

Lung Cancer Screening in the National Cancer Institute Community Oncology Research Program: Availability and Service Organization

Ruth C. Carlos, MD, MS^{a,b}, JoRean D. Sicks, MS^c, Caroline Chiles, MD^d, Lucy Gansauer, MSN, RN^e, Charles S. Kamen, PhD, MPH^f, Anne E. Kazak, PhD, ABPP^g, Heather B. Neuman, MD, MS^h, Joseph M. Unger, PhD, MSⁱ, Kathryn E. Weaver, PhD, MPH^j

Abstract

Purpose: Annual low-dose CT (LDCT) for lung screening in high-risk individuals decreases both lung cancer-specific mortality and all-cause mortality. Community oncology practice networks constituting the National Cancer Institute Community Oncology Research Program (NCORP) conduct clinical trials across the cancer spectrum. The authors report access to and characteristics of LDCT screening for lung cancer in these community oncology practices.

Methods: A landscape capacity assessment was conducted in 2017 across the NCORP network. The primary outcome was the proportion of adult oncology practice groups offering LDCT lung screening on site. The secondary outcomes were the proportion of those screening services (1) with radiologist participation in service management and (2) offered at ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Centers.

Results: Fifty-two percent of components and subcomponents responded to at least some portion of the assessment, representing 217 practice groups. Analyzing the 211 adult oncology practice groups responding to the primary question, 73% offered lung screening services on site. Radiologists participated in managing 69% of these services. Forty-seven percent were offered in ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Centers. Minority and underserved practice groups were less likely to offer lung screening; however, this association dissipated when analyses focused on practices within the United States. Safety net and Critical Access Hospital designation increased the likelihood of screening availability.

Conclusions: The majority of community oncology practice groups within the NCORP offered lung screening on site, although radiologist participation in service management and ACR Lung Cancer Screening Center designation, markers of service quality, were more variable.

Key Words: Lung cancer screening, LDCT, NCORP, disparities, safety net

J Am Coll Radiol 2019;16:427-434. Copyright © 2019 Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of American College of Radiology

^aDepartment of Radiology, University of Michigan Health System, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

^bInstitute for Healthcare Policy and Innovation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

^cECOG-ACRIN Biostatistics and Data Management Center, Brown University Center for Statistical Sciences, Providence, Rhode Island.

^dDepartment of Radiology, Wake Forest University Health Sciences Center, Medical Center Boulevard, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

^eSpartanburg Medical Center, Spartanburg, South Carolina.

^fCancer Control Unit, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York.

^gNemours Center for Healthcare Delivery Science, Nemours Children's Health System, Wilmington, Delaware.

^hDepartment of Surgery, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

ⁱSWOG Statistics and Data Management Center, Public Health Sciences, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, Washington.

^jDepartment of Social Sciences and Health Policy, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Medical Center Boulevard, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Corresponding author and reprints: Ruth C. Carlos, Department of Radiology, University of Michigan Health System, 1500 E Medical Center Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-0030; e-mail: rcarlos@med.umich.edu.

The research reported in this publication was supported in part by the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health under award numbers UG1CA189828 (R.C.C., J.D.S., and C.C.), and UG1CA189961 (C.S.K.), and UG1CA189824 (K.E.W.). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. Dr Carlos receives salary support from *JACR* and research support from the Neiman Health Policy Institute. All other authors state that they have no conflict of interest related to the material discussed in this article.

INTRODUCTION

Lung cancer screening by low-dose CT (LDCT) effectively decreases both the lung cancer–specific mortality and all-cause mortality [1,2] of this leading cause of cancer deaths [3]. This mortality benefit underscores the importance of rapid diffusion of lung cancer screening to practice, including community oncology practices, at which 77% of patients with cancer receive their care [4]. The number of screening sites has increased rapidly from 203 in 2014 [5] to 2,423 in 2017 [6]. Eberth et al's [5] 2014 analysis noted gaps in LDCT screening availability in several high-risk states. Although data from our group indicate a reasonable match between screening facilities and populations at risk, screening sites are not evenly distributed, increasing the potential for geographic disparities [6].

The National Cancer Institute (NCI) Community Oncology Research Program (NCORP) [7] is composed of 34 community sites and 12 minority and underserved (MU) sites. NCORP defines a community site as a consortium of community hospitals and/or oncology practices or a community-based integrated health care system. NCORP sites are located in the United States and Puerto Rico. A MU community site is defined as a consortium of community hospitals and/or oncology practices, a public hospital, or an academic medical center that has a patient population with at least 30% racial/ethnic minorities or rural residents [7]. Sites in the United States represent both community and MU sites, whereas the single site in Puerto Rico is an MU site. This broad network includes independent community practices, system-affiliated practices, and safety-net institutions, making NCORP a unique research setting to evaluate multilevel organizational structures and contextual factors influencing the process and outcome of cancer care [8]. Tasked with conducting clinical trials across the cancer spectrum from prevention to diagnosis, these community oncology sites serve as key providers of screening services. However, LDCT lung cancer screening service availability in this setting, as well as quality indicators of the screening service, may lag behind need and potentially contribute to disparities to access. This service disparity may be intensified by potential differences in lung screening coverage and public health prioritization in the United States compared with Puerto Rico. We aimed to assess the availability of lung cancer screening within the NCORP and quality indicators of this screening service, including designation as an ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Center, participation in a lung screening registry, and radiologist involvement in the management of service delivery.

METHODS

Survey Population

The 46 NCORP sites, community sites ($n = 34$), and MU community sites ($n = 12$), consisting of 943 components and subcomponents, were identified [7]. NCORP sites are located in the United States and Puerto Rico. These community and MU community sites include components, defined as a hospital, a cancer center, a physician practice, or another institution at which patients and participants are enrolled in NCI-approved clinical trials open to the NCORP. Subcomponents are defined as a practice or organization that contributes to the overall accrual of a component but is located in a separate geographic location, is part of the component's business entity, and is managed by the component [7]. All components and subcomponents were eligible to complete the 2017 landscape assessment, but only 650 indicated an interest in participating. Practices that identified themselves as solely children's oncology practices (ie, children's hospitals with pediatric inpatient beds and no adult inpatient beds) were excluded from this analysis.

Survey Design

Designed to evaluate the capacity within NCORP to conduct cancer care delivery research, the initial landscape assessment was fielded in 2015. A second landscape assessment, similarly designed by a multidisciplinary committee assembled by the NCI's Division of Cancer Prevention, queried institutional characteristics (eg, organizational ownership, practice size), clinical staff characteristics, and capacity to provide diagnostic, therapeutic, and supportive oncologic services (eg, lung cancer screening, genetic testing, nutritional counseling). This latter survey was fielded by Wake Forest Research Base in 2017, using the same methods previously described [9]. Briefly, principal investigators at each of the NCORP sites identified points of contact at each component and subcomponent responsible for survey completion. Multiple components or subcomponents could be designated as a single operational practice unit or "practice group" sharing common care practices and resources. Using practice grouping patterns identified in the responders, nonresponding components and subcomponents were manually assigned into similar practice groupings; however, the large majority (71%) of practice groups did represent a single component or subcomponent.

Survey Analysis

The primary outcome was the proportion of adult oncology practices that offered on-site LDCT screening for lung cancer. Secondary outcomes assessed were the proportion of lung screening services that (1) involved a radiologist in service management and (2) were offered at an ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Center. Independent correlates of the primary and secondary outcomes included organizational characteristics, such as MU community site designation, practice size, and ownership.

For the primary and secondary outcomes, “don’t know” and “no” responses were grouped together. For the primary outcome, practices with nonresponses ($n = 6$) were excluded from further analyses. For any other variables missing data, including the secondary outcomes and any predictor variables, missing at random was assumed, and a complete case analysis was performed. Logistic regression was used to assess the impact of practice characteristics on the primary and secondary outcomes. A multivariate model was performed, including all variables significant in bivariate models. Backward variable selection was performed to obtain a parsimonious multivariate model. Variables were removed until the remaining variables were significant at $P < .05$. Organization type, estimated number of adult beds, and number of oncology physicians were included as class variables with 3 degrees of freedom each.

Given differences in health insurance coverage and the emphasis on lung cancer prevention rather than screening [10], the analyses just described were replicated in a subpopulation of NCORP practices within the 50 states, excluding Puerto Rico.

All analyses were conducted using SAS (SAS Institute, Cary, North Carolina).

RESULTS

Of the 943 NCORP components and subcomponents, 493 (52%) responded to at least some of the survey, representing 217 practice groups. Of the 650 components and subcomponents that expressed interest in participating, 76% responded to at least some of the survey. Of these, 6 did not respond to the primary outcome and were excluded from subsequent analyses, leaving 211 evaluable adult oncology practices.

Adult Oncology Practice Characteristics

Of the responding practices, 17.1% were affiliated with MU sites, 24.4% self-identified as safety-net hospitals, and 21.5% were affiliated with designated Critical Access

Hospitals. More than half (55.5%) were owned by large regional or multistate health systems, whereas 34.4% claimed independent ownership. The median number of oncologists at each practice was 9 (range, 0-203).

Capacity for On-Site LDCT Lung Cancer Screening

A majority of the oncology practices (73.0%) offered on-site LDCT for lung cancer screening (Table 1). Of these services, 47.4% were designated as ACR Lung Cancer Screening Centers, and 69.5% had radiologist involvement in lung cancer screening service management. Radiologists solely managed 34 services (22%) and participated in multidisciplinary management in 73 services (47%).

Of the 154 practices offering screening services on site, 98 (63.6%) participated in the ACR Lung Cancer Screening Registry (LCSR), the only registry approved by CMS for Medicare reimbursement [11]. Screening practices also participated in other registries, including the International Early Lung Cancer Action Program Registry [12] ($n = 3$ [1.9%]), their own institutional registries ($n = 25$ [16.2%]), or other registries ($n = 11$ [7.1%]). Twenty-nine (18.8%) did not indicate any registry participation.

Table 2 summarizes the bivariate analyses. In multivariate analyses, MU designation remained a significant negative correlate of on-site lung screening availability (adjusted odds ratio [OR], 0.35; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.13-0.95), whereas safety-net hospital self-identification (adjusted OR, 3.23; 95% CI, 1.02-10.20) and Critical Access Hospital affiliation (adjusted OR, 3.49; 95% CI, 1.11-10.95) were independently associated with increased likelihood of screening availability (Table 3). As a group, health maintenance organization, public, or university ownership decreased the likelihood of screening

Table 1. Proportion of National Cancer Institute Community Oncology Research Program adult oncology practices offering low-dose CT for lung cancer screening on site and characteristics of these screening services

Cancer Screening	n	Denominator*	%
Lung cancer screening offered	154	211	72.99
Radiologist involved in lung cancer screening service management	107	154	69.48
Service is an ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Center	73	154	47.40

*Denominators exclude those practices ($n = 6$) that did not respond to the item querying on-site availability of low-dose CT lung screening.

Table 2. Correlates of on-site availability of LDCT for lung cancer screening, radiologist involvement in lung screening service management, and service designation as an ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Center, under bivariate analyses

Organizational Characteristic	n*	%	LDCT for Lung Cancer Screening Available On Site, OR (95% CI)	Radiologist Involvement in Service Management, OR (95% CI)	ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Center, OR (95% CI)
NCORP minority or underserved site (n [†] = 211)	36	17.06	0.33 (0.16-0.70)	0.92 (0.33-2.60)	0.76 (0.28-2.01)
Primarily a safety-net hospital (n = 209)	51	24.40	2.91 (1.23-6.91)	1.02 (0.47-2.19)	1.40 (0.69-2.83)
Affiliated with a designated Critical Access Hospital (n = 209)	45	21.53	3.71 (1.39-9.95)	0.39 (0.18-0.84)	1.87 (0.90-3.90)
Organizational ownership (n = 209)					
Independently owned	72	34.45	Reference	Reference	Reference
Owned by large regional/multistate health system with a health plan	80	38.28	6.67 (2.89-15.36)	1.10 (0.48-2.49)	1.00 (0.45-2.20)
Owned by large regional/multistate health system without a health plan	36	17.22	4.23 (1.57-11.40)	3.50 (1.01-12.12)	0.88 (0.34-2.28)
HMO/payer owned	1	0.48			
Publicly owned	16	7.66	1.13 (0.42-3.01) [‡]	2.80 (0.53-14.62) [‡]	0.71 (0.19-2.65) [‡]
University owned	4	1.91			
Estimated number of adult beds (n = 171)					
0	3	1.75	Reference	Reference	Reference
1-250	73	42.69	14.5 (5.25-40.09)	2.14 (0.61-7.51)	2.24 (0.64-7.87)
251-450	39	22.81	18.13 (5.38-61.11)	6.64 (1.47-29.99)	0.73 (0.20-2.76)
>450	56	32.75	6.82 (2.95-15.77)	1.33 (0.39-4.47)	1.72 (0.50-5.90)
Number of oncology physicians (n = 210)					
0-6	80	38.10	Reference	Reference	Reference
7-11	45	21.43	0.94 (0.44-1.99)	1.19 (0.45-3.17)	2.25 (0.88-5.75)
12-22	45	21.43	3.70 (1.40-9.78)	1.27 (0.52-3.09)	2.42 (1.03-5.69)
≥23	40	19.04	4.09 (1.45-11.59)	2.33 (0.85-6.38)	1.33 (0.55-3.22)

Note: CI = confidence interval; HMO = health maintenance organization; LDCT = low-dose CT; NCORP = National Cancer Institute Community Oncology Research Program; OR = odds ratio.

*The number of practices with the characteristic is provided in the column.

[†]The number of practices providing organization characteristics is in parentheses.

[‡]OR comparing the combination of HMO/payer owned and publicly owned and university owned compared with independently owned.

Table 3. Adjusted OR of availability of lung cancer screening, radiologist involvement in screening service management, and screening service designation as an ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Center

	Low-Dose CT for Lung Cancer Screening On Site Available	Radiologist Involvement in Service Management	ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Center*
Organizational Characteristic	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Minority or underserved site under NCORP	0.35 (0.13-0.95)		
Primarily a safety-net hospital	3.23 (1.02-10.20)		
Affiliated with a designated Critical Access Hospital	3.49 (1.11-10.95)	0.37 (0.16-0.86)	
Organizational ownership			
Independently owned	Reference	Reference	
Owned by large regional/multistate health system with a health plan	2.76 (0.99-7.66)	0.98 (0.40-2.43)	
Owned by large regional/multistate health system without a health plan	2.55 (0.79-8.21)	3.42 (0.92-12.74)	
HMO/payer owned, publicly owned and university owned	0.34 (0.08-1.37)	3.08 (0.54-17.69)	
Estimated number of adult beds:			
0	Reference	Reference	
1-250	6.75 (2.40-18.95)	1.37 (0.37-5.04)	
251-450	15.49 (3.50-68.61)	6.32 (1.31-30.51)	
>450	4.43 (1.25-15.72)	2.46 (0.65-9.30)	
Number of oncology physicians			
0-6	Reference		
7-11	1.17 (0.41-3.36)		
12-22	3.09 (0.84-11.35)		
≥23	6.80 (1.57-29.40)		

Note: CI = confidence interval; HMO = health maintenance organization; NCORP = NCORP = National Cancer Institute Community Oncology Research Program; OR = odds ratio.

*No variables are significant.

availability (adjusted OR, 0.34; 95% CI, 0.08-1.34) compared with independent ownership. Having adult inpatient facilities, regardless of the number of inpatient beds, increased the likelihood of on-site service availability, as did having 23 or more oncology physicians.

Regarding the management of lung cancer screening services offered, adjusting for other predictors, services offered at MU practices were less likely to have radiologists participating in the screening service management (adjusted OR, 0.37; 95% CI, 0.16-0.86); organizational ownership type and number of oncologists within the practice were not associated.

No organizational characteristics evaluated were associated with the likelihood of designation as an ACR Lung Cancer Screening Center.

Subanalyses Excluding Puerto Rico

None of the practices in Puerto Rico (n = 7) offered lung cancer screening. Limiting the analyses to practices within

the United States, excluding Puerto Rico, 73.3% offered lung cancer screening on site. In this subanalysis, MU designation was no longer a significant predictor. Multivariate predictors of lung cancer screening availability included classification as a safety-net hospital (OR, 3.26; 95% CI, 1.02-10.48), affiliation with a Critical Access Hospital (OR, 3.31; 95% CI, 1.07-10.20), ownership by a large regional or multistate health system with a health plan (OR, 2.89; 95% CI, 1.05-8.01), having an inpatient service regardless of number of beds, and having 23 or more oncology physicians on site (Table 4). Regarding the management of lung cancer screening services offered, affiliation with a Critical Access Hospital decreased the likelihood of radiologist involvement in the screening management (OR, 0.39; 95% CI, 0.18-0.84). As in the main analyses, no organizational characteristics evaluated were associated with the likelihood of providing the service at an ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Center.

Table 4. Correlates of on-site availability of low-dose CT for lung cancer screening, radiologist involvement in lung screening service management, and service designation as an ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Center: subanalyses excluding Puerto Rico

Organizational Characteristic	Low-Dose CT for Lung Cancer Screening On Site Available Adjusted OR (95% CI)	Radiologist Involvement in Service Management Adjusted OR (95% CI)	ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Center* Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Minority or underserved site under NCORP			
Primarily a safety-net hospital	3.26 (1.02-10.48)		
Affiliated with a designated Critical Access Hospital	3.31 (1.07-10.20)	0.39 (0.18-0.84)	
Organizational ownership			
Independently owned	Reference		
Owned by large regional/multistate health system with a health plan	2.89 (1.05-8.01)		
Owned by large regional/multistate health system without a health plan	2.41 (0.76-7.68)		
HMO/payer owned, publicly owned, and university owned	0.31 (0.08-1.28)		
Estimated number of adult beds			
0	Reference		
1-250	6.53 (2.27-18.79)		
251-450	14.81 (3.18-68.94)		
>450	3.49 (1.02-11.89)		
Number of oncology physicians			
0-6	Reference		
7-11	1.64 (0.54-4.97)		
12-22	3.42 (0.95-12.32)		
≥23	6.69 (1.59-28.18)		

Note: CI = confidence interval; HMO = health maintenance organization; NCORP = NCORP = National Cancer Institute Community Oncology Research Program; OR = odds ratio.

*No variables are significant.

DISCUSSION

Lung cancer screening was available at the majority of the community oncology practices within NCORP. Approximately half of screening services were offered at ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Centers. MU sites were less likely to offer lung cancer screening; however, there were no differences between community sites and MU sites when focusing on US community oncology sites only, excluding Puerto Rico. Safety-net hospitals and those affiliated with Critical Access Hospitals were more likely to offer lung cancer screening services. Almost 70% of lung cancer screening services involved radiologist management, either solely or as part of a multidisciplinary team. More than half of the practices offering lung cancer screening participated in the ACR LCSR, the only CMS-approved registry. The ACR LCSR is actively addressing the IT barriers to participating in the registry. MU practices offering LDCT lung

screening were less likely to have radiologist involvement in screening service management.

Access to lung cancer screening has markedly increased since 2014, when Eberth et al [5] identified 203 lung cancer screening service providers across the United States. A more recent evaluation by Charkhchi et al [6] found 2,423 screening service providers. This increase in availability has been bolstered by the US Preventive Services Task Force grade B recommendation for screening among 55- to 80-year-olds with at least 30 pack-year smoking histories [13] and Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act's elimination of cost sharing [14].

Community oncology practices are critical providers of care across the cancer spectrum, particularly MU sites that comprise at least 30% racial and ethnic minorities or rural residents. Early experience in lung cancer screening implementation have noted several system-level barriers: inadequate time for consulting, inadequate staffing and

patients' having too many other comorbidities to address screening [15], workload management to ensure appropriate evaluation of pulmonary nodules detected by screening [16], difficulty in identifying screening-eligible patients, limited resources to support screening, and IT, including reporting to the CMS-approved registry [17]. As LDCT lung screening guidelines and reimbursement have matured, its availability has increased in the broad community. Within the NCORP, three-fourths of responding practices offered LDCT lung screening on site, suggesting that NCORP may be an ideal network to conduct research to improve screening uptake and enhance implementation. For example, a current NCORP site-randomized trial is testing an intervention to improve delivery of evidence-based tobacco cessation at the point of care for LDCT.

Our initial analyses of MU oncology practices noted decreased likelihood of offering LDCT lung screening compared with other community oncology practices. The practices represented were located in the United States and Puerto Rico. We identified seven practices in Puerto Rico, all MU practices; none offered lung cancer screening. There is controversy regarding differences of quality and access of health care services between Puerto Rico and the United States. Rivera-Hernandez et al [18] compared the quality of preventive care, including breast and colon cancer screening, provided to white and Hispanic Medicare Advantage enrollees in the United States and Puerto Rico. They found significantly worse care for enrollees in Puerto Rico compared with their US counterparts. Other studies support the presence of a gap between health care services in Puerto Rico and the United States [19], such as lower colonoscopy rates [20]. However, Portela et al [20] reported that screening rates for mammography and Pap smears were comparable or better in Puerto Rico than the United States. Regarding lung cancer screening, lack of insurance coverage represented the most common limitation for implementation, followed by inadequate infrastructure and lack of radiologist support [21]. Furthermore, the Puerto Rico Comprehensive Cancer Control Plan: 2015-2020 focuses on lung cancer management through smoking cessation and risk reduction rather than screening, dissimilar from the proposed approach to breast, cervical, and colon cancer [10]. Therefore, we conducted subanalyses excluding the Puerto Rico practices. In these subanalyses, no significant differences in lung cancer screening availability were detected between MU practices compared with other community oncology practices with the United States.

We found that practices owned by large regional and multistate health systems with or without a health plan, having inpatient adult facilities, or having 12 or more oncology physicians were more likely to offer lung cancer screening. In a review of the effect of organizational structure on cancer screening process, Anhang Price et al [22] found mixed evidence for the relationship between patient volume (as a measure of practice size) and cancer screening adherence [23-26]. They highlighted that availability of facilities and staff members for screening are necessary but insufficient in the absence of other important factors, such as promoting patient recruitment, provider recommendation, and patient-provider communication. In our population, we posit that larger practices delivering a variety of care services have more human and technology resources, potentially facilitating the implementation of lung screening in these practices.

Implementation of lung cancer screening would increase imaging procedures by an average of 4% across health service areas [27]. Smieliauskas et al [27] reported that health service areas that were rural, with many eligible smokers, and disproportionately Hispanic or low-income smokers had significantly higher odds of facing capacity limitations. In our evaluation, lung screening services offered at MU practices were less likely to have radiologists participate in the service management. It remains to be seen if radiologist participation in screening program management results in enhanced capacity and service utilization.

Our study had notable limitations. This assessment was conducted as an internal assessment or research capacity, so we had limited information about LDCT screening services and potential predictors. We assumed that all practice locations within a given practice group offered the same lung screening service. We assessed lung cancer screening availability, not actual utilization; however, demonstrating resource availability is a necessary component of successful screening implementation and supports the feasibility of conducting LDCT screening research within the NCORP network.

Implications

A large proportion of NCORP community sites offered lung cancer screening services on site. MU oncology practices located in the United States were as likely to offer this service as other community oncology practices. Larger practices with inpatient facilities were also more likely to offer LDCT services on site. Availability alone does not guarantee use. Radiologist participation in implementation and management may improve patient participation where lung screening services are available.

TAKE-HOME POINTS

- The NCORP, a consortium of community practices that deliver oncologic care, represents one of the ideal networks to understand the dissemination and implementation of lung cancer screening.
- The majority of these community oncology practices offered lung cancer screening on site, although only half of the screening services took place at ACR Designated Lung Cancer Screening Centers.
- MU sites were less likely to offer lung screening, whereas safety-net hospitals and those affiliated with Critical Access Hospitals had higher availability.
- Radiologists participated in the implementation and management of lung screening at 70% of practices.
- Availability of service does not guarantee use; radiologist participation in service management may improve patient participation.

