WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:41:43" NOTE recognizability:0.866

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:01.810 All right. Good afternoon, everyone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:01.810 --> 00:00:04.958 We're going to go ahead and get started here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:04.960 \longrightarrow 00:00:07.370$ It's my pleasure to introduce

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:07.370 --> 00:00:08.816 Doctor Herman Pogosian.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:08.820 \longrightarrow 00:00:10.560$ She's an associate professor at

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00{:}00{:}10.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}12.300$ Yale University School of Nursing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:12.300 \longrightarrow 00:00:14.845$ She received her Bachelor of Science in

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:14.845 --> 00:00:17.200 nursing from Jonkoping University in Sweden,

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:17.200 \longrightarrow 00:00:18.510$ and she received her pH.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:18.510 \dashrightarrow 00:00:19.835$ D from the American University

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:19.835 --> 00:00:21.950 of Armenia and her PhD from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00{:}00{:}21.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}23.642$ University of Massachusetts, Boston.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:23.642 \longrightarrow 00:00:26.552$ Doctor Pogosian completed a postdoctoral

 $00:00:26.552 \longrightarrow 00:00:28.298$ fellowship and interprofessional

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00{:}00{:}28.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}30.020$ health services research at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:30.020 --> 00:00:32.180 Betty Irene Moore School of Nursing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:32.180 --> 00:00:34.049 At the University of California, Davis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:34.049 --> 00:00:36.563 Her research focus is on cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:36.563 --> 00:00:37.820 epidemiology and survivorship

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:37.883 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.108$ research with a particular interest

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:40.108 --> 00:00:41.888 in cancer health disparities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:41.890 \longrightarrow 00:00:44.380$ lung cancer screening survivors and their

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:44.380 \longrightarrow 00:00:46.610$ social network members including families,

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:46.610 \longrightarrow 00:00:47.792$ friends and others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:47.792 \longrightarrow 00:00:49.762$ Doctor proposing is the principal

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:49.762 \longrightarrow 00:00:51.939$ investigator of an NCI funded R1

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:51.939 \longrightarrow 00:00:53.594$ that is investigating social networks

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:53.594 \longrightarrow 00:00:55.846$ and effective states in the context

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:55.846 \longrightarrow 00:00:57.701$ of smoking behaviors among adults

 $00{:}00{:}57.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}00.370$ diagnosed with to bacco related cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00{:}01{:}00.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}02.183$ Please join me in welcoming Dr Prozium

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:01:02.183 \longrightarrow 00:01:03.990$ to Yale Cancer Center grand rounds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91897369642857200:01:03.990 --> 00:01:04.570 Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}01{:}09.160 --> 00{:}01{:}12.714$ Thank you. Good afternoon everyone and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:01:12.714 \longrightarrow 00:01:15.630$ thank you Michael for the kind introduction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:01:15.630 --> 00:01:18.142 And I'm very excited to be here today

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:01:18.142 \longrightarrow 00:01:21.070$ and to share some of my work with you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:01:21.070 \longrightarrow 00:01:23.606$ And I'll be talking a little bit about

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:01:23.606 \longrightarrow 00:01:26.323$ lung cancer screening in the US and also

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:01:26.323 \longrightarrow 00:01:29.070$ tobacco use among cancer survivors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:01:29.070 \longrightarrow 00:01:32.150$ So just to give a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}01{:}32.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}34.770$ of a background information,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:01:34.770 \longrightarrow 00:01:38.674$ we know that lung cancer is the 2nd

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:01:38.674 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.347$ leading cause of cancer and the leading.

 $00:01:42.350 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.510$ Leading cause of cancer related death

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:01:44.510 --> 00:01:47.390 in the US in both men and women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:01:47.390 \longrightarrow 00:01:50.477$ and this year it is estimated that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:01:50.477 \longrightarrow 00:01:53.648$ there will be about 236,000 new

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:01:53.648 --> 00:01:57.405 lung cancer cases and about 130,000

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:01:57.405 \longrightarrow 00:02:00.870$ deaths from lung cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:00.870 \longrightarrow 00:02:03.957$ But when we look at the incidence and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:02:03.957 --> 00:02:06.399 mortality rates for lung cancer by race,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:06.400 \longrightarrow 00:02:07.078$ ethnicity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:02:07.078 --> 00:02:10.848 certain racial and ethnic minorities groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}02{:}10.848 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}14.551$ they suffer more from lung cancer and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:14.551 \longrightarrow 00:02:17.730$ they have worse clinical outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}02{:}17.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}20.290$ compared to white individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:20.290 \longrightarrow 00:02:21.736$ And in fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:21.736 \longrightarrow 00:02:24.628$ African American men have the highest

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:24.628 \longrightarrow 00:02:27.871$ rate of lung cancer incidence rate

 $00:02:27.871 \longrightarrow 00:02:30.541$ and the highest mortality rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:30.550 \longrightarrow 00:02:34.223$ Compared to other racial ethnic groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:02:34.223 --> 00:02:37.687 and just for example one of the studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:37.690 \longrightarrow 00:02:40.102$ our earlier study that we published

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:02:40.102 --> 00:02:41.710 in general thoracic oncology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:41.710 \longrightarrow 00:02:47.345$ we found that black patients who had

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:02:47.350 --> 00:02:49.750 got surgery for their lung cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}02{:}49.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}52.918$ they had much lower post operative

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:52.918 \longrightarrow 00:02:55.658$ mental health related quality of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:55.658 \longrightarrow 00:02:58.378$ life compared to white patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}02{:}58.378 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}00.554$ undergoing lung cancer surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}03{:}00.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}03.374$ And also in terms of survival like

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:03:03.374 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.763$ there is again significant difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:03:05.763 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.592$ in in a five year survival comparing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:03:09.600 \longrightarrow 00:03:11.724$ Racial ethnic minority groups

 $00:03:11.724 \longrightarrow 00:03:13.317$ with white individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:03:13.320 \longrightarrow 00:03:14.704$ the five year survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:03:14.704 \longrightarrow 00:03:16.434$ The overall five year survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:03:16.440 \longrightarrow 00:03:20.388$ All stages combined is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:03:20.390 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.259$ Among all the races is 22% but when

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}03{:}23.259 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}25.797$ you compare the black individuals have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:03:25.797 \longrightarrow 00:03:28.465$ much have lower five year survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:03:28.465 --> 00:03:31.750 from lung cancer compared white and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}03{:}31.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}35.642$ lung cancer has has a poor prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:03:35.642 --> 00:03:39.057 And early detection of lung cancer is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}03{:}39.057 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}42.228$ kind of the key to improve survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:03:42.228 \longrightarrow 00:03:45.529$ among patients diagnosed with lung cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}03{:}45.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}48.206$ And unfortunately a lot of work

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}03{:}48.206 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}50.500$ has been done showing that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:03:50.500 \longrightarrow 00:03:51.838$ The early diet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}03{:}51.838 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}55.300$ the only less than 20% of patients are

 $00:03:55.300 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.760$ diagnosed with early stage lung cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:03:57.760 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.308$ Some of the studies suggest even like 16%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:04:00.308 \longrightarrow 00:04:02.516$ around 16% are diagnosed with stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:04:02.516 \longrightarrow 00:04:05.374$ one lung cancer when the more curative

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:04:05.374 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.058$ treatment options are available

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:04:07.058 \longrightarrow 00:04:09.618$ that help to improve the survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:04:09.618 --> 00:04:11.979 among these patients and last kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}04{:}11.979 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}15.320$ of 10 years or so about the sodium.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:04:17.340 --> 00:04:19.716 Screening for lung cancer with low

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:19.716 \longrightarrow 00:04:21.768$ dose computed tomography has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:04:21.768 --> 00:04:24.144 shown to reduce lung cancer mortality

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:04:24.144 --> 00:04:26.160 among individuals at higher risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:04:26.160 --> 00:04:27.696 so one of them well known.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:27.700 \longrightarrow 00:04:30.524$ The study conducted in trial in the US

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:30.524 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.670$ national lung cancer screening trial

 $00:04:32.670 \longrightarrow 00:04:35.400$ showed that screening with low dose

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}04{:}35.400 \to 00{:}04{:}37.359$ computed tomographic decreases lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:37.359 \longrightarrow 00:04:40.291$ cancer rate mortality rate by 20%

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:40.291 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.597$ and another study recently that came

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:43.597 \longrightarrow 00:04:47.159$ out more recently Nelson study trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:04:47.160 --> 00:04:48.309 And from Netherlands,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:48.309 \longrightarrow 00:04:51.166$ they showed that up to 26% reduction

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:04:51.166 --> 00:04:53.974 in lung cancer mortality among those

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:53.974 \longrightarrow 00:04:57.120$ who got screened for lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:57.120 \longrightarrow 00:04:59.770$ with low dose computed tomography.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:59.770 \longrightarrow 00:05:02.787$ So the and then since 2013,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:05:02.787 \longrightarrow 00:05:05.426$ we have a guideline in place by

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}05{:}05.426 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}07.796$ US Preventive Service Task Force

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:05:07.796 --> 00:05:09.840 recommending annual lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:05:09.840 \longrightarrow 00:05:12.710$ screening for high risk individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:05:12.710 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.965$ And those individuals are asymptomatic

 $00:05:14.965 \longrightarrow 00:05:18.584$ adults ages 50 to 80 years old and

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:05:18.584 \longrightarrow 00:05:21.152$ current and former smokers who quit

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:05:21.152 \longrightarrow 00:05:23.957$ within the past 15 years and they have

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:05:23.957 --> 00:05:26.910 at least 20 pack years of smoking history.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:05:26.910 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.808$ So this guideline was updated last year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:05:29.810 \longrightarrow 00:05:35.455$ To March of 2021 before the March 2021

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:05:35.455 \longrightarrow 00:05:39.873$ the age range age started 55 years 55

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}05{:}39.873 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}42.457$ to 80 years old and then the Smoking

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:05:42.457 --> 00:05:45.280 Pack history was 30 pack year history.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}05{:}45.280 \longrightarrow 00{:}05{:}48.143$ So they decreased last year the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:05:48.143 --> 00:05:50.356 guideline the criteria of 20 pack

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}05{:}50.356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}52.477$ year sister instead of 30 and 20

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}05{:}52.555 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}54.883$ pack year sister means that someone

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:05:54.883 \longrightarrow 00:05:57.967$ smokes at least one pack of cigarettes

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:05:57.967 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.530$ per day for at least 20 years.

