THE PRIMARY CARE PROVIDER (PCP)-CANCER SPECIALIST RELATIONSHIP: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND MIXED METHODS META-SYNTHESIS

RUNNING TITLE: THE PCP-CANCER SPECIALIST RELATIONSHIP

Lesly A. Dossett, MD MPH¹, Janella N. Hudson, PhD², M. Arden M. Morris, MD MPH³, Catherine Lee, MD⁴, Richard G. Roetzheim, MD⁵, Michael D. Fetters, MD MPH MA⁶, Gwendolyn P. Quinn, PhD⁷

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Surgery, University of Michigan Comprehensive Cancer Center, Ann Arbor, MI ²Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Health Outcomes & Behavior, Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute, Tampa, FL ³Associate Professor, Department of Surgery and Center for Health Outcomes & Policy, University of Michigan Health System, Ann Arbor, MI

⁴Associate Member, Comprehensive Breast Program, Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute, Tampa, FL
⁵Professor, Department of Family Medicine, University of South Florida Morsani College of Medicine, Senior Member
Department of Health Outcomes and Behavior and Comprehensive Breast Program, Moffitt Cancer Center, Tampa, FL
⁶Professor, Department of Family Medicine, University of Michigan Health System, Ann Arbor, MI
⁷Senior Member, Department of Health Outcomes & Behavior, Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute and Professor, Department of Oncologic Sciences, Morsani College of Medicine, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL

Corresponding Author

Lesly A. Dossett MD MPH Assistant Professor of Surgery Divsion of Surgical Oncology 3303 Cancer Center SPC 5932 1500 East Medical Center Drive Ann Arbor, MI 48109-5932

Total Pages : 31 Total Tables : 5 Total Figures : 4

DISCLOSURES : There are no relevant financial disclosures from any authors. This work has been supported in part by the Survey Methods Core Facility at the H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute, and NCI designated Comprehensive Cancer Center (P30-CA076292). Dr. Hudson was supported by an NIH Training Grant R25CA090314. The sponsors had no role in the analysis or interpretation of the data or in the article preparation, review or approval. We would like to acknowledge the assistance of Susan S. Sharpe (librarian) for assistance with developing the search strategy.

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version record. Please cite this article as doi:10.3322/caac.21385.

ABSTRACT

Despite being critical to models of coordinated care, the relationship and communication between primary care providers (PCPs) and cancer specialists throughout the cancer continuum is poorly understood. Using pre-defined search terms, we conducted a systematic review of the literature in three databases to examine the relationship and communication between PCPs and cancer specialists. Among 301 articles identified, 35 met all inclusion criteria and were reviewed in-depth. We integrated findings from qualitative, quantitative, and disaggregated mixed methods studies using meta-synthesis. Six themes were identified and incorporated into a preliminary conceptual model of the PCP-cancer specialists' endorsement of a specialist-based model of care, (3) PCPs' belief that they play an important role in the cancer continuum, (4) PCPs' willingness to participate in the cancer continuum, (5) cancer specialists' and PCPs' uncertainty regarding the PCP's oncology knowledge/experience, and (6) discrepancies between PCPs and cancer specialists regarding roles. These data indicate a pervasive need for improved communication, delineation and coordination of responsibilities between PCPs and cancer specialists. Future interventions aimed at these deficiencies may improve patient and physician satisfaction and cancer care coordination.

Keywords PCP, general practitioner, cancer specialist, oncologist, cancer, cancer care, shared-care, communication, models of care.

INTRODUCTION

Poor coordination and communication between primary care providers (PCPs) and specialist physicians contributes to avoidable patient morbidity and mortality, fragmented care and increased costs [1, 2]. Despite intense focus on the quality and safety of cancer care during the last 15 years, the ways in which cancer specialists interact and communicate with PCPs has largely escaped attention. In the Institute of Medicine's (IOMs) 2005 report *From Cancer Patient to Cancer Survivor: Lost in Transition,* coordination between specialists and PCPs was listed as one of four key components of survivorship care [3], but recommendations for how these physicians should interact during the cancer care continuum—including diagnosis, treatment, surveillance and palliation—were lacking.

Multiple models for the PCP-specialist physician relationship have been previously described including primary care-based, shared-care and specialist-based models[4]. These models have been investigated more thoroughly for diseases such as diabetes where clinical management of the disease is often chronic and within the scope of primary practice[5, 6]. While a limited number of studies have examined shared-care models in cancer survivorship, it is uncertain whether these models are feasible or accepted throughout the cancer care continuum where treatment episodes may be time-limited or incompletely understood by the PCP[7, 8]. A specialist-based model entails provision of care by cancer specialists for most issues that arise during cancer treatment and the initial post-treatment surveillance periods, including those that may fall within the scope of primary practice. However, the growing number of cancer survivors [9], the projected shortage of cancer specialists [10], and the increasing complexity of cancer patients with respect to age and co-morbidities all challenge assumptions about the effectiveness of a specialist-based model as optimal for value, quality and coordinated care [11, 12]. A fundamental component of any of these models of care and the PCP- specialist relationship is communication, and the frequency, quality and ideal means of communication between PCPs and cancer specialists is poorly understood.

Our objective was to describe the attributes of the relationship and communication between PCPs and cancer specialists. We performed a systematic review of the literature and a meta-synthesis of

qualitative, quantitative, and disaggregated mixed methods studies. We summarized the literature with regard to key themes relating to the PCP-cancer specialist relationship throughout the cancer care continuum to determine what is currently known, to inform a preliminary conceptual model, to expose relevant gaps in knowledge, and to make recommendations for future work.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data Sources and Searches

In November 2015, we initiated a search of the published literature using PubMed, MEDLINE and EMBASE databases for articles published between January 1, 2000 and October 31, 2015. As a first step, we broadly searched terms and synonyms for cancer specialist, primary care physician, communication and relationships and then built a search string that captured the keyword search terms (see supporting information). Next, we limited the search to studies that related to cancer care including diagnosis, treatment, palliation and survivorship. Searches were limited to English language articles. All publications were then combined into a single list and duplicates were excluded for review.

