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Background

- Socioeconomic disparities exist in the receipt of definitive local-regional treatment of breast cancer
- Quality of patient-provider communication contributes as socioeconomically disadvantaged describe:
  - Less understanding of treatment choice
  - Less likely to recall discussing a choice between options
  - Less active participation in decision-making
- A shared decision making intervention can improve quality of care in these vulnerable patients by
  1) imparting knowledge
  2) empowering patients to participate
Conceptual Model

**PRE-DISPOSING FACTORS**
- Patient characteristics
- Power imbalance
- Trust

**INTERACTIONAL CONTEXT FACTORS**
- Interpersonal characteristics of the clinician
- Terminology used by clinicians

**KNOWLEDGE**
- Options
- Personal values and preferences

**POWER**
- Permission to participate in decision
- Perceived ability to influence encounter
- Confidence in own knowledge

**CAPACITY TO ENGAGE IN SDM**

**PREPARATION FOR SDM ENCOUNTER**
- Expectation of the outcome of being involved in SDM
- Perceived need for preparation
- Providing information about options
- Decision support

**PREPARATION FOR SDM PROCESS**
Specific Aims

1. To evaluate the effectiveness of an intervention to provide a breast cancer surgery decision aid on the extent of patients’ engagement in decision making in clinics with a high proportion of socioeconomically disadvantaged patients.

2. To identify characteristics of patients for whom the intervention to provide a decision aid is ineffective for increasing engagement and identify areas for future intervention in these most vulnerable patients.

3. To determine the proportion of patients reached by the implementation of a decision aid in clinics with a high proportion of socioeconomically disadvantaged patients and determine clinic contextual characteristics associated with high and low reach.
Study Overview

- Hybrid effectiveness-implementation study within NCORP
  - 4 NCORP sites
  - 10 surgical practices, 10-30 surgeons
- Stepped wedge (pre-post) design

Decision Aid Implementation in Clinic

- Patient scheduled into clinic and offered decision aid
- Obtain written consent in clinic with brief patient questionnaire
- Audio-record consult
- Surgeon consult
- Patient Follow-up Survey
- Qualitative Interviews with Patient, Surgeon and Clinic Stakeholders
Study Outcomes

- Effectiveness Outcomes (Aim 1)
  - Power (primary)
    - Perceived Efficacy in Patient-Physician Interactions Questionnaire (PEPPI-5)
    - Street Patient Activation Coding System
  - Knowledge (secondary)
    - Breast cancer surgery options
    - Values & preferences

- Heterogeneity of Treatment Effect Analysis (Aim 2)
Study Outcomes

- Implementation Outcome- Reach (Aim 3)
  - Proportion of patients who accept the decision aid
  - Proportion of patients who review the decision aid
- Regression model to identify contextual characteristics associated with high and low reach
  - Patient mix, surgeon characteristics, clinic resources, etc.
Design Considerations

- Standard decision aid
- Will surgeons accept a decision aid?
  - UW pilot study
- Web-based platform
Anticipated Study Outcomes

- Develop a tailored approach to shared decision making that channels clinic resources to those most vulnerable patients
  - Identify contextual characteristics associated with the highest reach
  - Identify characteristics of patients for whom the decision aid alone is ineffective
  - Identify additional areas for future intervention that can be combined with the decision aid to improve engagement
Questions