 $00:06:01.530 \longrightarrow 00:06:04.692$ And Centers for Medicare and Medicaid

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}06{:}04.692 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}07.395$ Services provides coverage for annual

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:07.395 \longrightarrow 00:06:10.467$ lung cancer screening with low dose

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:10.467 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.709$ computer tomography for eligible individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}06{:}13.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}16.460$ And Affordable Care acts mandate

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:06:16.460 --> 00:06:18.660 private insurance companies to

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:18.660 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.050$ cover lung cancer screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:21.050 \longrightarrow 00:06:23.922$ So one of the main one of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}06{:}23.922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}26.417$ main reason that the screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:26.417 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.842$ guideline was updated the decrease

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}06{:}28.842 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}31.446$ the age and decrease the smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:06:31.450 --> 00:06:33.640 Great because?

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:33.640 \longrightarrow 00:06:36.080$ A lot of work has been done showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:36.080 \longrightarrow 00:06:38.079$ that black individuals were less

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:06:38.079 --> 00:06:40.269 often eligible under that guideline

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}06{:}40.269 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}42.515$ for lung cancer screening despite

00:06:42.515 --> 00:06:44.675 they have developing lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:44.675 \longrightarrow 00:06:47.875$ at much younger age and they have

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:47.875 \longrightarrow 00:06:49.743$ a lower smoking intensity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:49.750 \longrightarrow 00:06:51.946$ So it was hard to meet at 30 at

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:06:51.946 --> 00:06:53.920 least 30 pack years of smoking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:53.920 \longrightarrow 00:06:55.820$ smoking history criteria and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:55.820 \longrightarrow 00:06:59.065$ also they have like when you look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:59.065 \longrightarrow 00:07:01.195$ the smoking prevalence comparing non

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:07:01.195 --> 00:07:03.720 Hispanic whites and non Hispanic blacks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}07{:}03.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}06.324$ They have kind of a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:07:06.324 --> 00:07:07.960 like similar smoking rates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:07:07.960 --> 00:07:10.264 but they have much higher blocking

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:10.264 \longrightarrow 00:07:12.806$ the doors have much higher incidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:12.806 \longrightarrow 00:07:14.658$ rate from lung cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:07:14.660 --> 00:07:16.540 mortality rate from lung cancer.

 $00:07:16.540 \longrightarrow 00:07:19.336$ They are diagnosed with much earlier

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}07{:}19.336 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}22.682$ age and they have a lower in smoking

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}07{:}22.682 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}24.418$ intensity compared to white.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:24.420 \longrightarrow 00:07:26.520$ So that's why they expanded the

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:26.520 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.768$ kind of change the criteria with

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:28.768 \longrightarrow 00:07:31.463$ the hope that that more racial and

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:31.463 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.818$ ethnic minorities group will meet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:07:33.820 --> 00:07:37.028 Lung cancer screening criteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:37.028 \longrightarrow 00:07:39.434$ so become eligible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:07:39.440 --> 00:07:42.457 And with that, with the earlier guideline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}07{:}42.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}45.058$ the about studies show that about

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:45.058 \longrightarrow 00:07:46.790$ 8,000,000 adults were eligible

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:46.858 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.938$ for lung cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.424$ With a new guideline about 14.5 million

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:51.424 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.196$ adults are eligible for lung cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:07:54.200 --> 00:07:56.702 And there have been studies showing

 $00:07:56.702 \longrightarrow 00:07:59.199$ that when they changed the guidelines

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:59.199 \longrightarrow 00:08:02.191$ just few came out that more like with

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:02.270 \longrightarrow 00:08:04.358$ the new eligibility criteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:08:04.360 --> 00:08:06.864 higher proper high proportion

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:06.864 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.368$ of African Americans meet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:09.370 \longrightarrow 00:08:11.795$ Lucky meets the criteria for

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:11.795 \longrightarrow 00:08:13.823$ lung cancer screening. So.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:13.823 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.688$ The current rate for lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}08{:}16.688 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}19.520$ cancer screening is very low.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:19.520 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.234$ The utilization,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:20.234 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.376$ the uptake of lung cancer screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:22.376 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.653$ is very low in the US the new

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}08{:}24.653 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}08{:}26.190$ report that came out about in

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:26.190 \longrightarrow 00:08:30.084$ 2019 was 6.6% and then 2020 it

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:30.084 \longrightarrow 00:08:32.614$ dropped a little bit to 6.5%,

 $00:08:32.614 \longrightarrow 00:08:35.278$ but there have been some studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:08:35.278 --> 00:08:37.981 done and also our work that

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}08{:}37.981 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}40.290$ showed a little bit higher rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:40.290 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.307$ So that's so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:41.307 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.002$ but this the new report

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:43.002 \longrightarrow 00:08:44.509$ showed much lower rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:44.510 \longrightarrow 00:08:45.530$ That's why I just wanted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:45.530 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.720$ To bring to bring this numbers

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:47.720 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.758$ here and a lot of work has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:50.758 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.996$ done to show that lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:53.084 \longrightarrow 00:08:56.492$ screening rate uptake is much lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:08:56.492 --> 00:08:58.764 among African American individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}08{:}58.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}00.470$ or Russian ethnic minorities

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:00.470 \longrightarrow 00:09:02.170$ compared to white minorities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:02.170 \longrightarrow 00:09:04.495$ But the guy since guideline

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:09:04.495 --> 00:09:05.890 changed last March,

 $00:09:05.890 \longrightarrow 00:09:07.696$ there's still a lot of work need

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:07.696 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.090$ to be done to kind of have that

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:10.090 \longrightarrow 00:09:11.650$ clear understanding of the lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:09:11.710 --> 00:09:13.630 cancer screening uptake by race,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:13.630 \longrightarrow 00:09:16.120$ ethnicity and there has been.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:09:16.120 --> 00:09:19.480 Reports show saying that estimating

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:19.480 \longrightarrow 00:09:23.361$ that if we implement national lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}09{:}23.361 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}26.487$ cancer screening we could prevent up

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:26.487 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.102$ to like 6000 deaths in the US so but

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:31.102 \longrightarrow 00:09:34.039$ unfortunately the uptake is very low.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:34.040 \longrightarrow 00:09:36.994$ So we are interested in this study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}09{:}37.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}39.048$ So since some work has been done to

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}09{:}39.048 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}41.400$ show like uptake is low and then the

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:41.400 \longrightarrow 00:09:43.394$ uptake specifically it is much lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:09:43.394 --> 00:09:45.264 among racial and ethnic minorities.

00:09:45.270 --> 00:09:47.658 So we were interested to conduct

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:09:47.658 --> 00:09:49.725 this study to understand the

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}09{:}49.725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}51.750$ intention of high risk individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:51.750 \longrightarrow 00:09:54.549$ to get screened for the for lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:54.549 \longrightarrow 00:09:56.399$ cancer if their primary care

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:56.399 \longrightarrow 00:09:59.465$ provider if the healthcare providers

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:59.465 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.565$ recommended it so specifically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:10:02.570 --> 00:10:04.202 In this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}10{:}04.202 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}06.378$ we investigated the association

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:10:06.378 --> 00:10:09.042 between worry about future health

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}10{:}09.042 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}11.649$ issues of smoking and intention

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:10:11.649 --> 00:10:13.861 to undergo recommended lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:10:13.861 \longrightarrow 00:10:16.591$ cancer screening with low dose

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:10:16.591 --> 00:10:18.563 computed tomography within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:10:18.563 \longrightarrow 00:10:21.595$ next three months when if the

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:10:21.595 \longrightarrow 00:10:23.655$ healthcare provider recommended it.