Study Selection

We reviewed abstracts and excluded studies that described the physician-*patient* relationship or communication, studies that addressed cancer screening in the general population, the relationship or communication between PCPs or cancer specialists and other members of the health care team (nurses, pharmacist, managers), and comparisons of how PCPs or cancer specialists treat specific conditions (Figure 1). During data abstraction we elected to exclude studies that only reported on the patient perspective of the PCP-cancer specialist relationship. Our rationale for excluding these articles was that our original search terms did not include terms representing patients and we were not confident that our search had encompassed the entirety of articles that would represent the patient's perspective. We also felt the patient perspective, attitudes and preferences related to this relationship represented a significantly large and distinct topic as to be beyond the scope of this review. We supplemented our automated search by manually searching the bibliographies of included studies.

CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians

We developed inclusion and exclusion criteria for the systematic review, using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) schema [13]. Studies were excluded if they contained no data about cancer diagnosis, treatment or survivorship or no data about the relationship or communication between PCPs and cancer specialists. Both quantitative and qualitative studies were eligible for inclusion. One reviewer (L.A.D) assessed abstracts to ensure alignment with inclusion/exclusion criteria (Figure 2). In the second round of the review, at least 2 reviewers independently reviewed the remaining full text publications to verify eligibility (L.A.D, J.N.H. or G.P.Q.). After discussing discrepancies and reaching consensus and adding articles identified from hand-searching the references of eligible publications, the final set of eligible publications for data abstraction was identified

Data Abstraction

We developed a data abstraction tool that captured detailed data from both quantitative and qualitative studies; these included study design, main variables, statistical analysis, results and conclusions. For mixed methods studies, data was abstracted for both the quantitative and qualitative components and meta-inferences were used. Data were abstracted independently and in duplicate, and a third methodologist resolved disagreements.

Risk of Bias and Quality of the Studies

Methodological quality was assessed among quantitative and qualitative studies, and in the case of mixed methods designs, assessed independently for each portion of the study. We evaluated each quantitative study according to six criteria: assessment of reliability, validity and quality, minimization of selection and attrition bias where applicable, minimization of confounding, minimization of measurement bias, statistical tests, and whether or not the conclusions were supported by the results. We evaluated qualitative studies according to six separate criteria: assessment of reliability, validity and quality, sampling strategy, data reduction methods and data analysis, final themes with definitions, validation of results, and strategies for adjudication of discrepancies between coders.

Analysis

Thematic analysis was used to synthesize the quantitative and qualitative evidence into coherent themes[14]. As described in previous meta-synthesis of qualitative and quantitative studies [15], this technique specifically calls for integration of qualitative and quantitative data at the analysis and interpretation phases. We used an inductive approach, allowing the data content to direct the analysis. Each publication was read and reviewed in-depth. The data were then independently coded by at least two investigators and searched for significant themes related to the communication or relationship between PCPs and cancer specialists. The reviewers then discussed, compared and contrasted the themes across studies for further refinement until consensus was reached. In each case, consensus was reached and further adjudication was not necessary.

RESULTS

Our initial search identified 301 citations, of which 43 were potentially eligible for inclusion. The reasons for exclusion are summarized in Figure 2. After complete review and data abstraction, 36 studies met all inclusion criteria [12, 16-50]. Among eligible studies, 23 (64%) were quantitative surveys, 11 (30%) were qualitative studies, and 2 (6%) used mixed methods. The study subjects included PCPs and a variety of cancer specialists (Table 1). Among studies that included cancer specialists, 89% (n=17/19) included medical oncologists; only 31% (n=6/19) included radiation oncologists and only 16% (n=3/19) included surgeons or surgical oncologists. The majority of studies addressed survivorship only (n=26, 72%), while the remaining addressed the relationship or communication between PCPs and cancer specialist during other phases of cancer care. Most of the studies (n=23, 64%) were conducted in the US and the rest were conducted in Canada[18, 19, 39, 42], the United Kingdom[45, 47], Australia[34, 50], New Zealand[25] and the Netherlands[12, 21, 35]. Three studies lacked methodological detail [17, 31, 49] and were included in the final analysis with the caveat that the data should be interpreted with caution. **Major Themes**

Thematic analysis of the quantitative and qualitative papers revealed six major themes: (1) poor and delayed communication between PCPs and cancer specialists, (2) cancer specialists' endorsement of a

CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians

specialist-based model of care, (3) PCPs' belief that they play an important role in the cancer care continuum, (4) PCPs' willingness to participate in the cancer care continuum, (5) cancer specialists' and PCPs' uncertainty regarding the knowledge or training of the PCP to provide care, and (6) discrepancies between PCPs and cancer specialists regarding roles and expectations (Table 2). Importantly, these themes crossed methodologies and were consistently identified by quantitative (Table 3), qualitative (Table 4) and mixed methods studies (Table 5). Themes were incorporated into a preliminary conceptual model of the PCP-cancer specialist relationship as it pertained to the model of cancer care (Figure 3).

Poor and delayed communication between cancer specialists and PCPs

Many of the included studies reported on the frequency, quality or timing of the communication between cancer specialists and PCPs with many studies emphasizing survivorship communication [12, 17, 19, 21, 23-25, 28, 30, 32, 37-39, 43, 46-48, 50].

