SKIN CANCER SCREENING AT UPMC

Laura K. Ferris, MD, PhD Associate Professor of Dermatology





UPMC

University of Pittsburgh Medical Center

UPM

Largest health care system in Western PA

- 21+ hospitals with >5,100 licensed bedsMore than 500 outpatient sites
- More than 3.9 million outpatient visits annually
 - 61% medical-surgical market share in Allegheny County
 - 41% medical-surgical market share in western Pennsylvania (29 counties)
- 5,500 affiliated physicians, including 3,500 employed by UPMC
 UPMC Insurance Services Division
 - More than 2.5 million members covered by UPMC Insurance Services products

http://www.upmc.com/about/facts/numbers/Pages/default.aspx

The Vision

- Modeled after Schleswig-Holstein experience
- Designed as a "Quality Initiative" and not as research
- Collaborative effort: oncology, dermatology, UPMC Health Plan, UPMC administration, medical informatics, public health and epidemiology
- Screening performed by PCPs, annually, on patients 35 year and older
- PCPs trained in the identification of skin cancer (melanoma and NMSC)
- Screening performed as part of routine wellness or physical exams
- Use of the integrate EHR to alert clinicians of eligible patients by adding to the health maintenance module
- Unique aspects:
 - PCP vs patient initiation of screening
 - PCP determines disposition of patient with concerning lesion: biopsy vs refer
 - PCP not compensated for screening
 - Quality initiative, not research- no tracking of screening outcomes at level of individual patient
 - Ability to get some health care utilization data from UPMC Health Plan

PCP TRAINING

UPMC-employed PCPs were invited to participate

- Information about skin cancer diagnosis and discussion of intervention occurred at series of town hall style meetings prior to start of screening
- PCPs were invited take INFORMED training, an on-line course designed to improve early detection of melanoma and SCC, BCC
- Previous validation study, among PCPs at 2 sites who completed INFORMED:
 - Mean score for appropriate diagnosis / management increased from 36.1% to 46.7% (OR, 1.6; 95% confidence interval, 1.4-1.9)
 - Dermatology referrals for suspicious lesions or new visits by participants' patients decreased at both sites after the course (from 630 to 607 and from 726 to 266, respectively)

http://www.skinsight.com/info/for_professionals/dermatology-education-resources
J Am Board Fam Med. 2013 Nov-Dec;26(6):648-57.

OUTCOME MEASURES

- # screen-eligible patients seen by PCPs
- Disposition of screen-eligible patients
 - Screened
 - Patient declined
- Demographics of screened population
- Impact of INFORMED training on screening by PCPs
- Differences in heath care utilization by population targeted for screening vs. control population among those patients with UPMC Health Plan
- Melanoma depth in UPMC melanoma tumor registry pre vs. post initiation of screening
- Procedures preformed by PCPs during visits in which screening occurred
- New diagnoses of melanoma and other skin cancers subsequent to screening

OUTCOME MEASURES

- # screen-eligible patients seen by PCPs
- Disposition of screen-eligible patients
 - Screened
 - Patient declined
- Demographics of screened population
- Impact of INFORMED training on screening by PCPs
- Differences in heath care utilization by population targeted for screening vs. control population among those patients with UPMC Health Plan
- Melanoma depth in UPMC melanoma tumor registry pre vs. post initiation of screening
- Procedures preformed by PCPs during visits in which screening occurred
- New diagnoses of melanoma and other skin cancers subsequent to screening

