Breast Cancer Risk Management Following Universal Risk Stratification:

Impact of Risk Communication on High-Risk Clinic Visits, Chemoprevention, Genetic Counseling, and Genetic Testing

Claire C. Conley, PhD,¹ Bianca M. Augusto, BS,¹ Jennifer D. Garcia, BA,¹ Stephanie N. Taylor, BS,¹ McKenzie McIntyre, BS,¹ Richard G. Roetzheim, MD, MPH,^{1,2}

Kimberly Funaro, MD,¹ Travis Gerke, PhD,¹ Jongphil Kim, PhD,¹ Bethany L. Niell, MD, PhD,¹ Susan T. Vadaparampil, PhD, MPH¹

¹Moffitt Cancer Center, Tampa, Florida; ²University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida

Background

- A subset of women carry elevated risk for breast cancer (lifetime risk ≥20%).
- These women have options for managing their risk, including:
 - Attending a specialty high-risk clinic
 - Risk-reducing medication (chemoprevention)
 - Genetic risk assessment (counseling and/or testing).
- Unfortunately, these services are dramatically underutilized.
 - High-risk clinic appointment: 14%
 - Chemoprevention: 12-17% of eligible women
 - Genetic testing: 14-51% of eligible women
- Screening mammography represents one potential opportunity to evaluate and communicate breast cancer risk stratification information and risk-based recommendations to patients and providers. This approach is known as universal risk stratification.
- For screening mammography patients, Moffitt Cancer Center (MCC) recently implemented universal risk stratification with automated calculation of estimated lifetime risk scores using three models: Tyrer-Cuzick7(TC7), BRCAPRO, and modified Gail.
- The purpose of the present study is to characterize uptake of high-risk clinic visits, chemoprevention, genetic counseling, and genetic testing among following universal risk stratification.

Methods

- Women presenting for screening mammography underwent universal risk stratification as part of routine clinical care.
- Estimated lifetime risk was computed using the modified Gail, Tyrer-Cuzick (TC7), and BRCAPRO models.
- Numerical risk information was sent to referring providers via the electronic medical record.
- Women received a mailed letter with categorical risk information ("average" or "elevated"). Women with elevated risk also received contact information for the institution's high risk breast clinic.
- High (≥20% lifetime) risk women (n=153) were approached and a subset (n=71, 46% accrual rate) consented to a follow-up study.

Participant Characteristics (N=71)	Mean (SD) or %
Age (years)	52.3 (8.4)
Race: Caucasian	90%
Ethnicity: Hispanic/Latina	11%
Partner Status: Married/Cohabitating	79%
Education: ≥College	81%
Employment Status: Currently Working	71%
Household Income: ≥\$70,000/year	68%
Health Insurance Type: Private	74%

Measures

- At 6-months post-screening, women self-reported whether they had:
 - a) Attended a high-risk clinic appointment
 - b) Initiated chemoprevention medication
 - c) Attended genetic counseling
 - d) Received genetic testing

Results

- A total of 66 women (93%) completed the 6-month follow-up.
- Seven patients (11%) reported uptake of any BC risk management behaviors.

Uptake of Risk-Reducing Behavior (N=66)	%
Appointment with high risk specialist	
Yes, attended.	6%
No, but I have scheduled an appointment.	8%
No, and I will not schedule an appointment.	85%
Don't know	1%
Taken tamoxifen or raloxifene*	
Yes	2%
No	97%
Genetic counseling appointment*	
Yes, attended.	5%
No, but I intend to.	6%
No, and I do not intend to.	88%
Completed genetic testing*	
Yes	5%
No	94%

*One patient missing data

Conclusions

- The rates of breast cancer risk management behaviors observed in this study are lower than the rates previously observed in the literature.
 - This may be due to the follow-up time point selected.
 - Extended follow-up is necessary to understand uptake of risk-management strategies in high risk women unaffected by breast cancer.
- Universal risk stratification alone may not lead to increased uptake of breast cancer risk management behaviors.
 - Interventions may be needed to increase the uptake of risk-appropriate behaviors in the growing group of women identified as high risk following implementation of universal risk stratification programs.



Special thanks to the patients who participated in this study for their support and assistance, as well as the trainees and staff of the CRISP research group, Comprehensive Breast Program, Department of Diagnostic Imaging, Divisions of Health Outcomes and Behavior, and Division of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics.