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Objectives of Presentation

1. Discuss access to breast reconstruction
2. Acquire knowledge about the proposed PhD thesis aimed at exploring access to breast reconstruction in Ontario
3. Discuss strengths and limitations of proposal
Breast Cancer
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1 in 9 Canadian women
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Can lead to body image issues and a decline in quality of life
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Access to Breast Reconstruction

Immediate breast reconstruction rates: (% of mastectomy)

Canada:
- 3.4% in 1990
- 9% in 2002
- 16% in 2012

United States:
- 15% in 1998
- 38% in 2008
Barriers to Access

Patient
• older age
• rural geographic location
• immigrant status

Physician
• no referral to plastic surgeons

System
• non-teaching hospitals
• lack of operating room time
Study Rationale

- We are lacking a comprehensive summary of the barriers to breast reconstruction.
- The current literature fails to capture an understanding of how and why breast cancer patients experience barriers to access to BR
  - how these barriers may differ by institution or their location in the province of Ontario.
- Without a thorough understanding of these barriers, no effective interventions can be designed to improve access to BR.
Aims

• **Aim 1:** Comprehensive review of the literature to summarize the currently known barriers to breast reconstruction.

• **Aim 2:** Increase our understanding of barriers to BR in Ontario through qualitative research.

• **Aim 3:** Design interventions by engaging with key stakeholders through a one day end of project knowledge translation meeting.
Aim 1

Systematic Review
Records identified through database searching (n = 6497)

Additional records identified through other sources (n = 0)

Records after duplicates removed (n = 4282)

Records screened (n = 4282)

Records excluded (n = 3972)

Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = 310)

Full-text articles excluded, with reasons (n = 211)

Studies included in qualitative synthesis (n = 99)
Access to Care Framework

Penchansky, Thomas, and MacKillop Access to Care Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability</strong></td>
<td>Relationship of the volume and type of existing services to the patient’s needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong></td>
<td>Relationship between the location of supply and the location of patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accommodation</strong></td>
<td>Relationship between how the supply resources are organized and the patients’ ability to accommodate to these factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability</strong></td>
<td>Relationship of prices of services to the patients’ ability to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptability</strong></td>
<td>Relationship of patients’ attitudes about providers to the characteristics of providers, as well as to provider attitudes about acceptable personal characteristics of patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong></td>
<td>Awareness of services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results - Systematic Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>BR Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability</strong></td>
<td>+ Teaching or academic hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Private hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ National cancer institution center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong></td>
<td>+ Women living in urban locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Greater distance to a plastic surgeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accommodation</strong></td>
<td>- Reduced access to operating theatre time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability</strong></td>
<td>+ Private health insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Patients in lower socio-economic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptability</strong></td>
<td>- Older or male surgeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Concerns that BR may mask the detection of local recurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Younger, more educated, married, Caucasian, English speaking patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong></td>
<td>- Patient not aware of the option of BR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of timely information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results - Systematic Review

Availability
- Volume at hospital
- Type of hospital (private, academic, National cancer institution center)

Institution
- Availability of reconstructive services
- Access to the operating room

Accommodation
- Breast reconstruction

Patient
- Geographic location
- Distance to BR

Accessibility
- Belief that BR interferes with BC treatment
- Selection of patients for discussion of BR and/or referral to a plastic surgeon

Awareness
- Knowledge of the option to undergo BR

Acceptability
- Informing patients of the option of BR

Affordability
- Health insurance
- Socioeconomic status

Physician

Number of plastic surgeons at institution
- Plastic surgery department
Aim 2

Qualitative Research
Methods - A. Pilot and B. Multisite Interviews

• Semi-structured interviews, 30-60 minutes length
• **Participant**: Breast cancer patient, clinician, administrator
• Purposive and snowball sampling
• **Sample size**: *54 total or until saturation achieved*
  • 3 breast cancer patients, 6 sites: 18 total
  • 3 physicians, 6 sites: 18 total
  • 3 administrators, 6 sites: 18 total
• **Theoretical Framework**: 
  • Constructivist paradigm
  • Qualitative descriptive methodology
• **Analysis**: Thematic analysis
Methods - Multisite Interview Sites

- **High Volume** (> 20 cases/year)
  - Toronto
  - London

- **Medium Volume** (10-20 cases/year)
  - Ottawa
  - Hamilton

- **Low Volume** (< 10 cases/year)
  - Thunder Bay
  - Windsor
Methods - Interview Guides

Patient
- Discuss experience with treatment of breast cancer, emphasizing views on BR.

Physician
- Discuss current practice in breast cancer treatment, with emphasis on personal beliefs and values of BR

Administrator
- Discuss current institutional breast cancer treatment regimens, specifically, availability and structure of the BR program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patient interest / desire</strong></td>
<td>“I pushed for immediate reconstruction when the breast was going to be removed” (001 Patient)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the patient’s desire is the most important part of this” (003 Surgeon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual view on ideal candidate</strong></td>
<td>“some patients are interested, but they’re not really good candidates” (003 Surgeon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organized group / teamwork</strong></td>
<td>“we have a good group: we have good surgeons, and we have a good clinical coordinator, and I think almost everyone that really wants it and are candidates for it, get it” (003 Surgeon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we get in together and strategize and work together” (002 Administrator)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aim 3

End of Project Knowledge Translation Meeting
Methods - Knowledge Translation Meeting

• One centralized provincial stakeholder meeting
• Engage with key stakeholders to develop interventions to target the identified barriers to BR
• Modified Delphi Technique to achieve consensus on the barriers to be prioritized and addressed as well as select appropriate and feasible interventions to target these
• Participants: 15 total
  • Breast cancer patients, physicians, administrators
  • Policy makers, key partner organization
• Goal: Produce a summary report of identified challenges, gaps and potential solutions
Limitations

• Recruitment of participants
  • Patients from BR waitlist
    ✓ Will aim to select participants with varying opinions, from geographically diverse regions, with different beliefs and values

• Bias towards breast reconstruction
  ✓ Expert multidisciplinary thesis committee with balanced and neutral view on this topic
  ✓ Use of reflexivity
Implications

• A thorough understanding of barriers to BR is needed in order to engage with key stakeholders to develop interventions to improve access to BR.

• The ultimate goal is to ensure that access to BR is equitable, timely, and local across Ontario.
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