🖮 Hyperspace - DE	RM ST MARGARET	5 HBC - e1prd11/PRDAPP1 - UPMC Product	tion - LAURA K FERRIS - FERRILK		🏝 🛞 🛛 Results Staff Mess	sage Rx Auth Result Not	es Canceled Ord	
Epic - 🗘	B 📫 F 🏠 Home 🖟	🕜 Schedule 🗳 In Basket 🖻 Review 🔩	Encounter Tel Call 😫 Refill Enc 頥	Patient Lists 😑 Clinical I	Links 🗸 😰 Support	🔹 🍋 🤌 👗 Link Acti	ive 🗸 💣 Print 🗸 🔒 Sec	cure 🚊 Log Out
	est,Test	×					EpicCare	Q Search
Female, 40 year o	ld, 08/15/1975	Allergies: Sulfa (S	ulfonamide) Patient Messages: 🖃	PCP: TANZER, PE	TER P MyUPMC: Inactive			
Test, Test (<u>)76027974)</u>	Health Maintenar	nce	Pri Ins: None	Phone: H: 888-888	-8888		
	Health Maintena	ance						? Close X
Chart Review	_s [©] <u>P</u> ostpone 9	<u>Override</u> X R <u>e</u> move Override <i>/</i> Edit	Modifiers 🔀 Report 🚯 Update HM	Document Past Immuniz	ation			
SnapShot	Due Date	Торіс	Date Completed					
Problem List	2/6/2014	TETANUS DIPHTHERIA	2/6/2004					
History	9/3/2014	PAP SMEAR 6 MO	3/3/2014 (Done)					
Allergies	3/3/2015	LIPID PROFILE 1Y	<u>/2014</u>					
Immunizations	🔊 3/4/2015	MAMMOGRAM, DIAGNOSTIC	<u>3/4/2014</u>	11/13/2013 (Prv				
Demographics	3/4/2015	FULL BODY SKIN EXAM	3/4/2014 (SCRIPT GIVEN)					
Letters	🔊 3/13/2015	DIABETIC FOOT EXAM	3/13/2014 (Done)					
Audia anam	8/1/2015	FLU SHOT	11/12/2012					
Audiogram	3/5/2016	DIABETIC RETINAL EXAM	3/5/2014 (Done)					
Growth Chart	9/12/2017	COLONOSCOPY 5 YEAR	9/12/2012 (Prv Comp)					
Synopsis	12/12/2017	DEXA SCAN 5 YEAR	<u>12/12/2012</u>					
Review Flowshe	Hoalth Mainto	nanco Modifiore		Status Logon				
Results Review	CAD-UPN	IC		Overdue	Nue On	Ø Due Soon	_s [®] Postponed	
Proxy Access	Colonosco	ppy 5 Yr		Definitions	_			
Flowsheets	Dexa Sca Diabetic E	ve Exam 2 Yr		Completed:	Done with the require	d satisfactions		
Medications	History of	Diabetes		Addressed:	Overridden with the in	ntention of not completing	the topic	
Order Entry	Mammogr Mammogr	am 2 Yr am Diagnostic		Aged Out:	No longer eligible bas	ed on patient's age to cor	nplete this topic	
Under Elitiy	PAP Sme	ar 6 Mo		Override Type	Abbreviations			
Health Maintena	Health Mainte	nance Plans		Done Pry Comp	Done Previously completed			
Education	ADVANC	DIRECTIVES		SERIES	Series Completed			
Travel Screen	CAD-UPN COLONO	SCOPY 5 YEAR		COMPL	Mat Applicable			
FYI	DEXA SC	AN 5 YEAR		(N/S)	Reason not specified			
	DIABETE	S RETINAL EXAM 2 YR S URINE		Declined	Declined			
·	DIABETIC	CREATININE		(inactive)	D			
More Activities	DIABETIC	FOOT EXAM		Postponed	Postponed			
()) 📀 🖬 🗪 🛛	🗞 💽 💌				▲ 1 al (10:50 PM 10/27/2015