 $00:10:26.080 \longrightarrow 00:10:27.970$ This was a cross-sectional survey

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:10:27.970 \longrightarrow 00:10:29.860$ who conducted the online survey.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:10:29.860 \longrightarrow 00:10:32.735$ We used Qualtrics research panel

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:10:32.735 \longrightarrow 00:10:35.035$ to recruit study subjects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

00:10:35.040 --> 00:10:38.408 In this study we included 152 adults

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:10:38.408 \longrightarrow 00:10:41.640$ aged between 55 to 74 years old with

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

00:10:41.733 --> 00:10:44.659 at least 30 pack years of smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:10:44.660 \longrightarrow 00:10:47.076$ So this was part of a much larger

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:10:47.076 \longrightarrow 00:10:49.773$ study we had that we looked into

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00{:}10{:}49.773 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}51.788$ electronic cigarette use as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00{:}10{:}51.866 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}54.080$ and the total sample size of

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:10:54.080 \longrightarrow 00:10:56.194$ the original study was eight.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:10:56.194 \longrightarrow 00:11:00.270$ 121 and out of 800 twenty 152 who

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:00.270 \longrightarrow 00:11:02.310$ made the criteria of at least

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

00:11:02.310 --> 00:11:04.410 having 30 pack years of smoking.

00:11:04.410 --> 00:11:07.186 So we used 30 pack years of smoking

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00{:}11{:}07.186 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}09.678$ because of the prior guideline for

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:09.678 \longrightarrow 00:11:12.258$ lung cancer screening and the age

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:12.336 \longrightarrow 00:11:15.486$ range we used 55 to 74 based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:15.486 \longrightarrow 00:11:18.346$ the national lung cancer screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:18.346 \longrightarrow 00:11:20.350$ eligible eligibility criteria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:20.350 \longrightarrow 00:11:22.840$ The outcome variable was the intention

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:22.840 \longrightarrow 00:11:25.017$ to undergo lung cancer screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00{:}11{:}25.017 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}27.227$ with low dose computed tomography

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00{:}11{:}27.227 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}30.419$ within the next three months if if

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:30.419 \longrightarrow 00:11:32.215$ healthcare provider recommended it

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00{:}11{:}32.215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}34.671$ and the predictive was the worry

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:34.671 \longrightarrow 00:11:36.506$ about health consequences of smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:36.510 \longrightarrow 00:11:39.070$ It also collected some covered

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:39.070 \longrightarrow 00:11:40.606$ coverage as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:40.610 \longrightarrow 00:11:44.270$ We used Stata to conduct descriptive

00:11:44.270 --> 00:11:46.710 statistics and logistic regression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:46.710 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.250$ so this table shows sample characteristics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:50.250 \longrightarrow 00:11:53.316$ Majority of them were about 80%

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:53.320 \longrightarrow 00:11:57.572$ were ages between 55 to 64 years

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:11:57.572 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.792$ and about 60% were male.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:12:00.792 \longrightarrow 00:12:04.368$ We oversampled a racial and ethnic

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:12:04.368 \longrightarrow 00:12:06.859$ minoritized individuals in our sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00:12:06.860 \longrightarrow 00:12:07.950$ So about

NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714

 $00:12:10.420 \longrightarrow 00:12:13.890$ 21.7% self reported as black

NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714

 $00:12:13.890 \longrightarrow 00:12:17.080$ individuals and 42.8% self reported

NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714

 $00:12:17.080 \longrightarrow 00:12:20.572$ as white and 12.5% as Asians.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714

 $00:12:20.572 \longrightarrow 00:12:25.290$ And we had like 25% of the sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714

 $00:12:25.290 \longrightarrow 00:12:27.135$ We are Hispanics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714

 $00:12:27.140 \longrightarrow 00:12:29.000$ In terms of the income,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714

 $00:12:29.000 \longrightarrow 00:12:31.779$ kind of a little bigger portion of

 $00:12:31.779 \longrightarrow 00:12:35.676$ the participants 36.8% had the lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714

00:12:35.676 --> 00:12:39.356 than 25,000 annual household income.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90803731

 $00:12:42.300 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.832$ So we found that majority

NOTE Confidence: 0.90803731

 $00:12:45.832 \longrightarrow 00:12:48.966$ of the samples about 86.2%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90803731

 $00:12:48.966 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.196$ they're willing to undergo lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.90803731

00:12:51.196 --> 00:12:52.980 cancer screening if healthcare

NOTE Confidence: 0.90803731

 $00{:}12{:}53.052 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}54.800$ provider recommended it so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90803731

 $00{:}12{:}54.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}59.260$ And also found that 67.7%

NOTE Confidence: 0.90803731

00:12:59.260 --> 00:13:01.980 were very much worried,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90803731

 $00:13:01.980 \longrightarrow 00:13:03.516$ moderately or very much

NOTE Confidence: 0.90803731

00:13:03.516 --> 00:13:05.052 worried about them smoking

NOTE Confidence: 0.90803731

 $00:13:05.052 \longrightarrow 00:13:06.650$ related health consequences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826208976111111

 $00:13:08.720 \longrightarrow 00:13:12.493$ So in this this table shows the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8262089761111111

 $00{:}13{:}12.493 \to 00{:}13{:}15.148$ participants smoking history and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.826208976111111

 $00:13:15.148 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.980$ mean pug years tobacco smoking was

NOTE Confidence: 0.826208976111111

 $00:13:17.980 \longrightarrow 00:13:20.115$ 50.8 and the mean number of years

00:13:20.115 --> 00:13:21.830 they've been smoking cigarette was

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:13:23.980 \longrightarrow 00:13:28.784$ 44.9. So in the in the regression analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

00:13:28.790 --> 00:13:32.456 we found that, you know, high individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:13:32.456 \longrightarrow 00:13:34.621$ high risk individuals who were

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:13:34.621 \longrightarrow 00:13:37.304$ moderately or very much worried about

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:13:37.304 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.489$ the health consequences of smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:13:39.490 \longrightarrow 00:13:42.556$ They are much more willing to undergo

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:13:42.556 \longrightarrow 00:13:44.670$ recommended lung cancer screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:13:44.670 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.372$ We didn't find difference by age groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00{:}13{:}47.372 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}50.705$ and but we also found that men had much

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:13:50.705 \longrightarrow 00:13:54.237$ the men had much higher odds of reporting

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:13:54.237 \longrightarrow 00:13:56.812$ willingness to undergo lung cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00{:}13{:}56.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}59.712$ Training if they were recommended by

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:13:59.712 \longrightarrow 00:14:01.640$ their healthcare provider compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

00:14:01.714 --> 00:14:04.078 to female and also the interesting

00:14:04.078 --> 00:14:06.540 finding where the black individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00{:}14{:}06.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}08.805$ those self reported black individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:14:08.805 \longrightarrow 00:14:11.979$ at high risk for developing lung cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:14:11.980 \longrightarrow 00:14:14.728$ They were they had much lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

00:14:14.728 --> 00:14:16.560 odds ratio of reporting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:14:16.560 \longrightarrow 00:14:19.216$ willingness to undergo recommended

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:14:19.216 \longrightarrow 00:14:23.200$ lung cancer screening and we didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:14:23.302 \longrightarrow 00:14:26.716$ find differences in by by ethnicity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:14:28.940 \longrightarrow 00:14:31.676$ So for the conclusion and the study we

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

00:14:31.676 --> 00:14:34.793 it was obvious that many individuals at

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00{:}14{:}34.793 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}37.760$ high risk for developing lung cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:14:37.760 \longrightarrow 00:14:42.736$ they were willing to get screened for lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

00:14:42.736 --> 00:14:46.760 cancer and but the screening by race,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

00:14:46.760 --> 00:14:49.068 ethnicity, African self reported

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

00:14:49.068 --> 00:14:51.953 black individuals have much lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:14:51.960 \longrightarrow 00:14:54.508$ odds of being willing to get screened

00:14:54.508 --> 00:14:56.419 and I think like that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

00:14:56.420 --> 00:14:58.076 So this was a quantitative study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:14:58.080 \longrightarrow 00:14:59.976$ one of the steps will be I think.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

00:14:59.980 --> 00:15:02.070 To conduct kind of qualitative

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

00:15:02.070 --> 00:15:04.610 study just to understand why they

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:15:04.610 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.500$ don't want to get screened.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:15:06.500 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.623$ So with this only we know that yes the

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:15:09.623 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.096$ percentage is lower and they don't want.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:15:12.100 \longrightarrow 00:15:14.701$ But I think that we need kind of to

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00{:}15{:}14.701 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}17.438$ go more in depth to understand like

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

00:15:17.438 --> 00:15:20.682 why they don't want to get this life

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:15:20.682 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.052$ saving screening and we should have

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00{:}15{:}23.060 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}15{:}25.754$ like a public health initiative to

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:15:25.754 \longrightarrow 00:15:28.152$ increase awarenesses of lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:15:28.152 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.224$ screening among specifically among.

