101724
- Radomski TR, Huang Y, Park SY, et al. Low-value prostate cancer screening among older men within the Veterans Health Administration. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2019;67(9):1922-1927. doi:10.1111/jgs.16057
- Royce TJ, Hendrix LH, Stokes WA, et al. Cancer screening rates in individuals with different life expectancies. JAMA Intern Med. 2014;174(10):1558-1565. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2014.3895
- Schonberg MA, Davis RB, McCarthy EP, et al. Index to Predict 5-Year Mortality of Community-Dwelling Adults Aged 65 and Older Using Data from the National Health Interview Survey. J Gen Intern Med. 2009;24(10):1115-1122. doi:10.1007/s11606-009-1073-



• SUPPLEMENTAL CONTENT



Women Screened for Cervical Cancer (Per 1,000 Women/PCMM in 2017)



Included Patients per 1,000 in PCMM

400
300
200
100



Low-Value Cervical Cancer Tests Among Those Screened



Proportion Receiving a Low-Value Test

8% 5% 3% 0%



Patients Screened for Colon Cancer (Per 1,000 Patients/PCMM in 2017)



Included Patients per 1,000 in PCMM





Low-Value Colon Cancer Tests Among Those Screened



Proportion Receiving a Low-Value Test

18% 12% 6% 0% 57



Men Screened for Prostate Cancer (Per 1,000 Men/PCMM in 2017)



Included Patients per 1,000 in PCMM

- 500
- 300
- 100





Low-Value Prostate Cancer Tests Among Those Screened



Proportion Receiving a Low-Value Test

	53%
1	44%
	34%
	24%

