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Why Cancer Clinical Trials?

• Essential to
  – Test the safety and efficacy of new treatments
  – Translate knowledge into tangible benefits for patients
  – State-of-the-science treatment for eligible individuals

• IOM/NIH: every individual with cancer should have access to high quality clinical trials

• So why are so few eligible patients enrolled?
  – And why are minority populations underrepresented?
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Research Summary (1)

• Most eligible cancer patients are never informed about trials
  – Physicians unaware of trials, too busy, not interested, don’t feel supported, worry about patient trust, biases

• When physicians offer a trial, most patients agree
  – Both minority and majority populations
  – Agreement is higher when physicians use patient-centered communication and make an explicit recommendation

Research Summary (2)

• When trials are discussed, physician language is often confusing and/or coercive
  – Technical language, no mention of purpose, maximize benefits, minimize risks

• For trial discussions with Black (v. White) patients:
  – Visits are shorter
  – Fewer mentions of the trial are made
  – Less information re: key elements of consent is provided

Eggly Pat Educ Couns 2008; Barton Writ Comm 2009; Eggly Health Expect 2013
Black-White Differences in Trial Discussions

Number of Times Elements of Consent Mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Participation</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eggly Health Expect 2013
Oncologist Training Objectives

- Improve *knowledge and attitudes*:
  - Knowledge: Role of oncologist in trial accrual
  - Attitudes: Increase positive attitudes (clinical trials are important); reduce negative attitudes (trials are a burden)

- Improve *communication*:
  - Provide background and real-life examples of
    - *Informational* communication (e.g., key elements)
    - *Relational communication* (e.g., patient-centered, shared decision making)

Albrecht J Clin Onc 2008; Eggly in prep
Aims

• Aim #1: Re-enact videos
  – Select, re-enact video segments illustrating trial-related communication (informational and relational)
• Aim #2: Assess re-enactments
  – Obtain stakeholders’ perspectives on suitability for training on oncologists
  – Compare re-enactments to originals
Procedures: Aim 1

• **Data**: Videos from prior study on communication and clinical trials if had an explicit offer of a trial (n=39)

• **Selection of segments**: Research assistants observed videos and selected segments based on:
  – Relational Communication: high- and low-quality
  – Informational Communication: key elements of consent, side effects, and randomization

• **Re-enactment**: Segments (n=11) and “mashups” (n=2) transcribed verbatim, professionally re-enacted
Sample Re-enactment

• Watch for
  – Relational and informational communication
  – Any interesting aspects of the interaction
Procedures: Aim 2

• **Evaluation:**
  – Stakeholders’ perceptions (Med oncs, cancer survivors n=19)
  – Fidelity of re-enactments (Trained research assistants n=15)

• To what extent do you think…. (1=low; 5=high)
  – The segment was believable, informative, realistic, valuable for training
  – The doctor used lay language, used clear and easy explanations, was informative and thorough, seemed to care, encouraged questions
  – The discussion included information about the trial’s purpose, risks, benefits, and voluntariness
Results: Stakeholders’ Perspectives

- **Believable**
  - Physicians (n=9): 4.50
  - Survivors (n=10): 4.30

- **Informative**
  - Physicians (n=9): 4.20
  - Survivors (n=10): 4.00

- **Realistic**
  - Physicians (n=9): 4.40
  - Survivors (n=10): 4.20

- **Valuable for Training**
  - Physicians (n=9): 4.10
  - Survivors (n=10): 4.00

- **Lay Language**
  - Physicians (n=9): 4.00
  - Survivors (n=10): 4.00

- **Clear and Easy Explanation**
  - Physicians (n=9): 3.80
  - Survivors (n=10): 3.80

- **Informative and Thorough**
  - Physicians (n=9): 3.80
  - Survivors (n=10): 3.80

- **Doctor seemed to care**
  - Physicians (n=9): 4.40
  - Survivors (n=10): 4.30

**Quality of Segment**

**Quality of Physician Communication**
Results: Re-enactments v. Originals
MD Informational Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Re-enactment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doc Explained Purpose</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc Explained Risks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc Explained Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc Explained Voluntariness</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose vs. Risks vs. Benefits vs. Voluntariness

Bar chart showing comparison of original and re-enactment for each aspect of documentation: explained purpose, explained risks, explained benefits, and explained voluntariness.
Results: Re-enactments v. Originals: MD Relational Communication

- Lay Language* (4.2 vs. 3.7, p<.05)
- Clear Explanations* (4.3 vs. 3.7, p<.05)
- Informative, Thorough* (4.1 vs. 3.2)
- Seemed to Care* (3.9 vs. 3.5)
- Encouraged Questions (2.8 vs. 2.5)

*P<.05
Conclusions and Next Steps

• Re-enactments are appropriate for training
  – Future research is needed to assess effectiveness

• Integrate re-enactments into training module
  – Relevant to clinical practice
  – Interactive & engaging; encourage critical thinking & reflection
  – Web-based; access from anywhere; CME-bearing

• Pilot-test for feasibility, acceptability, and effectiveness on oncologists’
  – *Attitudes* about trials
  – *Rates of trial offers* to eligible patients
  – Quality of communication during trial offers
  – Rates of *informed* participation in diverse population
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