00:15:30.224 --> 00:15:32.784 Racial and ethnic minorities groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00{:}15{:}32.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}36.278$ and there has been some some other

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:15:36.278 \longrightarrow 00:15:39.248$ studies showing that the awarenesses

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

00:15:39.248 --> 00:15:42.259 public among general population about

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

00:15:42.259 --> 00:15:45.667 lung cancer screening is quite low.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

00:15:45.670 --> 00:15:49.346 So we should do some public health

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00{:}15{:}49.346 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}51.886$ initiatives to increase that awarenesses.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:15:54.570 \longrightarrow 00:15:56.994$ So one of the interesting thing for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:15:56.994 \longrightarrow 00:15:59.110$ for getting screened for lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

00:15:59.110 --> 00:16:01.282 is the sheer decision making visits.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}01.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}03.665$ So CMS mandates that healthcare

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:03.665 \longrightarrow 00:16:07.243$ providers have to have a shared decision

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:07.243 \longrightarrow 00:16:10.597$ screening visit with with patients then

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

00:16:10.597 --> 00:16:13.929 refer them to lung cancer screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:13.930 \longrightarrow 00:16:16.288$ So during that visit healthcare providers

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:16.288 \longrightarrow 00:16:19.376$ need to identify if the patient is eligible

 $00:16:19.376 \longrightarrow 00:16:21.870$ for screening based on their age and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}21.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}24.936$ Smoking history and they also need

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:24.936 \longrightarrow 00:16:27.634$ to discuss about benefits and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:27.634 \longrightarrow 00:16:29.574$ risks of lung cancer screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:29.580 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.652$ They need to use your decision making

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:31.652 \longrightarrow 00:16:33.970$ aid that talks about risks and benefits

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:33.970 \longrightarrow 00:16:36.022$ of lung cancer screening and during

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

00:16:36.079 --> 00:16:38.074 that visit they also need to discuss

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:38.074 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.094$ about that if with current smokers

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:40.094 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.422$ they need to discuss emphasize the

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

00:16:42.422 --> 00:16:44.184 importance of quitting smoking and

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:44.184 \longrightarrow 00:16:46.158$ if those who are former smokers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}46.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}48.386$ they need to discuss the importance

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:48.386 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.770$ of being existent from from smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:50.770 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.757$ So we conducted.

00:16:51.757 --> 00:16:54.060 And I use this study to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}54.126 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}16{:}56.562$ like just rate of patient provider

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:56.562 \longrightarrow 00:16:58.603$ discussion about lung cancer screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

00:16:58.603 --> 00:17:01.039 is it happening or not happening and

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:01.039 \longrightarrow 00:17:04.878$ then to understand how it is related to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}17{:}04.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}07.568$ Quite attempts so specifically in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:07.568 \longrightarrow 00:17:09.958$ study invested in investigated the

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:09.958 \longrightarrow 00:17:12.062$ relationship between patient provider

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}17{:}12.062 \to 00{:}17{:}14.692$ discussions about lung cancer screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

00:17:14.764 --> 00:17:17.218 and smoking quit attempts among adults

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}17{:}17.218 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}19.221$ eligible for lung cancer screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:19.221 \longrightarrow 00:17:22.109$ So I used this data from that main

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

00:17:22.109 --> 00:17:24.836 the study that I mentioned earlier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}17{:}24.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}26.628$ like 821 subjects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

00:17:26.628 --> 00:17:28.416 Out of them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:28.420 \longrightarrow 00:17:30.975$ 282 met the criteria of at least

 $00:17:30.975 \longrightarrow 00:17:33.658$ 20 pack years of smoking history.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:33.660 \longrightarrow 00:17:38.032$ So outcome variable was the the quit attempt.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:38.032 \longrightarrow 00:17:40.456$ They tried to quit smoking within

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:40.456 \longrightarrow 00:17:42.038$ the past 12 months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:42.040 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.920$ And for the predictor variable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:43.920 \longrightarrow 00:17:45.635$ participants were asked the question

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:45.635 \longrightarrow 00:17:48.040$ at any time in the past year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:48.040 \longrightarrow 00:17:50.456$ Have you talked with your doctor or other?

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:50.460 \longrightarrow 00:17:52.580$ Other health professional about having

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:52.580 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.649$ a test to check for lung cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00:17:57.710 \longrightarrow 00:18:00.632$ So this is the the sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

00:18:00.632 --> 00:18:01.606 characteristics again.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00{:}18{:}01.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}06.102$ So majority were between 55 to 64 years

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00{:}18{:}06.102 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}11.890$ of age female 62% and 26% were identified

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

00:18:11.890 --> 00:18:16.130 as self identified black individuals,

 $00{:}18{:}16.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}18.910$ 18% self identified Asian individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00:18:18.910 \longrightarrow 00:18:20.877$ and 37% white individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00:18:20.877 \longrightarrow 00:18:24.618$ And in terms of lung cancer screening it

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00:18:24.618 \longrightarrow 00:18:27.610$ was kind of surprising to see that much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

00:18:27.610 --> 00:18:30.578 Majority of them 84% did not have

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00{:}18{:}30.578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}32.551$ discussion with their healthcare

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00:18:32.551 \longrightarrow 00:18:35.636$ provider about lung cancer screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00:18:35.640 \longrightarrow 00:18:37.439$ Even if even though they were at

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

00:18:37.439 --> 00:18:39.560 high with the new guideline they are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00:18:39.560 \longrightarrow 00:18:42.784$ they were they are at much higher risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

00:18:42.784 --> 00:18:44.862 for developing lung cancer screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00:18:44.862 \longrightarrow 00:18:47.940$ because we use a 20 pack years the

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00:18:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.040$ criteria to include study subjects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00{:}18{:}50.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}53.868$ Only 16% reported that they discussed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:18:55.930 \longrightarrow 00:18:59.164$ But discussed have had a discussion with

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:18:59.164 \longrightarrow 00:19:02.300$ their provider about lung cancer screening.

00:19:02.300 --> 00:19:06.020 So this table shows participants smoking

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:06.020 \longrightarrow 00:19:10.013$ history and about the mean park year

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:10.013 \longrightarrow 00:19:13.576$ of to bacco use was 39.4 and the mean

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:13.576 \longrightarrow 00:19:16.400$ number of years they smoked cigarette was

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:16.400 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.318$ 44.4 and majority of the participants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:20.320 \longrightarrow 00:19:24.073$ 59% of the participants had at least 30 or

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:19:24.073 --> 00:19:28.576 more pack year smoking history and 39% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:28.576 \longrightarrow 00:19:32.720$ the participants they tried to quit smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:32.720 \longrightarrow 00:19:37.112$ In the past year we also asked participant

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:37.112 \longrightarrow 00:19:40.599$ what which what methods they used

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:40.600 \longrightarrow 00:19:44.080$ to help them to quit smoking and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:44.080 \longrightarrow 00:19:46.830$ surprisingly a lot of them reported.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}19{:}46.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}49.114$ Switching to electronic cigarette,

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:49.114 \longrightarrow 00:19:53.083$ use that with the hope that it

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:19:53.083 --> 00:19:55.765 will help them to quit smoking.

 $00:19:55.770 \longrightarrow 00:19:58.472$ But we know from the later evidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:58.472 \longrightarrow 00:20:00.390$ that that's not the case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923 00:20:00.390 --> 00:20:01.416 It's it. NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:20:01.416 --> 00:20:03.981 It doesn't help individuals to

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:20:03.981 \longrightarrow 00:20:06.818$ quit smoking and stay existence

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:20:06.818 \longrightarrow 00:20:09.828$ successfully for a longer time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:20:09.830 \longrightarrow 00:20:13.322$ And so in the regression analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:20:13.322 --> 00:20:16.979 we found found that those who had

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:20:16.979 \longrightarrow 00:20:18.751$ discussion with their healthcare

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:20:18.751 --> 00:20:21.270 providers about lung cancer screening,

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}20{:}21.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}24.350$ they're much more likely to try to

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}20{:}24.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}27.393$ quit smoking compared to those who did

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}20{:}27.393 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}29.847$ not have discussion we didn't find.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:20:29.850 \longrightarrow 00:20:33.288$ I didn't find the differences by

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:20:33.288 \longrightarrow 00:20:35.007$ race or ethnicity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:20:35.010 \longrightarrow 00:20:37.686$ and also didn't find the differences

 $00:20:37.686 \longrightarrow 00:20:40.180$ in them in the having.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}20{:}40.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}42.335$ Non cancerous discussion would health care

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:20:42.335 --> 00:20:47.200 providers by race and or or ethnicity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:20:47.200 --> 00:20:47.534 So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:20:47.534 \longrightarrow 00:20:50.206$ so one of the main finding of

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:20:50.206 --> 00:20:52.810 many individuals who are eligible

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:20:52.810 --> 00:20:54.998 for lung cancer screening,

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:20:55.000 \longrightarrow 00:20:57.298$ they don't do, they don't get,

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:20:57.300 \longrightarrow 00:21:00.100$ they don't have a discussion with their

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}21{:}00.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}02.078$ healthcare providers about lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:21:02.078 --> 00:21:04.220 screening which is kind of required

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:04.220 \longrightarrow 00:21:06.579$ mandated by CMS before getting screen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}21{:}06.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}08.610$ So they have to have the shared

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:21:08.610 --> 00:21:10.913 decision making and also.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:10.913 \longrightarrow 00:21:14.939$ And the one the some other

00:21:14.939 --> 00:21:18.459 research shows that improving,

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}21{:}18.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}20.468$ providing education training for

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:21:20.468 --> 00:21:22.476 healthcare providers about lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:21:22.476 --> 00:21:24.839 cancer screening kind of will help

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:24.839 \longrightarrow 00:21:26.771$ to improve the lung cancer uptake.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:26.780 \longrightarrow 00:21:29.552$ So the having the discussion with

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:29.552 \longrightarrow 00:21:31.847$ patients about lung cancer screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:31.847 \longrightarrow 00:21:34.799$ it kind of it helps to kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}21{:}34.799 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}36.820$ improve the lung cancer screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:21:36.820 --> 00:21:39.586 uptake as well as it will improve,

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}21{:}39.586 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}42.428$ it will help patients to get motivated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:21:42.430 --> 00:21:44.422 Try to quit smoking and maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:44.422 \longrightarrow 00:21:46.629$ eventually help them to quit smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:46.630 \longrightarrow 00:21:49.414$ So also another way is then

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:21:49.414 --> 00:21:51.270 people who get screened,

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:51.270 \longrightarrow 00:21:53.045$ there has been another work

 $00:21:53.045 \longrightarrow 00:21:54.110$ including our earlier.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:54.110 \longrightarrow 00:21:57.118$ So those who get actually get to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:21:57.118 --> 00:22:00.387 point to get screened for lung cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:22:00.390 \longrightarrow 00:22:03.198$ So they are more motivated to

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:22:03.198 \longrightarrow 00:22:05.070$ try to quit smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:22:05.070 \longrightarrow 00:22:06.756$ So that's why like this are

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:22:06.756 \longrightarrow 00:22:08.450$ kind of very much related.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:22:08.450 \longrightarrow 00:22:10.030$ So first helping patients to

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}22{:}10.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}11.610$ quit smoking or referring them

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:22:11.669 \longrightarrow 00:22:13.009$ to lung cancer screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:22:13.010 \longrightarrow 00:22:18.089$ So help them also to quit smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:22:20.120 \longrightarrow 00:22:23.340$ And so one of the other big part of my

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:22:23.430 \longrightarrow 00:22:26.634$ work has been focused on understanding

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:22:26.634 \longrightarrow 00:22:29.710$ tobacco use among cancer survivors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:22:29.710 \longrightarrow 00:22:32.614$ and I use the NCI definition for cancer

 $00:22:32.614 \longrightarrow 00:22:34.857$ survivors and individuals are considered

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}22{:}34.857 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}37.737$ cancer survivors from the time of

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:22:37.737 \longrightarrow 00:22:40.311$ diagnosis through the balance of life

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:22:40.311 \longrightarrow 00:22:42.521$ and their family members, caregivers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:22:42.521 \longrightarrow 00:22:46.658$ friends are all impacted by the survivorship

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:22:46.658 \longrightarrow 00:22:49.349$ experience and they're included.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:22:49.350 \longrightarrow 00:22:54.096$ And this definition, so we know that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:22:54.100 --> 00:22:57.782 And do two major advancement in cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}22{:}57.782 \to 00{:}23{:}00.660$ screening or detection and treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:00.660 \longrightarrow 00:23:03.516$ So many individuals these days live

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}23{:}03.516 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}06.980$ with the history of cancer diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:06.980 \longrightarrow 00:23:10.619$ In fact, in 1971 about 3,000,000

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:10.619 \longrightarrow 00:23:12.977$ individuals who live in cancer history.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:23:12.980 --> 00:23:16.380 And as of January this year about 18

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:16.380 \longrightarrow 00:23:18.520$ million individuals are living with

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:18.520 \longrightarrow 00:23:20.932$ cancer history and it is projected

 $00:23:20.932 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.834$ to increase significantly by 2014.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:23.834 \longrightarrow 00:23:26.918$ There will be about 26 million

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:23:26.918 --> 00:23:27.946 cancer survivors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:27.950 \longrightarrow 00:23:30.536$ So in order to maximize the

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:23:30.536 --> 00:23:32.998 overall well-being of this growing

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:23:32.998 --> 00:23:35.026 population of cancer survivors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:35.030 \longrightarrow 00:23:37.604$ identifying the health risk behaviors and

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:37.604 \longrightarrow 00:23:40.575$ helping them to change will help will

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}23{:}40.575 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}42.544$ help improve their overall well-being.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}23{:}42.544 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}45.302$ And one of the health risk behaviors

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:45.302 \longrightarrow 00:23:46.630$ is tobacco use is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:46.630 \longrightarrow 00:23:50.923$ which is still prevalent among among

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}23{:}50.923 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}52.488$ individuals diagnosed with cancer even

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:52.488 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.789$ though a lot of work has been done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:54.790 \longrightarrow 00:23:57.325$ And tobacco use decreased significantly

 $00:23:57.325 \longrightarrow 00:23:59.860$ over the past five decades.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:23:59.860 --> 00:24:00.416 Still,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:00.416 \longrightarrow 00:24:02.640$ many individuals continue to

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:02.640 \longrightarrow 00:24:05.500$ smoke after the cancer diagnosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:05.500 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.950$ and the prevalence of the tobacco

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:09.048 \longrightarrow 00:24:13.610$ use varies by by cancer type.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:13.610 \longrightarrow 00:24:15.650$ And those who are diagnosed with

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:15.650 \longrightarrow 00:24:17.010$ the tobacco related cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:24:17.010 --> 00:24:19.782 they have the highest rate of smoking

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:19.782 \longrightarrow 00:24:22.890$ compared to those who are not diagnosed

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}24{:}22.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}24.730$ with to bacco related cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:24:24.730 --> 00:24:27.922 And we know that continued tobacco use

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:24:27.922 --> 00:24:29.971 among cancer survivors significantly

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:29.971 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.996$ reduces the cancer treatment effectiveness

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:24:32.996 --> 00:24:36.470 and it worsens treatment side effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:24:36.470 --> 00:24:37.883 reduces overall survival.

 $00:24:37.883 \longrightarrow 00:24:40.709$ It also increases the risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:40.709 \longrightarrow 00:24:43.247$ recurrence and symptom burden and also.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:24:43.250 --> 00:24:45.716 Increases the risk of smoking related

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:45.720 \longrightarrow 00:24:49.968$ comorbidities and we know that there are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88797846380952400:24:49.970 --> 00:24:52.184 there is a. NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:52.184 \longrightarrow 00:24:54.570$ Evidence based to bacco treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:54.570 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.300$ guidelines available in the US and

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}24{:}57.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}59.566$ that healthcare provider that would

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:59.566 \longrightarrow 00:25:01.706$ help health healthcare providers to

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}25{:}01.706 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}04.064$ use that to follow that guideline

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:04.064 \longrightarrow 00:25:07.120$ to help individuals smokers to

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:25:07.120 --> 00:25:09.460 quit quit smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}25{:}09.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}13.048$ So the gold standard for to bacco

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:13.048 \longrightarrow 00:25:17.069$ treatment is using combining the use

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:17.069 \longrightarrow 00:25:20.121$ of pharmacotherapy and behavioral

00:25:20.121 --> 00:25:22.410 intervention and healthcare.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524 00:25:22.410 --> 00:25:22.827 Providers. NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:25:22.827 --> 00:25:25.329 First they need to assess and

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:25.329 \longrightarrow 00:25:26.580$ document tobacco use,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:25:26.580 --> 00:25:30.947 then provide advice to quit those who smoke,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}25{:}30.947 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}33.461$ and then assist them with their

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:33.461 \longrightarrow 00:25:35.658$ pharmacotherapy and behavioral counseling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:35.660 \longrightarrow 00:25:37.830$ And they also own a regular basis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}25{:}37.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}40.686$ They have to reassess smoking status

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:40.686 \longrightarrow 00:25:43.967$ among former smokers to make sure they

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:43.967 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.559$ are still absent from to bacco use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:46.560 \longrightarrow 00:25:49.716$ And then we conducted this study

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}25{:}49.716 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}53.309$ so to understand how how cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:25:53.309 --> 00:25:56.085 programs are implementing this

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:56.085 \longrightarrow 00:25:58.376$ evidence based to bacco treatments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:58.376 \longrightarrow 00:26:01.960$ So we conduct in this study we know

 $00:26:02.045 \longrightarrow 00:26:04.781$ that from other work that tobacco

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:26:04.781 \longrightarrow 00:26:07.736$ use still is prevalent among among

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:26:07.736 \longrightarrow 00:26:10.280$ individuals diagnosed with cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:26:10.280 \longrightarrow 00:26:13.552$ So in this study we just wanted to

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:26:13.552 \longrightarrow 00:26:16.802$ understand more like how this evidence based.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524 00:26:16.802 --> 00:26:17.443 Michael,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:26:17.443 \longrightarrow 00:26:21.181$ Guideline is implemented and then the

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}26{:}21.181 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}26.560$ results we found that only 7% of those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}26{:}26.560 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}26{:}29.758$ Cancer programs in the Northeast region,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:26:29.760 \longrightarrow 00:26:32.880$ they had optimal integration of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:26:32.880 \longrightarrow 00:26:35.976$ guidelines into their into their

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:26:35.976 \longrightarrow 00:26:40.188$ delivery system and only about 39%

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00{:}26{:}40.188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}43.132$ of this program had a had a system

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:26:43.132 \longrightarrow 00:26:46.003$ in place that healthcare providers

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:26:46.003 \longrightarrow 00:26:49.615$ they can easily identify screen for

00:26:49.707 --> 00:26:52.617 tobacco use and then document the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:26:52.617 \longrightarrow 00:26:56.252$ tobacco use and also only 25% they had.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:26:56.252 \longrightarrow 00:26:59.553$ System in place that they could easily

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:26:59.553 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.814$ prescribe pharmacotherapy and refer

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:27:01.814 \longrightarrow 00:27:06.256$ them to a counseling so and so all