🖛 Hyperspace - DE	RM ST MARGARET	S HBC - e1prd11/PRDAPP1 - UPMC Prod	uction - LAURA K	FERRIS - FERRILK		Results Staff Mess	age Rx Auth Result Note	s Canceled Ord	• <u>- 8 ×</u>
Epic - 🖓	📫 F 🏠 Home	🔇 Schedule 🗳 In Basket 🗗 Review	မှိ Encounter 🍒	🖁 Tel Call 😫 Refill Enc 🖩	🖥 Patient Lists 🔵 Clinica	l Links 👻 🔁 Support	🔹 🔌 🖉 👗 Link Activ	re 👻 🎒 Print 👻 🔒 See	cure 🙎 Log Out
🟠 🖴 👗 T	est,Test	×						EpicCare	Search
Female, 40 year ol	d, 08/15/1975	Allergies: Sulfa	a (Sulfonamide	Patient Messages: 🚘	PCP: TANZER, F	PETER P MyUPMC: Inactive			
Test, Test (0	1602/9/4)	Health Mainte	nance		Pri Ins: None	Phone: H: 888-888-	8888		2 Class X
									Close X
Chart Review	_s [©] <u>P</u> ostpone y	<u>Override</u> X Remove Override // E	Edit Modifiers	Report 💮 Update HM	Document Past Immun	ization			
SnapShot	Due Date	Topic	Date	e Completed					
Problem List	2/6/2014	TETANUS DIPHTHERIA	2/6/2	2004					
History	9/3/2014	PAP SMEAR 6 MO	3/3/2	2014 (Done)					
Allergies	3/3/2015	LIPID PROFILE 1Y	<u>3/3/2</u>	2014					
Immunizations	S 3/4/2015	MAMMOGRAM, DIAGNOSTIC	<u>3/4/2</u>	<u>2014</u>	11/13/2013 (Prv				
Demographics	3/4/2015	FULL BODY SKIN EXAM	3/4/2	2014 (SCRIPT GIVEN)					
Letters	S 3/13/2015	DIABETIC FOOT EXAM	3/13	/2014 (Done)					
Audiogram	3/5/2016		11/1	ZIZUIZ					
Growth Chart	9/12/2017			nance Override - FULL	BODY SKIN EXAM				
Synopsis	12/12/2017	DEXA SCAN 5 YEAR	Reason:	Done	Done				-
Review Flowshe			Satisfied on:	10/27/2015	Today				
Results Review	Health Mainte	nance Modifiers	Comment:				Due Seen	@ Postpopod	
Proxy Access	Colonosco	opy 5 Yr				Assent	al Due Soon	⊒,- Postponeu	
Flowsheets	Dexa Sca	in 5 Yr Fye Eyam 2 Yr				<u>A</u> ccept <u>C</u> anc			
Medications	History of	Diabetes			Addressed:	Overridden with the in	tention of not completing t	the topic	
Order Entry	Mammogi Mammogi	ram 2 Yr ram. Diagnostic			Aged Out:	No longer eligible bas	ed on patient's age to com	plete this topic	
Health Maintona	PAP Sme	ar 6 Mo			Override Typ	be Abbreviations			
Education	Health Mainte	nance Plans			Prv Comp	Previously completed			
Education Travel Care an	ADVANCI CAD-UPN	E DIRECTIVES IC			SERIES	Series Completed			
Traver Screen	COLONO	SCOPY 5 YEAR			NA	Not Applicable			
FYI	DIABETE	S RETINAL EXAM 2 YR			(N/S)	Reason not specified			
	DIABETE				(inactive)	Declined			
More Activities	DIABETIC	C FOOT EXAM			Postponeo	d Postponed			•
📀 🏉) 🜔 🖻 🕬						- i al (10:53 PM 10/27/2015

SCREENING RATES (2014)

- Screening was initiation in January 2014
- Screen-eligible population (327,569 unique individuals) defined as:
 - Adult age 35 years or older
 - Presenting for "routine office visit or physical"
 - Not screened in past 12 months
- Screening rates for 2014:
 - 52,882 unique individual screened (16.1% of adults age 35 years or older seen by a UPMC PCP for an office visit at least once in CY2014)
- Disposition of patients not screened
 - Primarily not noted by PCP (80% all eligible patients)
 - Low rate of patients noted as refusing screen (1.1%)

SCREENED POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS, 2014

Sex	Females = 57.2% Males = 42.8%
F:M ratio	1.3
Age	Median age (range) = 59 years (35-91) Mean age (SD) = 59.1 years (12)
Race	90.1% white 7.4% black 0.1% Asian

INFORMED TRAINING – UPTAKE AND IMPACT

- A total of 182 physicians completed INFORMED training
- Screening rates significantly higher among physicians who completed INFORMED
 - INFORMED trained physicians:
 - PCP of record for 10.8% of patients with at least one screen-eligible
 - Performed 29.7% of all screens
 - On average screened 44.2% of eligible patients they saw
 - NON- INFORMED trained physicians:
 - PCP of record for 89.2% of patients with at least one screen-eligible
 - Performed 70.3% of all screens
 - On average screened 12.7% of eligible patients they saw

50% of screens were performed by the 50 highest screeners

UPMC MELANOMA REGISTRY

	2011	2012	2013	2014
Total # primary	735	692	621	609
cutaneous melanomas				
# melanoma in situ	112 (15.2%)	165 (23.8%)	168 (27.1%)	146 (24.0%)
# invasive melanomas	457	364	298	297
with known Breslow				
depth				
Median Breslow depth	0.9 mm	0.92 mm	0.75 mm	0.65 mm
invasive melanoma	(0.1-9.67)	(0.1-9.5)	(0.1-9.2)	(0.1-9.0)
(with known depth)				

2014 MELANOMA CASES FROM TUMOR REGISTRY

	2014		Screened patients	
Total # primary	609	Total melanomas	21	
cutaneous melanomas		In situ lesion (% total)	8 (38%)	
# melanoma in situ	146 (24.0%)	Invasive lesions (% total)	13 (62%)	
		Median and Mean	Median = 0.35 mm	
# invasive melanomas	297	Breslow depth invasive melanoma	Mean = 0.49 mm (range = $0.2-1.5 \text{ mm}$)	
with known Breslow				
depth		13/21 melanomas (62%) detected by PC who did INFORMED training		
Median Breslow depth	0.65 mm			
invasive melanoma	(0.1-9.0)	5/21 melanomas (24%) detected by a c		
(with known depth)		among top 20 highest screeners		

MEASURING HARMS OF SCREENING FOR MELANOMA

Potential harms of screening:

Easier to measure

- Cost of screening (increase in skin procedures)
- Undue patient anxiety
- Scaring from biopsies

More challenging to measure

 False positives (can define as detection of "indolent" melanoma or as biopsy of benign lesions)

UPMC HEALTH PLAN- COST OF TREATING ADVANCED MELANOMA

Cost of drugs utilized to treat melanoma by the screen-eligible population Jan 1, 2012 – Dec 31, 2014

Drug Name	Unique Member	Total Scripts	Total Paid Amount
TEMOZOLOMIDE	160	2849	\$ 8,590,490
VEMURAFENIB	13	134	\$ 1,442,230
IPILIMUMAB	22	72	\$ 2,907,448
DABRAFENIB MESYLATE	5	78	\$ 652,132
TRAMETINIB DIMETHYL SULFOXIDE	4	66	\$ 644,361
PACLITAXEL	147	1397	\$ 113,105
CARBOPLATIN	173	1322	\$ 62,560
DACARBAZINE	3	9	\$ 764
TOTAL	-	5,927	\$ 14,413,090

UPMC HEALTH PLAN DATA

- About 30% of the screen-eligible population is covered by a UPMC Health Plan product (includes commercial, Medicare, and Medicaid plans)
- We estimate that about 15% of eligible UPMC Health Plan members were screened
- Among patients covered by UPMC Health Plan who are age 35 years and above who had a claim submitted with a CPT code for an office visit during the noted calendar year, can divide into two groups (group A or group B)
 - Group A = has a PCP in group encouraged to do INFORMED and screen (A1 = group with highest INFORMED training rate)
 - Group B = all other PCPs, not asked to do INFORMED or screen

	2012	2013	2014
GROUP A	80,539	86,215	89,507
- A1 ONLY	65,823	71,019	74,009
GROUP B	267,164	300,478	304,703

SKIN PROCEDURE RATES

- Unique members with at least one skin procedure in given year by provider group for members 35 years and over who had an eligible PCP visit
- Procedures defined as CPT code for a biopsy, a lesion shaving, an excision, Mohs surgery, destruction of a malignant lesion, destruction of a premalignant lesion (any diagnosis) or a sentinel node excision (latter only if with a melanoma diagnosis)

	2012	2013	2014	% CHANGE (2012-13)	Ρ	% CHANGE (2013-14)	Ρ
GROUP A	8,352 (10.4%)	9,653 (11.2%)	10,005 (11.2%)	0.8%	<0.01	0%	0.9
- A1 ONLY	6,880 (10.5%)	8,001 (11.3%)	8,318 (11.2%)	0.8%	<0.01	0%	0.87
GROUP B	26,296 (9.8%)	30,611 (10.2%)	29,542 (9.7%)	0.3%	<0.01	-0.5%	<0.01