REFERENCES

1. National Lung Screening Trial Research TeamAberle DR, Adams AM, et al. Reduced lung-cancer mortality with low-dose computed tomographic screening. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:395-409.
2. National Lung Screening Trial Research TeamAberle DR, Berg CD, et al. The National Lung Screening Trial: overview and study design. *Radiology* 2011;258:243-53.
3. American Cancer Society. Key statistics for lung cancer. Available at: <https://www.cancer.org/cancer/non-small-cell-lung-cancer/about/key-statistics.html>. Accessed June 29, 2018.
4. Pfister DG, Rubin DM, Elkin EB, et al. Risk adjusting survival outcomes in hospitals that treat patients with cancer without information on cancer stage. *JAMA Oncol* 2015;1:1303-10.
5. Eberth JM, Qiu R, Adams SA, et al. Lung cancer screening using low-dose CT: the current national landscape. *Lung Cancer* 2014;85:379-84.
6. Charkhchi P, Kolenic GE, Carlos RC. Access to lung cancer screening services: preliminary analysis of geographic service distribution using the ACR Lung Cancer Screening Registry. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2017;14:1388-95.
7. National Cancer Institute. NCORP map. Available at: <https://ncorp.cancer.gov/findasite/map.html>. Accessed June 29, 2018.
8. Kent EE, Mitchell SA, Castro KM, et al. Cancer care delivery research: building the evidence base to support practice change in community oncology. *J Clin Oncol* 2015;33:2705-11.
9. Carlos RC, Sicks JD, Chang GJ, et al. Capacity for cancer care delivery research in national cancer institute community oncology research program community practices: availability of radiology and primary care research partners. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2017;14:1530-7.
10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Puerto Rico Comprehensive Cancer Control Plan 2015 - 2020. Available at: ftp://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/Publications/Cancer/ccc/puerto_rico_ccc_plan.pdf. Accessed June 29, 2018.
11. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services decision memo for screening for lung cancer with low dose computed tomography (LDCT) (CAG-00439N). Available at: [https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/nca-decision-memo.aspx?NCAId=274&NcaName=Screening+for+Lung+Cancer+with+Low+Dose+Computed+Tomography+\(LDCT\)&TimeFrame=7&DocType=All&bc=AQAAIAAAAgAAAA%3D%3D&](https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/details/nca-decision-memo.aspx?NCAId=274&NcaName=Screening+for+Lung+Cancer+with+Low+Dose+Computed+Tomography+(LDCT)&TimeFrame=7&DocType=All&bc=AQAAIAAAAgAAAA%3D%3D&). Accessed June 29, 2018.
12. International Early Lung Cancer Action Program. Announcing the Registry for Lung Screening Excellence. Available at: <http://www.ielcap.org/news/announcing-registry-lung-screening-excellence>. Accessed June 29, 2018.
13. US Preventive Services Task Force. Lung cancer: screening. Available at: <https://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/Page/Document/UpdateSummaryFinal/lung-cancer-screening>. Accessed June 29, 2018.
14. The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Sec. 2713, Coverage of Preventive Services. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/BILLS-111hr3590enr/pdf/BILLS-111hr3590enr.pdf>. Accessed January 24, 2019.
15. Triplett M, Kross EK, Mann BA, et al. An assessment of primary care and pulmonary provider perspectives on lung cancer screening. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2018;15:69-75.
16. Gesthalter YB, Koppelman E, Bolton R, et al. Evaluations of implementation at early-adopting lung cancer screening programs: lessons learned. *Chest* 2017;152:70-80.
17. Carter-Harris L, Gould MK. Multilevel barriers to the successful implementation of lung cancer screening: why does it have to be so hard? *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2017;14:1261-5.
18. Rivera-Hernandez M, Leyva B, Keohane LM, Trivedi AN. Quality of care for white and Hispanic Medicare Advantage enrollees in the United States and Puerto Rico. *JAMA Intern Med* 2016;176:787-94.
19. Elliott MN, Haviland AM, Dembosky JW, Hambarsoomian K, Weech-Maldonado R. Are there differences in the Medicare experiences of beneficiaries in Puerto Rico compared with those in the U.S. mainland? *Med Care* 2012;50:243-8.
20. Portela M, Sommers BD. On the outskirts of national health reform: a comparative assessment of health insurance and access to care in Puerto Rico and the United States. *Milbank Q* 2015;93:584-608.
21. Martinez-Gonzalez J, Rodriguez-Cintrón W, Albors-Sanchez J, Rodriguez-Sepulveda Y. Lung cancer screening in community based practice in Puerto Rico: a survey of Puerto Rico pulmonologists [abstract]. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2016;193:2016A4236.
22. Anhang Price R, Zapka J, Edwards H, Taplin SH. Organizational factors and the cancer screening process. *J Natl Cancer Inst Monogr* 2010;2010:38-57.
23. Soban LM, Yano EM. The impact of primary care resources on prevention practices. *J Ambul Care Manage* 2005;28:241-53.
24. Yano EM, Soban LM, Parkerton PH, Etzioni DA. Primary care practice organization influences colorectal cancer screening performance. *Health Serv Res* 2007;42:1130-49.
25. Mehrotra A, Epstein AM, Rosenthal MB. Do integrated medical groups provide higher-quality medical care than individual practice associations? *Ann Intern Med* 2006;145:826-33.
26. Greiner KA, Engelman KK, Hall MA, Ellerbeck EF. Barriers to colorectal cancer screening in rural primary care. *Prev Med (Baltim)* 2004;38:269-75.
27. Smieliauskas F, MacMahon H, Salgia R, Shih Y-CT. Geographic variation in radiologist capacity and widespread implementation of lung cancer CT screening. *J Med Screen* 2014;21:207-15.