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00{:}27{:}06.256 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}09.506$ found that the to bacco treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:27:09.506 \longrightarrow 00:27:12.106$ were not delivered consistently

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

00:27:12.208 --> 00:27:14.848 and routinely among among cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:27:14.848 \longrightarrow 00:27:18.466$ survivors so and one of the some

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:27:18.466 \longrightarrow 00:27:21.394$ of the Bears identified in the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00{:}27{:}21.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}23.578$ Oh, identified in the work related

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

00:27:23.578 --> 00:27:26.332 to not having the optimal strategy in

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:27:26.332 \longrightarrow 00:27:29.209$ place to identify to screen for to bacco

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:27:29.287 \longrightarrow 00:27:31.800$ use and document a lot of providers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:27:31.800 \longrightarrow 00:27:33.980$ They reported the limited time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00{:}27{:}33.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}35.858$ so they didn't have enough time

 $00:27:35.858 \longrightarrow 00:27:37.680$ to screen for that as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556 00:27:37.680 --> 00:27:39.990 And then. NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00{:}27{:}39.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}42.766$ Limited reimbursement for clinicians

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:27:42.766 \longrightarrow 00:27:46.236$ to provide to bacco treatment was

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:27:46.236 \longrightarrow 00:27:48.980$ also another another barrier.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:27:48.980 \longrightarrow 00:27:53.495$ So NCI identifies as well like that

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:27:53.500 \longrightarrow 00:27:55.800$ the screening for tobacco use,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:27:55.800 \longrightarrow 00:27:59.820$ documenting to bacco use and treating

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:27:59.820 \longrightarrow 00:28:02.676$ is kind of has and hasn't been that

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:28:02.676 \longrightarrow 00:28:05.379$ well in the in this country and

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

00:28:05.379 --> 00:28:09.525 since in 2017 is NCI launched Cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00{:}28{:}09.525 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}12.233$ Center cessation initiative which

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:28:12.233 \longrightarrow 00:28:16.446$ was funded part of the NCI Cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:28:16.446 \longrightarrow 00:28:20.200$ Moonshine Program and the overall like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:28:20.200 \longrightarrow 00:28:23.820$ Long term goal of this.

 $00:28:23.820 \longrightarrow 00:28:27.383$ Of this initiative is that to provide

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:28:27.383 \longrightarrow 00:28:31.159$ funding to cancer centers and to help

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:28:31.159 \longrightarrow 00:28:34.381$ them to build an implement sustainable

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:28:34.481 \longrightarrow 00:28:37.481$ to bacco cessation treatment programs

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:28:37.481 \longrightarrow 00:28:41.231$ that can help healthcare providers

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:28:41.231 \longrightarrow 00:28:44.600$ routinely address tobacco sensation

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

00:28:44.600 --> 00:28:49.658 among cancer survivors and since 2017,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

00:28:49.658 --> 00:28:53.906 fifty two NCI designated cancer centers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

00:28:53.910 --> 00:28:56.484 You said this funding and yells

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:28:56.484 \longrightarrow 00:28:59.552$ Cancer Center is one of those 52

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00{:}28{:}59.552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}02.078$ and there has been some studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

00:29:02.078 --> 00:29:05.020 already came out showing kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:29:05.020 \longrightarrow 00:29:07.455$ positive outcome those centers who

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:29:07.460 \longrightarrow 00:29:11.177$ got the funding that they have them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

00:29:11.180 --> 00:29:14.316 Kind of a system in place to identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00{:}29{:}14.316 \longrightarrow 00{:}29{:}17.022$ to screen and document to bacco use

00:29:17.022 --> 00:29:19.832 and help smokers to quit smoking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:29:19.832 \longrightarrow 00:29:23.350$ but it's been since 2017 so like

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:29:23.350 \longrightarrow 00:29:26.050$ I think sustainability should be

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:29:26.050 \longrightarrow 00:29:28.936$ evaluated so for longer term to

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:29:28.936 \longrightarrow 00:29:31.880$ see if if it's still moving on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556 00:29:31.880 --> 00:29:34.990 So from. NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:29:34.990 \longrightarrow 00:29:38.486$ From my work and from the work of

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:29:38.486 \longrightarrow 00:29:41.169$ other researchers kind of we understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:29:41.169 \longrightarrow 00:29:44.173$ how the we know that tobacco use

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

 $00:29:44.173 \longrightarrow 00:29:47.086$ is still is a problem is is still.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}29{:}49.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}52.362$ And common among individuals were diagnosed

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:29:52.362 \longrightarrow 00:29:55.340$ with lung individuals who had cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}29{:}55.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}58.392$ So we decided to conduct this study

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:29:58.392 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.359$ and it was funded by NCI to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:02.360 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.078$ the role of social networks and

00:30:05.078 --> 00:30:07.624 affective States and in smoking

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:30:07.624 --> 00:30:10.196 behavior among cancer patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:30:10.200 --> 00:30:12.225 So I have done some work looking at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:12.225 \longrightarrow 00:30:14.252$ role of social networks and I'm sure you

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:14.252 \longrightarrow 00:30:16.380$ know like the Yale has a big team who

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}30{:}16.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}18.292$ looks at the social network as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:18.292 \longrightarrow 00:30:20.970$ It really shows how important it is to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:20.970 \dashrightarrow 00:30:23.095$ Involve your social network members

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}30{:}23.095 \to 00{:}30{:}26.347$ to help to change the smoking behavior

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:30:26.347 --> 00:30:28.435 or health risk behaviors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:28.440 \longrightarrow 00:30:30.561$ But when you look at the intervention

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:30.561 \longrightarrow 00:30:32.579$ side like smoking cessation programs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:32.580 \longrightarrow 00:30:35.220$ those are mostly focused on an

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:35.220 \longrightarrow 00:30:38.356$ individual and we know that those if

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:38.356 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.373$ they get a treatment get the referral.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:41.380 \longrightarrow 00:30:42.958$ But when they go back home,

 $00:30:42.960 \longrightarrow 00:30:45.280$ like get the treatment by get home in

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}30{:}45.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}47.508$ their network and someone is in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}30{:}47.508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}49.098$ network smoking it increases their

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:49.160 \longrightarrow 00:30:50.980$ chance of like starting smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:50.980 \longrightarrow 00:30:53.068$ So that's why so we discount,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:53.070 \longrightarrow 00:30:54.033$ we are hoping,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:54.033 \longrightarrow 00:30:55.959$ hoping that we can develop social

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:30:55.959 \longrightarrow 00:30:57.719$ network best smoking cessation

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}30{:}57.719 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}59.555$ interventions for patients diagnosed

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}30{:}59.555 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}01.450$ with to bacco related cancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:31:01.450 \longrightarrow 00:31:05.290$ So hopefully we can help them to guit

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:31:05.290 \longrightarrow 00:31:08.370$ smoking and stay quit for a longer term.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}31{:}08.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}12.843$ So on this grant I am working with them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:31:12.850 \longrightarrow 00:31:16.126$ Team then if I have like really great team,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:31:16.130 --> 00:31:17.603 excellent collaborators from

00:31:17.603 --> 00:31:19.567 Dana Farber Cancer Institute,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:31:19.570 --> 00:31:23.245 Northeastern University and Dartmouth College

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:31:23.245 \longrightarrow 00:31:28.398$ and I have a consultants from MGH and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:31:28.400 --> 00:31:30.548 And University of Pennsylvania,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:31:30.548 \longrightarrow 00:31:33.233$ we just started the recruitment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:31:33.240 \longrightarrow 00:31:36.000$ So this is the specific aims.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:31:36.000 \longrightarrow 00:31:38.060$ Basically we want to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:31:38.060 \longrightarrow 00:31:40.760$ the role of social network members,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:31:40.760 \longrightarrow 00:31:44.126$ how they impact the smoking behavior

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:31:44.126 --> 00:31:47.873 of cancer population and also we want

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}31{:}47.873 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}51.156$ to know that how the cancer diagnosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:31:51.160 --> 00:31:53.785 Impacts on the social network

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:31:53.785 \longrightarrow 00:31:55.112$ members smoking behavior.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:31:55.112 --> 00:31:58.851 So I have done some work to look into

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:31:58.851 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.503$ the the cancer diagnosis that it

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:01.503 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.536$ kind of motivates network members to

 $00:32:04.536 \longrightarrow 00:32:07.246$ change their health risk behaviors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:07.250 \dashrightarrow 00:32:11.044$ So this is a mixed method design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:32:11.050 --> 00:32:14.008 The phase one we're conducting it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:14.008 \longrightarrow 00:32:15.622$ a quantitative approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:32:15.622 --> 00:32:18.312 We're using egocentric social network

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:32:18.312 --> 00:32:20.754 approach to identify tobacco late,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:20.754 \longrightarrow 00:32:23.364$ hence individual stagnant with tobacco

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:23.364 \longrightarrow 00:32:25.985$ related cancer and then after the

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}32{:}25.985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}28.717$ phase one and date it's a one year

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:28.717 \longrightarrow 00:32:31.057$ follow up and we'll we're conducting

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:31.057 \longrightarrow 00:32:33.424$ a best line then three months,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:33.424 \longrightarrow 00:32:36.980$ six months and 12 months and then after 12.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}32{:}36.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}40.516$ Months do we want to do a qualitative