Erequency of Communication. In one study, 60% of PCPs indicated that the frequency of communication they received was "not enough", and expressed a desire to be more closely informed by either phone or email[43]. In another survey of PCPs, 44% indicated that they "sometimes", "rarely," or "never" were informed of the diagnosis or outcomes of their patients in the post-referral period and they described a significant gap in communication between diagnosis and the end of treatment [24]. Oncologists also endorsed infrequent communication with PCPs. In one survey, only 40% reported communication on an ongoing basis [32] and in interviews, specialists expressed that the frequency of cancer care, the logistical challenges of treatment, and the multiple providers involved in care among the barriers to frequent communication was a major barrier to implementation of a shared-care model [12].

Quality and Timing of Communication. Even when communication was transmitted by the cancer specialist and received by the PCP, PCPs noted deficiencies in content, mode, volume and style that

limited the usefulness of the information. In one study, PCPs described a lack of information regarding exactly what communication content the patient had received which led to these PCPs to report being "out of the loop"[33]. Some PCPs reported that the sheer volume of correspondence made it difficult to assess a patient's status in a timely fashion[27]. In another study, PCPs noted that the mode and style in which information was shared lacked coordination with care episodes and coherence[19]. In a study that audited letters from oncologists to PCPs, only 20% contained information regarding prognosis, 55% described what the patient was told, and only 10% included when or how to contact the oncologist[25].

Survivorship Communication. In one study, only 56% of PCPs involved in cancer survivorship reported that the specialist communicated transfer of survivorship care to the PCP[21], a finding that was supported in another study in which 56-62% of PCPs indicated that transfer communication was infrequent [46]. Several studies looked specifically at how discharge letters or survivorship care plans (SCPs) impacted communication between PCPs and cancer specialists[22, 27, 29, 31]. In one study, 89% of oncology providers felt it was very important for PCPs to receive SCPs, but 38% did not feel it was their responsibility to provide these plans[36]. In another study, only 14% of cancer specialists reported providing care plans to PCPs, citing limited training, no available template and a lack of reimbursement as barriers to this particular form of communication [38]. SCPs were generally a desired form of communication by PCPs. In one survey, 88% of PCPs believed that electronic medical record (EMR) generated SCPs were useful in coordinating care[22]. In another study, 85% of PCPs believed SCPs helped them to understand their roles.

<u>Strategies used by PCPs to overcome inadequate communication.</u> In some situations when communication was inadequate PCPs reported that they relied on the patient for updates[26, 27]. PCPs also described a strategy of re-referral of the patient to the cancer specialist when a question arose, given the reported difficulty in speaking directly with cancer specialists[39].

Factors Enhancing Communication. Five studies identified conditions that facilitated satisfactory communication [18, 26, 28, 39, 50]. One described a Canadian centralized cancer care system with synoptic discharge communication in which PCPs were satisfied with discharge communication from

oncologists[18]. In another study of PCPs, communication from oncologists was variable, but improved when the PCP and oncologist had a pre-existing relationship and practiced in the same health care system[26]. In a study of PCPs and cancer specialist in a Veterans Administration (VA) system, communication was enhanced by an integrated EMR though these same providers reported difficulty communicating with providers external to the hospital and EMR system[28]. PCPs that reported satisfaction with cancer specialists communication typically also reported ease of reaching cancer specialists by phone or email[39]. In a randomized trial in Australia, PCPs an increase in confidence and satisfaction with communication was noted among PCPs receiving faxed tailored chemotherapy information as compared to those PCPs receiving usual correspondence[50].

Cancer specialists' endorsement of a specialist-based model of care

A number of studies described cancer specialists' preference for a specialist-based model of care[19, 27, 28, 32, 34, 37, 44, 45]. In one study, 50% of medical oncologists reported serving as the PCP for at least 25% of their patients (but without specific mention of what specific primary care service were provided)[32]. In another study, oncologists endorsed their preference for specialist-based care because they believed patients were not well enough to go to multiple physicians[28]. The preference for a specialist-based model extended into survivorship care with 44% of breast cancer specialists in one survey stating that a breast surgeon should always be involved in breast cancer survivorship[44]. Cancer specialists also expressed uncertainty about the appropriateness of PCP-based survivorship care and this uncertainty seemed to influence practice patterns[34, 45]. In one study of oncologists' practice related to survivorship care, oncologists admitted that they rarely discharged cancer survivors to PCPs for surveillance and survivorship, instead monitoring patients indefinitely[27]. Oncology providers indicated that they felt this long-term commitment provided patients with reassurance that any potential problems would be detected as early as possible. Other specialists desired to remain involved with survivors because patient contact provided positive reinforcement of the success of their therapy. In one qualitative study, oncology specialists stated that they struggled with discharging survivors because of the bonds they had

established with patients and their concern for survivors needs. They reported becoming "emotionally invested" in the success of the patient and wanted to remain involved even after the completion of active treatment[37]. While specialists often acknowledged the role of the PCP in addressing health concerns, they viewed cancer care as a "special domain" and acknowledged being protective and possessive of some patients. In another study, oncologists reported treating minor problems within the scope of primary practice because of uncertainty regarding the PCPs willingness or ability to address such problems[19].

PCPs belief that they play an important role in the cancer continuum

PCPs believed they played an important role during cancer care, specifically with regard to providing moral support, education, and management of medical issues that arose during cancer care[23, 24, 27, 28, 33, 39, 42]. They characterized their care as philosophically different from that of the oncologists and as "balancing" the oncologists' approach. Specifically, PCPs noted that they were "oriented toward the whole person", rather than focusing on "just their cancer." PCPs also thought that cancer specialists excluded them because the PCPs might be less willing to support aggressive cancer treatments in patients with poor prognoses[23]. In one study, PCPs reported that patients viewed them as trusted experts and described patients' elicitation of the PCPs opinion on recommendations regarding treatments and therapies before initiation of the treatments prescribed by the cancer specialist. They described patients' reliance on the PCP to manage symptoms, interpret information presented by the cancer specialist and to help patients make sense of their personal experience of cancer[33]. In one survey, 80% of PCPs felt they were positioned better than cancer specialists to provide psychosocial support to their patients, and that because of this, they should be involved throughout the cancer care continuum[42].