DERMATOLOGY VISITS

Unique members with at least one claim for a visit to a dermatologist in given year by provider group for members 35 years and over who had an eligible PCP visit

	2012	2013	2014	% CHANGE (2012-13)	% CHANGE (2013-14)
GROUP A	13,364 (16.6%)	14,979 (17.4%)	16,076 (18.0%)	0.8%	0.6%
- A1 ONLY	10,915 (16.6%)	12,341 (17.4%)	13,338 (18.0%)	0.8%	0.6%
GROUP B	32,844 (12.3%)	37,700 (12.5%)	38,521 (12.6%)	0.2%	0.1%

CLAIMS ASSOCIATED WITH A DIAGNOSIS OF MELANOMA

Unique individuals with at least one claim with a primary diagnosis of melanoma for given year by provider group for members 35 years and over who had an eligible PCP visit

	2012	2013	2014
GROUP A	292 (0.36%)	282 (0.33%)	323 (0.36%)
- A1 ONLY	249 (0.38%)	236 (0.33%)	270 (0.36%)
GROUP B	724 (0.27%)	818 (0.27%)	872 (0.29%)

Identified Skin Procedure	% of Group A and			
Groups	Group B N	Vembers		
Groups	GROUP A	GROUP B		
Biopsy	8.4%	5.0%		
Lesion Shaving	3.4%	1.1%		
Excision	28.5%	29.6%		
Mohs Surgery	9.9%	4.4%		
Destruction Malignant	1.2%	0.8%		
Destruction Premalignant	3.7%	1.9%		
Sentinel Lymph Node	5.9%	8.6%		

MEASURING PATIENT OUTCOMES AFTER SCREENING

Telephone survey ongoing among patients who were screened to determine

- Embarrassment due to screening
- Anxiety about being diagnosed with skin cancer, getting skin biopsy
- General symptoms of anxiety (worry, sleep loss, disturbance of relationships)
- If referred for biopsy, what is plan to follow through and what was outcome?
- Patient perception of disfigurement due to biopsy
- Likelihood of
 - undergoing future screening
 - performing self-examination of skin
 - using sun protection strategies
- Repeated in 6 months to see if these factors persist

LESSONS LEARNED

- Multidisciplinary team is critical (dermatology, primary care, melanoma specialists, informatics, public health, statistician, payer representative, medical administration, EHR representative)
 - Early involvement of all from the start of the planning process
 - May be easier to roll out with a pilot group than on a larger scale
 - Do you have dermatologists to see the screen-positive patients?
- Maximize PCP involvement and buy in
 - Consider how to track which PCPs are asked to train and who completes training
 - Determine if you want only trained vs all PCPs to screen
 - Consider some sort of incentive other than the intrinsic reward of doing what is right
 - Realize you are asking them to do a screening not recommended by the USPSTF
 - Realize they are asked to address so many issues in a routine visit and you are adding to it
 - Report back on successes and results periodically
 - Ask for and use feedback to maintain interest and motivation

LESSONS LEARNED

- Figure out which outcomes you want to measure and decide how to do so before you start
 - What defines a successful intervention and how will you measure it?
 - Do you have a way to measure melanoma mortality, if this is the most important outcome?
 - Determine what defines a screen-eligible patient and visit
 - If possible engineer in simple way to note if screen was done, if a suspicious lesion was identified
- The more closed the system, the easier it will be to track outcomes
 - It is very difficult to track melanomas biopsied outside the system and this will result in under reporting of melanomas diagnosed
- Consider relative merits of quality initiative vs. IRB-approved research and value of a combined strategy
- Don't let perfect be the enemy of good
 - Keep the process as simple as possible from training, to exam, to documentation, to data collection

THE TEAM

- University of Pittsburgh/UPMC
 - John Kirkwood, MD
 - Laura Ferris, MD, PhD
 - Francis Solano, MD
 - Melissa Saul, MS
 - Steve Perkins, MD
 - Steven Shapiro, MD
 - Valerie Trott
 - Kathleen Slavish
- Brown University
 - Martin Weinstock, MD, PhD
 - Patricia Risica, PhD
- Harvard
 - Alan Geller, MPH, RN