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}32{:}40.516 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}42.806$ dieting interviews with the cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:42.806 \longrightarrow 00:32:45.121$ survivor and self identify significant

 $00:32:45.121 \longrightarrow 00:32:47.983$ network member to understand how do

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:47.983 \longrightarrow 00:32:51.288$ they impact on their health risk behaviors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:51.290 \longrightarrow 00:32:52.338$ their relationship.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:32:52.338 --> 00:32:55.158 So we just started a screening,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:55.158 \longrightarrow 00:32:57.654$ we are recruiting from Dana Farber

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}32{:}57.654 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}59.548$ Cancer Institute and we are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:32:59.550 \longrightarrow 00:33:02.077$ So we have some discussions that maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:33:02.077 --> 00:33:05.258 later we can open up to the recruitment

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00{:}33{:}05.258 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}07.278$ to include your Cancer Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667 00:33:07.280 --> 00:33:09.380 As well. NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:33:09.380 \longrightarrow 00:33:11.354$ So this is just the illustration

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:33:11.354 \longrightarrow 00:33:13.200$ of the egocentric social network.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

00:33:13.200 --> 00:33:14.880 So basically all information,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:33:14.880 \longrightarrow 00:33:17.400$ the ego here represents the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:33:17.477 \longrightarrow 00:33:19.489$ individual diagnosis tobacco related

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:33:19.489 \longrightarrow 00:33:22.004$ cancer and then network members

 $00:33:22.004 \longrightarrow 00:33:24.098$ they are who they identify.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:33:24.100 \longrightarrow 00:33:24.626$ So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:33:24.626 \longrightarrow 00:33:27.782$ so far actually it's going well

NOTE Confidence: 0.805844966666667

 $00:33:27.782 \longrightarrow 00:33:29.360$ and so collect

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00{:}33{:}29.469 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}32.943$ collecting the social network data is

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00{:}33{:}32.943 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}37.679$ quite rich and so we are doing via zoom,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

00:33:37.680 --> 00:33:41.130 so our program manager. Michael?

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00{:}33{:}41.130 \to 00{:}33{:}43.110$ Research coordinator, they meet via zoom,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00:33:43.110 \longrightarrow 00:33:45.476$ so we collect the data via zoom

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

00:33:45.476 --> 00:33:48.093 and so far it's been great and

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

00:33:48.093 --> 00:33:50.690 we'll see how it's going to be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00:33:50.690 \longrightarrow 00:33:55.807$ Our sample size is 4 point 24129,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00{:}33{:}55.807 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}59.146$ so hopefully we can reach our sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00:33:59.146 \longrightarrow 00:34:02.731$ size and then to see how the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00:34:02.731 \longrightarrow 00:34:05.159$ role of social network in the.

 $00:34:05.160 \longrightarrow 00:34:06.668$ And the smoking behavior.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00{:}34{:}06.668 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}09.775$ So this is I would like to thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00:34:09.775 \longrightarrow 00:34:12.364$ everyone that helped me to to build

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00:34:12.364 \longrightarrow 00:34:15.020$ my program of research and what I did,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00:34:15.020 \longrightarrow 00:34:18.177$ my education and the team and everyone

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00{:}34{:}18.177 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}21.972$ that I'm working with and if you have any

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00:34:21.972 \longrightarrow 00:34:24.699$ questions I'll be happy to to answer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00:34:24.700 \longrightarrow 00:34:25.530$ Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46218666

 $00{:}34{:}27.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}27.480 \ \mathrm{Good}.$

NOTE Confidence: 0.5698318375

00:34:34.280 --> 00:34:35.528 Questions for Doctor Symposium?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79336552

00:34:40.010 --> 00:34:44.360 We have at least. OK, go ahead. Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78854163

 $00{:}34{:}46.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}47.525$ Do you see a correlation between

NOTE Confidence: 0.78854163

 $00:34:47.525 \longrightarrow 00:34:51.160$ either willingness to quit or

NOTE Confidence: 0.78854163

 $00:34:51.160 \longrightarrow 00:34:53.204$ willingness willingness to screen?

NOTE Confidence: 0.78854163

00:34:53.204 --> 00:34:56.494 I thought that for either your personal

NOTE Confidence: 0.78854163

 $00:34:56.494 \longrightarrow 00:34:58.440$ studies with the number of pack years,

 $00:34:58.440 \longrightarrow 00:35:02.880$ also with their accuracy with the risk of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78854163

 $00{:}35{:}02.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}05.390$ The risk of getting token cancer efficiently.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00:35:07.480 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.035$ So thank you. So for the willingness of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00:35:11.035 \longrightarrow 00:35:14.638$ the being willing to go to get screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00:35:14.640 \longrightarrow 00:35:17.118$ We include everyone with at least

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00:35:17.118 \longrightarrow 00:35:19.896$ 30 pack years, but I didn't look

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00:35:19.896 \longrightarrow 00:35:22.826$ at by like are you saying like

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00:35:22.826 \longrightarrow 00:35:26.840$ categorized between 30 to 404075?

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00:35:26.840 \longrightarrow 00:35:30.600$ Yeah, we didn't. We didn't look at that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00:35:30.600 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.520$ We didn't look at that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00:35:32.520 \longrightarrow 00:35:35.124$ but there have been some work that

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

00:35:35.124 --> 00:35:37.633 they look like having the park

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00{:}35{:}37.633 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}39.818$ here as a continuous variable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00:35:39.820 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.872$ So when it increases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00{:}35{:}41.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}44.437$ their intention also increases to

 $00:35:44.437 \longrightarrow 00:35:47.360$ screen from other researchers work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00{:}35{:}47.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}49.170$ But we just we didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00:35:49.170 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.618$ look at that separately.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860062705

 $00:35:52.890 \longrightarrow 00:35:54.706$ I actually had a related question to that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860062705

 $00:35:54.710 \longrightarrow 00:35:57.446$ So for those, so in your study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860062705

 $00:35:57.446 \longrightarrow 00:35:59.588$ you looked at whether or not a

NOTE Confidence: 0.860062705

 $00:35:59.588 \longrightarrow 00:36:01.009$ conversation with their provider

NOTE Confidence: 0.860062705

00:36:01.009 --> 00:36:02.879 about lung cancer screening then

NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875

 $00{:}36{:}05.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}06.438$ impacted their willingness or

NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875

 $00:36:06.438 \longrightarrow 00:36:09.270$ their attempts to quit, correct.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875

 $00:36:09.270 \longrightarrow 00:36:10.974$ I was wondering if actual.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875

 $00:36:10.974 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.284$ So that was the discussion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875

 $00:36:12.290 \longrightarrow 00:36:14.778$ I was wondering if there was any idea

NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875

 $00{:}36{:}14.778 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}16.794$ to look at actual people who actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875

00:36:16.794 --> 00:36:18.271 received lung cancer screening and

NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875

00:36:18.271 --> 00:36:20.168 then whether or not that then directly

 $00:36:20.168 \longrightarrow 00:36:21.720$ impacted their willingness to quit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:21.800 \longrightarrow 00:36:23.160$ So yeah, that's actually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:23.160 \longrightarrow 00:36:25.592$ That's like I have like some research

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

00:36:25.592 --> 00:36:28.481 project working on like we have to do like

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:28.552 \longrightarrow 00:36:30.944$ a longitudinal to see if they get the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:30.950 \longrightarrow 00:36:32.450$ if they have the referral,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:32.450 \longrightarrow 00:36:34.620$ the discussion, then the referral,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:34.620 \longrightarrow 00:36:36.200$ then the actual screening,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:36.200 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.570$ if it helps them to quit

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:38.656 \longrightarrow 00:36:40.826$ smoking so from other works.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:40.830 \longrightarrow 00:36:43.071$ So that's all like when I saw the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00{:}36{:}43.071 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}45.424$ the literature review we did people who

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00{:}36{:}45.424 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}48.247$ actually get to that point who get screened,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:48.250 \longrightarrow 00:36:50.644$ they are more likely to be motivated

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:50.644 \longrightarrow 00:36:52.848$ and they make quit attempts but

 $00:36:52.848 \longrightarrow 00:36:54.688$ we know that the smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00{:}36{:}54.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}57.554$ Is like just they need to get help.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:57.560 \longrightarrow 00:37:00.647$ Just trying the quit attempt is a first step

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:00.647 \longrightarrow 00:37:03.918$ but successfully quit they need to get help.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:03.920 \longrightarrow 00:37:05.900$ So in our study we just

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:05.900 \longrightarrow 00:37:07.220$ looked only the discussion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:07.220 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.668$ We didn't follow up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

00:37:08.668 --> 00:37:10.116 it was just cross-sectional.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00{:}37{:}10.120 --> 00{:}37{:}12.234$ We didn't follow up to see if

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:12.234 \longrightarrow 00:37:13.820$ they actually screened and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:13.820 \longrightarrow 00:37:15.355$ if they screened they steal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:15.360 \longrightarrow 00:37:17.445$ The quit attempts are higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:17.445 \longrightarrow 00:37:19.432$ or lower and also the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:19.432 \longrightarrow 00:37:21.736$ I'm in that say I looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:21.736 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.177$ on the use the criteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00{:}37{:}24.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}27.020$ updated criteria 20 pack years.