PCPs' desire and willingness to play a role in the cancer continuum

<u>PCP views about timing of involvement.</u> PCPs expressed a desire to remain involved in all phases of the cancer continuum and expressed frustration with the lack of interaction with patients undergoing active treatment[29]. They described their efforts to maintain good relationships with patients, but also felt

CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians

oncologists "swallow[ed] up" the patient by providing primary as well as cancer care. PCPs complained that some patients only visited after an oncologist refused to perform a procedure such as a Pap smear, leaving them feeling exploited and "shut out"[23]. In some situations, PCPs believed patient preferences contributed to the specialist-based model with 65% of PCPs in one study stating that the patient's desire for specialist care was a barrier to PCP involvement[21]. Only one study reported PCP ambivalence about assuming a larger role, despite these PCPs feeling capable of assuming the role if necessary[37].

<u>PCP role in survivorship.</u> PCPs were especially willing to participate during the survivorship phase[12, 21, 23, 29, 33, 39-42, 46, 49]. In a survey of PCPs who had attended a refresher course on care of adult survivors of childhood cancer, 97% of PCPs indicated that they were willing to participate in shared care of these patients, and 64% felt it was their responsibility to be in charge of survivorship care[12]. In one study of PCPs, 32% believed that they should be involved at an earlier phase of follow-up of breast cancer patients and 40% were willing to accept exclusive responsibility for follow-up earlier than 5-years after active treatment. Nineteen percent (19%) were willing to assume follow-up immediately after active treatment[21]. PCPs ready to assume exclusive responsibility for survivorship care 2-3 years after active treatment identified several modalities that would ease this transition including a patientspecific letter from the specialist, printed guidelines, expedited access to investigations when recurrence was suspected, and expedited re-referral if necessary[42].

Specialists and PCPs are uncertain of the PCPs knowledge or training to provide care

Despite PCPs' willingness to participate in the cancer care continuum, cancer specialists expressed skepticism that PCPs were trained to provide this care[19, 20, 45]. In one study, oncologists reported treating problems within the scope of a PCPs practice because of uncertainty regarding the PCPs' competence to address such problems[19]. In another study, only 23% of oncologists believed that PCPs had the skills to conduct appropriate testing for breast cancer recurrence and only 38% believed PCPs could care for late effects of breast cancer and breast cancer treatment[20]. A further study of breast cancer specialists cited concerns for a lack of PCP experience or training in oncology as barriers to discharge for

follow-up; they indicated that increased education and training, development of shared protocols and recruitment of primary care based oncology nurses would facilitate early discharge to PCPs[45].

PCPs mostly endorsed this uncertainty and lack of knowledge or training[17-21, 29, 33, 37, 43, 46, 49, 50]. Insufficient knowledge of cancer issues was cited as a barrier to providing survivorship care by 58% of PCPs in one study[17] and 79% in another[29]. In one study, PCPs felt uncomfortable with patient's questions about their cancer diagnosis and described a lack of knowledge regarding current treatment protocols[33]. A group of PCPs treating breast cancer survivors expressed a lack of confidence in managing lymphedema, family planning and psychosocial counseling[18]. With regards to colorectal cancer survivorship care, PCPs desired knowledge regarding genetic counseling and testing, increased risks for second colorectal cancers, and other cancers and diseases[43]. In one study, PCPs relied on the Internet to stay current and to answer patient questions[33].

Discordant expectations and preferences between providers

Another dominant theme was discordance or uncertainty in provider roles and expectations throughout the cancer care continuum, as well as preferences in care models among (within) and between PCPs and oncologists[16, 20, 28, 29, 33, 40]. In two studies that examined expectations of providers' roles, Cheung *et al* noted discrepant expectations between and among PCPs and cancer specialists[16, 40]. When considering specific components of survivorship care, PCPs and oncologists showed high discordance in perceptions of their own roles for cancer follow-up, cancer screening, and general preventive health (agreement rates of 3%, 44%, and 51%, respectively)[40]. PCPs endorsed being uncertain of their roles[29] and not knowing what patient management belonged to the PCP and what would be handled by the oncologist[33]. Preferences also differed among cancer specialists, with medical oncologists assuming a primary care role in some cases, while radiation and surgical oncologists expressed a preference for only managing cancer-related issues[28]. One study specifically addressed the preferred model of care among PCPs and oncologists—38% of PCPs preferred a shared-care model compared to only 16% of oncologists. In contrast, 57% of oncologists preferred a specialist-based model[20].

DISCUSSION

The very nature of a cancer diagnosis, the complexity and toxicity of cancer treatments, and the fragmented nature of the cancer care system all pose significant challenges to high quality coordination of care[30]. Key in the ability to achieve cancer care coordination is the communication and relationship between PCPs and cancer specialists. In this systematic review and meta-synthesis, we identified that cancer specialists' communication with PCPs lacks the frequency, timing and content desired by PCPs. Both PCPs and cancer specialists expressed skepticism regarding the other party's ability to play their role. Cancer specialists cite PCPs' lack of familiarity with cancer treatments and surveillance, and PCPs note that cancer specialists' neglect psychosocial care they believe PCPs are better positioned and equipped to provide. In turn, expectations for care roles are discordant. Cancer specialists predominantly express a preference for specialist-based care throughout the cancer continuum, including the surveillance and survivorship phases. PCPs express a willingness/desire to be more involved during the cancer continuum where they believe they can provide a perspective focused on the "whole patient" that complements and provides context for active cancer treatments.