 $00:37:27.020 \longrightarrow 00:37:29.176$ So one of the explanation can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00{:}37{:}29.176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}32.077$ such a low rate of discussion that

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:32.077 \longrightarrow 00:37:34.447$ healthcare providers they didn't know

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:34.447 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.218$ that the guideline would be changed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:37.220 \longrightarrow 00:37:39.565$ So I looked at 20 but the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:39.565 \longrightarrow 00:37:42.540$ study collected 2017 so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

00:37:42.540 --> 00:37:44.550 It might have been lower,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:44.550 \longrightarrow 00:37:47.840$ so if the guideline was updated earlier.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852885533636364

 $00:37:48.550 \longrightarrow 00:37:50.380$ So we have a question from

NOTE Confidence: 0.852885533636364

00:37:50.380 --> 00:37:52.130 the chat from Doctor Silver,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852885533636364

 $00:37:52.130 \longrightarrow 00:37:53.426$ she asked under resource,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852885533636364

 $00:37:53.426 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.771$ patients poor as well as ethnic and

NOTE Confidence: 0.852885533636364

 $00{:}37{:}55.771 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}57.451$ racial minoritized groups are more

NOTE Confidence: 0.852885533636364

 $00:37:57.451 \longrightarrow 00:37:59.515$ likely to roll their own cigarettes

NOTE Confidence: 0.852885533636364

00:37:59.515 --> 00:38:01.495 due to expense and maybe under

 $00:38:01.495 \longrightarrow 00:38:03.550$ counted when it comes to pack years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852885533636364

 $00{:}38{:}03.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}05.520$ Any thoughts about trying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.852885533636364

 $00:38:05.520 \longrightarrow 00:38:07.638$ capture those who do not bypass?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:08.560 \longrightarrow 00:38:10.546$ So yeah, that's a very important

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:10.546 \longrightarrow 00:38:12.800$ question and that's a good question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:12.800 \longrightarrow 00:38:15.540$ So yes, that's another issue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:15.540 \longrightarrow 00:38:20.110$ But in order to Umm the way to measure it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

00:38:20.110 --> 00:38:22.090 it's very difficult if they

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00{:}38{:}22.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}23.674$ roll their own cigarettes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:23.680 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.704$ So that's kind of one of the limitation

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00{:}38{:}26.704 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}29.699$ that we're going to miss those

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

00:38:29.699 --> 00:38:31.855 population just healthcare providers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:31.860 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.758$ they have to follow whatever CMS mandates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:34.760 \longrightarrow 00:38:37.700$ So first they have to count their

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:37.700 \longrightarrow 00:38:40.760$ to bacco use, then they each and then meet

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:40.760 \dashrightarrow 00:38:42.834$ the guidelines so without, so that's.

 $00:38:42.834 \longrightarrow 00:38:44.913$ The limitation is it will be very

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:44.913 \longrightarrow 00:38:46.753$ hard to identify those people

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:46.753 \longrightarrow 00:38:48.603$ who roll their own cigarettes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:48.610 \longrightarrow 00:38:50.542$ So one of the requirements that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:50.542 \dashrightarrow 00:38:53.135$ they have to meet to smoke at least

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

00:38:53.135 --> 00:38:54.989 20 pack years of a cigarette,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:54.990 \longrightarrow 00:38:55.998$ that's the history.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92445532

 $00:39:01.650 \longrightarrow 00:39:03.260$ OK. Well, I have one. I have one

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:03.270 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.242$ other additional question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:04.242 \longrightarrow 00:39:06.790$ This is a pretty big picture one now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

00:39:06.790 --> 00:39:08.554 So and that first study that

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:08.554 \longrightarrow 00:39:09.436$ you presented presented,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:09.440 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.672$ you said that you found about 86%

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:11.672 \longrightarrow 00:39:14.324$ of the patients or the participants

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:14.324 \longrightarrow 00:39:16.970$ had reported a willingness to

00:39:16.970 --> 00:39:19.430 undergo lung cancer screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00{:}39{:}19.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}21.185$ However, like an actual real-world

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

00:39:21.185 --> 00:39:22.589 practice that the percentage

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:22.589 \longrightarrow 00:39:23.819$ actually who are eligible,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:23.820 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.655$ who actually do undergo screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:25.655 \longrightarrow 00:39:27.180$ is under 10%, correct.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:27.180 \longrightarrow 00:39:29.651$ Do you have any thoughts about like what

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:29.651 \longrightarrow 00:39:31.628$ that disconnect is or ways to study it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:31.630 \longrightarrow 00:39:33.590$ Or even down the roadways

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:33.590 \longrightarrow 00:39:35.158$ to address it potentially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:35.340 \longrightarrow 00:39:37.920$ So yeah that's very important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:37.920 \longrightarrow 00:39:39.780$ So even though they are Wheeling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:39.780 \longrightarrow 00:39:41.880$ I think we have to kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:41.880 \longrightarrow 00:39:44.179$ of so they meet a lot of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:44.180 \longrightarrow 00:39:45.580$ there has been a lot of work song,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:45.580 \longrightarrow 00:39:46.996$ so they meet, they get discussion,

 $00:39:47.000 \longrightarrow 00:39:48.694$ they get referral that they have to

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:48.694 \longrightarrow 00:39:50.379$ screen and then they don't show up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:50.380 \longrightarrow 00:39:52.192$ So like that's why screening rate

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:52.192 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.015$ is low and I think there would be

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:55.015 \longrightarrow 00:39:56.950$ like community enrich like programs

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:56.950 \longrightarrow 00:39:59.179$ or like the patient navigator.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:59.180 \longrightarrow 00:40:00.992$ So I think they should be

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:00.992 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.200$ some system in place.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00{:}40{:}02.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}04.575$ That whoever like during the

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00{:}40{:}04.575 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}06.950$ discussion during the sheer decision

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

00:40:07.025 --> 00:40:09.069 making visit expressed willingness

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:09.069 \longrightarrow 00:40:11.624$ to go through the screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

00:40:11.630 --> 00:40:14.110 So I think we have to have some,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:14.110 \longrightarrow 00:40:16.891$ some system in place that we can follow up

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:16.891 \longrightarrow 00:40:19.885$ and to see today make the screening or not.

 $00:40:19.890 \longrightarrow 00:40:23.298$ So for now it's high they want but.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:23.300 \longrightarrow 00:40:25.985$ An actual number of last

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:25.985 \longrightarrow 00:40:28.602$ year of 2020 was 6.5%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:28.602 \longrightarrow 00:40:31.836$ So those two numbers are very different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:31.840 \longrightarrow 00:40:33.240$ So we had like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:33.240 \longrightarrow 00:40:34.640$ we don't have that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:34.640 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.428$ System to identify follow

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:36.428 \longrightarrow 00:40:38.663$ up and bring them back

NOTE Confidence: 0.804891701538462

 $00:40:39.000 \longrightarrow 00:40:40.432$ and other, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.804891701538462

 $00:40:40.432 \longrightarrow 00:40:41.864$ other cancer screening also

NOTE Confidence: 0.804891701538462

 $00{:}40{:}41.864 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}43.720$ saw a dip in the 202020.

NOTE Confidence: 0.804891701538462

00:40:43.720 --> 00:40:46.270 Yeah, because yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.804891701538462

 $00:40:46.270 \longrightarrow 00:40:47.610$ that could be impacting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79926547355556

 $00:40:49.090 \longrightarrow 00:40:51.743$ States. So that report that I presented

NOTE Confidence: 0.79926547355556

 $00:40:51.743 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.439$ some from that they showed like in

NOTE Confidence: 0.79926547355556

 $00{:}40{:}54.439 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}57.123$ some states it's quite stable and then

00:40:57.123 --> 00:40:59.409 some states were higher or lower.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799265473555556

 $00:40:59.410 \longrightarrow 00:41:01.430$ So it wasn't like across

NOTE Confidence: 0.799265473555556

00:41:01.430 --> 00:41:03.450 the US that it dropped,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79926547355556

 $00:41:03.450 \longrightarrow 00:41:05.328$ there were states were doing much

NOTE Confidence: 0.79926547355556

 $00{:}41{:}05.328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}07.020$ better compared to other states.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7261948

 $00{:}41{:}10.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}12.750$ Any final questions for Doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.7261948

00:41:12.750 --> 00:41:14.600 Pogosian about this important work?

NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238

00:41:16.520 --> 00:41:18.120 Well, thank you, everyone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238

 $00:41:18.120 \longrightarrow 00:41:21.859$ So, Umm for being here for this time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238

 $00:41:21.860 \longrightarrow 00:41:23.596$ And I just want to say like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238

 $00:41:23.600 \longrightarrow 00:41:26.096$ I'm new at Yale. It's been not new.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238

00:41:26.100 --> 00:41:28.676 It's been a year and I'll be very

NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238

 $00{:}41{:}28.676 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>} 00{:}41{:}30.909$ much interested if you have any

NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238

00:41:30.909 --> 00:41:32.809 similar research interests or areas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238

 $00:41:32.810 \longrightarrow 00:41:34.955$ I'll be happy to collaborate

 $00:41:34.955 \longrightarrow 00:41:37.573$ with any one of you. OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238

00:41:37.573 --> 00:41:39.330 Thank you. Thanks for coming.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238

00:41:39.330 --> 00:41:40.539 Thanks so much, everyone.