Communication between PCPs and specialists can be difficult in general, and opportunities for building relationships are few when these relationships must span clinics or hospital systems, as is often the case in complex cancer care[30, 51]. The existing data document inadequate communication primarily from cancer specialist to PCP in terms of frequency, content, style, and mode. The inadequacies leave PCPs with the perception that the cancer specialists had "swallowed up" the patient or the feeling of being "out of the loop". A striking absence in the identified literature relates to the extent and quality of ongoing communication from PCPs to cancer specialists related to changes in a patient's overall condition, comorbidities or concern for recurrence. It is unclear to what extent deficiencies in PCP-cancer specialist communication impact care coordination. At a minimum we noted that PCPs ask patients for information (which may erode trust in the healthcare system) or use re-referral as a strategy to overcome difficulty in

directly communicating with cancer specialists. These strategies may be both inaccurate and inefficient. We did note several circumstances associated with satisfactory or enhanced communication including the use of a shared EMR (such as in the Veterans Administration health system) and direct communication access to cancer specialists by PCPs (personal phone or email). Some cancer systems now allow access to electronic health portals for referring physicians and patients. These systems may help address communication gaps, but these portals were not considered in any of the identified studies. It is uncertain how PCPs use these system, and the use of and satisfaction with these systems remains an area for further investigation. Outside of integrated health systems, cancer specialists do not typically have access to primary care records.

Intervention strategies aimed at improving and facilitating the quality of communication between PCPs and cancer specialists may improve patient and provider satisfaction, while reducing duplication (laboratory or imaging tests) or omission of important services (psychological support or management of co-morbidities). We recommend (Figure 4) that cancer specialists aim to make personal contact with PCPs after initial referral, to report major changes in a patient's course, and at discharge. When possible cancer specialists should share direct contact information (personal mobile number or email address) with PCPs to facilitate timely communication and perhaps avoid the need for re-referral. Cancer centers and specialists must also emphasize (and delineate responsibility for) the provision of a SCP to the PCP at discharge. This mode of communication was nearly unanimously viewed as helpful by PCPs, providing justification to address the identified barriers to this mode of communication for the cancer specialist (cancer specialist's lack of training in preparing SCPs and a lack of reimbursement). PCPs need to know what to watch for, when to refer back to the cancer specialists, and that cancer specialists will respond in a timely way when patients are re-referred.

Beyond improved communication, there is a need for recognition and delineation of physician roles throughout the cancer care continuum that considers the necessary contributions of both the PCP and cancer specialists and avoids duplication or omission in important services. In the reviewed literature, cancer specialists expressed a preference for a specialist-based model where they provide active treatment,

CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians

surveillance, palliative and survivorship care, and in some cases provide services that would normally fall within the scope of primary practice. This preference seemed to be motivated by three factors—(1) a belief that the patient was too ill to visit multiple physicians, (2) an obligation to the patient rooted in the belief that PCPs were ill-equipped to provide care, and/or (3) personal fulfillment in continuing to see patients during the survivorship phase. PCPs did not prefer a specialist-dominated model, especially during the advanced cancer/palliative and survivorship phases of care[20]. Excluding or not engaging the PCP during active treatment fails to capitalize on the patient-PCP continuity relationship and potentially erodes this relationship in a way that could have implications for both the palliative care and survivorship phases of care.

Guidelines for how cancer specialists and PCPs should optimally relate and communicate during various phases of the cancer care continuum are lacking. We believe these guidelines must consider disease site, cancer prognosis and treatment toxicity and must be in line with patient preferences and expectations. We recommend that PCPs and cancer specialists encourage patients to remain engaged with their PCPs during active cancer treatment via regularly scheduled visits. These visits should address ongoing management of comorbidities, long-term cancer or cancer treatment related symptom management, and the patient's understanding and satisfaction with their cancer care in the context of their global health and quality of life preferences. We specifically recommend visits with the PCP to follow the initial consultation with the cancer specialists, precede any major cancer operation (inpatient hospital stay, or as recommended by the cancer specialist), at regular intervals during active treatments, and at discharge from cancer specialist surveillance or transition to palliative care. We have proposed a preliminary conceptual model that can provide the framework for further investigations, elaboration, validation and guideline development (Figure 3). In this model, we propose that the relationship between PCP and cancer specialist is influenced by provider preferences, expectations, perceived competence and patient preferences, while the quality of communication is influenced by the content, mode and frequency of communication from cancer specialist to PCP. Together the relationship and communication influence the shared-care model. While we are not aware of any existing conceptual models for the PCP-cancer

specialist relationship, this model does compare to a conceptual model that has been proposed for the interprofessional collaboration between OB physicians and midwives[52]. Both of these conceptual models emphasize trust, respect, communication, and role clarity.

Resistance to a shared-care or PCP-based model for survivorship and palliation by cancer specialists may become problematic as the number of cancer patients and survivors increases globally. For cancer survivorship, a long-term specialist-based model results in patients receiving specialty care despite being well; this may negatively impact access to cancer clinics that already face shortages of specialists. For palliative care, a specialist-based model may result in patients traveling frequently or over long distances and being outside of their support communities at a time when their performance status is poor and the need for psychosocial support is a priority. At least one barrier to a transition to a shared- or PCPbased model for palliation or survivorship is a real or perceived lack of oncology knowledge and experience by PCPs. It is unclear how much cancer specialists appropriately or inappropriately project necessary skills needed by PCPs. As suggested above, PCPs often feel they can competently follow and execute SCPs as well as recognize variations that require referral back to oncologists. There may be a misperception by cancer specialists that PCPs want to provide "cancer care" rather than "care for patients with cancer." We did note that PCPs often turned to Internet resources to address knowledge gaps. This finding suggests that these web-based resources should be provided by and/or vetted by major cancer organizations and provided in a format that meets the needs of the PCP. As the number of cancer patients on chronic active treatments and survivors increase, PCPs will need to become increasingly familiar with short and long-term treatment toxicities, surveillance and other aspects of survivorship care and many believe they can do this through teamwork with cancer specialists. Cancer organizations, health systems and specialists should aim to provide resources that are succinct and easily accessible to the PCPs caring for their patients. Primary care graduate medical education training programs should ensure exposure to cancer patients in various phases of the cancer continuum and cancer organizations should provide continuing medical education (CME) programs for PCPs who care for cancer patients and/or survivors.

Strengths and Limitations

Our review has exposed several important themes regarding the PCP-cancer specialist relationship as well as relevant gaps in the literature. The majority of the existing literature focuses on the survivorship phase of care only. Most of the studies reviewed also focused on the perceptions and needs of the PCP. Among studies that included cancer specialists, medical oncologists were the most common group sampled. One study specifically excluded surgeons working at National Cancer Institute (NCI) Community Cancer Center Programs, stating that the topic was less relevant to them[36]. Given these gaps in the literature, it is uncertain how these themes apply to the continuum of cancer care and care provided by other disciplines of cancer specialists such as surgeons and radiation oncologists and our conceptual model will be refined as future data become available.

As with any systematic review, our search was limited by the possibility of publication and search bias. To minimize these limitations we used broad and comprehensive search terms, searched multiple large databases, and hand-searched the references of included studies. Our findings are also limited by the available literature, and as previously noted the majority of the available literature sampled only medical oncologists instead of a broad range of cancer specialists, and many cancer types (outside of breast and colorectal cancer) are poorly represented. Finally, several of the included studies lacked key methodological details regarding sampling and analysis and thus it was difficult to judge the quality of the results.

Conclusion

In summary, these synthesized data inform a preliminary conceptual model and present a compelling rationale for further investigation and targeted strategies aimed at understanding and improving the PCP-cancer specialist relationship and communication throughout the cancer care continuum. A compelling confluence of views relative to the common goal of maximizing the care of cancer patients unites PCPs and cancer specialists, but how to optimize the relationship needs resolution. This review suggests that improving PCP-cancer specialist communication (especially from cancer specialist to PCP),

establishing guidelines for provider roles during various phases of care to maximize the skill sets and needs of both PCP and cancer specialist, and providing well designed and timed oncology resources for PCPs may help achieve the shared goals of improving the quality and coordination of cancer care and enhancing patient and physician satisfaction.

epter Acce

REFERENCES

- McGlynn EA, Asch SM, Adams J, Keesey J, Hicks J, DeCristofaro A, Kerr EA: The quality of health care delivered to adults in the United States. *N Engl J Med* 2003, 348(26):2635-2645.
- In: Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington (DC);
 2001.
- Hewitt ME, Greenfield S, Stovall E, National Cancer Policy Board (U.S.). Committee on Cancer
 Survivorship: Improving Care and Quality of Life.: From cancer patient to cancer survivor :
 lost in transition. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press; 2006.
- Madarnas Y, Joy AA, Verma S, Sehdev S, Lam W, Sideris L: Models of care for early-stage breast cancer in Canada. *Current oncology (Toronto, Ont)* 2011, 18 Suppl 1:S10-19.
- 5. Ciardullo AV, Daghio MM, Brunetti M, Bevini M, Daya G, Feltri G, Novi D, Goldoni CA, Messori A, Guerzoni A *et al*: Changes in long-term glycemic control and performance indicators in a cohort of type 2 diabetic patients cared for by general practitioners: findings from the "Modena Diabetes Project". *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis* 2003, 13(6):372-376.
- Renders CM, Valk GD, de Sonnaville JJ, Twisk J, Kriegsman DM, Heine RJ, van Eijk JT, van der
 Wal G: Quality of care for patients with Type 2 diabetes mellitus---a long-term comparison of
 two quality improvement programmes in the Netherlands. *Diabet Med* 2003, 20(10):846-852.
- Oeffinger KC, McCabe MS: Models for delivering survivorship care. Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology 2006, 24(32):5117-5124.
- 8. Cohen HJ: A model for the shared care of elderly patients with cancer. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 2009, **57 Suppl 2**:S300-302.
- Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A: Cancer statistics, 2015. CA: a cancer journal for clinicians 2015, 65(1):5-29.
- Erikson C, Salsberg E, Forte G, Bruinooge S, Goldstein M: Future supply and demand for oncologists : challenges to assuring access to oncology services. Journal of oncology practice / American Society of Clinical Oncology 2007, 3(2):79-86.

- Rose JH, O'Toole EE, Koroukian S, Berger NA: Geriatric oncology and primary care: promoting partnerships in practice and research. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 2009, 57 Suppl 2:S235-238.
- 2. Blaauwbroek R, Zwart N, Bouma M, Meyboom-de Jong B, Kamps WA, Postma A: The willingness of general practitioners to be involved in the follow-up of adult survivors of childhood cancer. *Journal of cancer survivorship : research and practice* 2007, 1(4):292-297.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P: Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2009, 62(10):1006-1012.
- 4. Dixon-Woods M, Agarwal S, Jones D, Young B, Sutton A: **Synthesising qualitative and quantitative evidence: a review of possible methods**. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2005, **10**(1):45-

53.

- Mead EL, Doorenbos AZ, Javid SH, Haozous EA, Alvord LA, Flum DR, Morris AM: Shared
 decision-making for cancer care among racial and ethnic minorities: a systematic review. Am
 J Public Health 2013, 103(12):e15-29.
- 6. Cheung WY, Neville BA, Earle CC: Associations among cancer survivorship discussions, patient and physician expectations, and receipt of follow-up care. *Journal of clinical oncology* : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology 2010, **28**(15):2577-2583.
- Dulko D, Pace CM, Dittus KL, Sprague BL, Pollack LA, Hawkins NA, Geller BM: Barriers and facilitators to implementing cancer survivorship care plans. *Oncology nursing forum* 2013, 40(6):575-580.
- Smith SL, Wai ES, Alexander C, Singh-Carlson S: Caring for survivors of breast cancer: perspective of the primary care physician. *Current oncology (Toronto, Ont)* 2011, 18(5):e218-226.
- 9. Haq R, Heus L, Baker NA, Dastur D, Leung FH, Leung E, Li B, Vu K, Parsons JA: **Designing a** multifaceted survivorship care plan to meet the information and communication needs of

breast cancer patients and their family physicians: results of a qualitative pilot study. BMC medical informatics and decision making 2013, 13:76.

- Potosky AL, Han PK, Rowland J, Klabunde CN, Smith T, Aziz N, Earle C, Ayanian JZ, Ganz PA, Stefanek M: Differences between primary care physicians' and oncologists' knowledge,
 attitudes and practices regarding the care of cancer survivors. *Journal of general internal medicine* 2011, 26(12):1403-1410.
- Roorda C, Berendsen AJ, Haverkamp M, van der Meer K, de Bock GH: Discharge of breast
 cancer patients to primary care at the end of hospital follow-up: a cross-sectional survey.
 European journal of cancer (Oxford, England : 1990) 2013, 49(8):1836-1844.
- Donohue S, Sesto ME, Hahn DL, Buhr KA, Jacobs EA, Sosman JM, Andreason MJ, Wiegmann DA, Tevaarwerk AJ: Evaluating primary care providers' views on survivorship care plans generated by an electronic health record system. *Journal of oncology practice / American Society of Clinical Oncology* 2015, 11(3):e329-335.
- 3. Dicicco-Bloom B, Cunningham RS: The experience of information sharing among primary care clinicians with cancer survivors and their oncologists. *Journal of cancer survivorship : research and practice* 2013, 7(1):124-130.
- Shen MJ, Binz-Scharf M, D'Agostino T, Blakeney N, Weiss E, Michaels M, Patel S, McKee MD,
 Bylund CL: A mixed-methods examination of communication between oncologists and
 primary care providers among primary care physicians in underserved communities. *Cancer* 2015, 121(6):908-915.
- 5. Babington S, Wynne C, Atkinson CH, Hickey BE, Abdelaal AS: **Oncology service** correspondence: do we communicate? *Australasian radiology* 2003, **47**(1):50-54.
- Mayer DK, Gerstel A, Leak AN, Smith SK: Patient and provider preferences for survivorship care plans. Journal of oncology practice / American Society of Clinical Oncology 2012, 8(4):e80-86.

- Hewitt ME, Bamundo A, Day R, Harvey C: Perspectives on post-treatment cancer care: qualitative research with survivors, nurses, and physicians. *Journal of clinical oncology :* official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology 2007, 25(16):2270-2273.
- Sada YH, Street RL, Jr., Singh H, Shada RE, Naik AD: Primary care and communication in shared cancer care: a qualitative study. *The American journal of managed care* 2011, 17(4):259-265.
- 9. Dittus KL, Sprague BL, Pace CM, Dulko DA, Pollack LA, Hawkins NA, Geller BM: Primary
 Care Provider Evaluation of Cancer Survivorship Care Plans Developed for Patients in their
 Practice. Journal of general practice (Los Angeles, Calif) 2014, 2(4):163.
- Prouty CD, Mazor KM, Greene SM, Roblin DW, Firneno CL, Lemay CA, Robinson BE, Gallagher TH: Providers' perceptions of communication breakdowns in cancer care. *Journal* of general internal medicine 2014, 29(8):1122-1130.
- Blanch-Hartigan D, Forsythe LP, Alfano CM, Smith T, Nekhlyudov L, Ganz PA, Rowland JH:
 Provision and discussion of survivorship care plans among cancer survivors: results of a nationally representative survey of oncologists and primary care physicians. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology* 2014, 32(15):1578-1585.
- O'Toole E, Step MM, Engelhardt K, Lewis S, Rose JH: The role of primary care physicians in advanced cancer care: perspectives of older patients and their oncologists. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 2009, 57 Suppl 2:S265-268.
- 3. Rayman KM, Edwards J: **Rural primary care providers' perceptions of their role in the breast cancer care continuum**. *The Journal of rural health : official journal of the American Rural Health Association and the National Rural Health Care Association* 2010, **26**(2):189-195.
- Rychetnik L, Morton RL, McCaffery K, Thompson JF, Menzies SW, Irwig L: Shared care in the follow-up of early-stage melanoma: a qualitative study of Australian melanoma clinicians' perspectives and models of care. *BMC health services research* 2012, 12:468.

- Ezendam N, Nicolaije K, Kruitwagen R, Pijnenborg J, Vos C, Boll D, Bommel M, Van De Poll-Franse L: Survivorship care plans to inform the primary care physician of gynaecological
 cancer patients: Trial results and implications for future development. *Psycho-oncology* 2013, 22:31-32.
- Salz T, McCabe MS, Onstad EE, Baxi SS, Deming RL, Franco RA, Glenn LA, Harper GR, Jumonville AJt, Payne RM *et al*: Survivorship care plans: is there buy-in from community oncology providers? *Cancer* 2014, 120(5):722-730.
- Kantsiper M, McDonald EL, Geller G, Shockney L, Snyder C, Wolff AC: Transitioning to breast cancer survivorship: perspectives of patients, cancer specialists, and primary care providers. *Journal of general internal medicine* 2009, 24 Suppl 2:S459-466.
- Merport A, Lemon SC, Nyambose J, Prout MN: The use of cancer treatment summaries and care plans among Massachusetts physicians. Supportive care in cancer : official journal of the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer 2012, 20(7):1579-1583.
- O'Brien MA, Grunfeld E, Sussman J, Porter G, Hammond Mobilio M: Views of family
 physicians about survivorship care plans to provide breast cancer follow-up care:
 Exploration of results from a randomized controlled trial. *Current Oncology* 2015, 22(4):252-259.
- 0. Cheung WY, Neville BA, Cameron DB, Cook EF, Earle CC: **Comparisons of patient and physician expectations for cancer survivorship care**. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology* 2009, **27**(15):2489-2495.
- Shalom MM, Hahn EE, Casillas J, Ganz PA: Do survivorship care plans make a difference? A primary care provider perspective. Journal of oncology practice / American Society of Clinical Oncology 2011, 7(5):314-318.
- Del Giudice ME, Grunfeld E, Harvey BJ, Piliotis E, Verma S: Primary care physicians' views of routine follow-up care of cancer survivors. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology* 2009, 27(20):3338-3345.

- Salz T, Oeffinger KC, Lewis PR, Williams RL, Rhyne RL, Yeazel MW: Primary care providers' needs and preferences for information about colorectal cancer survivorship care. *Journal of* the American Board of Family Medicine : JABFM 2012, 25(5):635-651.
- 4. van Hezewijk M, Hille ET, Scholten AN, Marijnen CA, Stiggelbout AM, van de Velde CJ:
 Professionals' opinion on follow-up in breast cancer patients; perceived purpose and influence of patients' risk factors. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2011, 37(3):217-224.
- Donnelly P, Hiller L, Bathers S, Bowden S, Coleman R: Questioning specialists' attitudes to breast cancer follow-up in primary care. *Ann Oncol* 2007, 18(9):1467-1476.
- Nissen MJ, Beran MS, Lee MW, Mehta SR, Pine DA, Swenson KK: Views of primary care providers on follow-up care of cancer patients. *Family medicine* 2007, 39(7):477-482.
- 7. Watson EK, Sugden EM, Rose PW: Views of primary care physicians and oncologists on
 cancer follow-up initiatives in primary care: an online survey. Journal of cancer survivorship : research and practice 2010, 4(2):159-166.
- Forsythe LP, Parry C, Alfano CM, Kent EE, Leach CR, Haggstrom DA, Ganz PA, Aziz N,
 Rowland JH: Use of survivorship care plans in the United States: associations with
 survivorship care. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 2013, 105(20):1579-1587.
- 9. Papagrigoriadis S, Koreli A: The needs of general practitioners in the follow-up of patients with colorectal cancer. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2001, **27**(6):541-544.
- Jefford M, Baravelli C, Dudgeon P, Dabscheck A, Evans M, Moloney M, Schofield P: Tailored chemotherapy information faxed to general practitioners improves confidence in managing adverse effects and satisfaction with shared care: results from a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology* 2008, 26(14):2272-2277.
- 1. Wood ML: **Communication between cancer specialists and family doctors**. *Canadian family physician Medecin de famille canadien* 1993, **39**:49-57.

2. Smith DC: Midwife-physician collaboration: a conceptual framework for interprofessional collaborative practice. *J Midwifery Womens Health* 2015, **60**(2):128-139.

Acce

Characteristic	N=36 (%)
ancer Site*	
Breast	14 (39)
Colorectal	7 (19)
Endometrial	1 (3)
Melanoma	1 (3)
Various (3 or more types)	18 (50)
tudy Location	
United States	23 (64)
Outside United States	13 (36)
tudy Population*	
Primary Care/Generalist Physicians	30 (83)
Cancer Specialists	19 (54)
Medical Oncologists	17/19 (89)
Radiation Oncologists	6/19 (31)
Surgical Oncologists	3/19 (16)
tage of Cancer Care	
Curative Intent Treatment	3 (8)
Survivorship	26 (72)
Cancer Continuum	6 (17)

Accept

Table 2. Organization of References Into Themes			
Characteristic	Quantitative Studies (n=22)	Qualitative Studies (n=11)	Mixed Studies (n=2)
Poor and delayed communication between PCPs and cancer specialists	[12, 21, 22, 25, 38, 43, 46-48]	[19, 23, 26-28, 30, 32, 37, 39]	[17, 24, 50]
Cancer specialists endorse a specialist-driven model of care	[44, 45]	[19, 27, 28, 32, 34, 37]	
PCPs believe they play an important role in the cancer continuum	[42]	[23, 27, 28, 33, 39]	[24]
PCPs are willing to pay a role in the cancer care continuum	[12, 21, 29, 40, 42, 46, 49]	[23, 33, 39, 41]	
Oncologists and PCPs are uncertain of PCPs knowledge or ability to provide care	[18, 20, 21, 29, 43, 45, 46, 49]	[19, 33, 37]	[17, 50]
Discordance among expectations and perceived roles	[16, 20, 29, 40]	[28, 33]	
PCP primary care physician			

Accepted

U			
Table 3. Summary of F	indings from the Quantitativ	e Literature.	
Article	Participants	Study Design	Findings
Blaauwbrock et al.[12]	233 PCPs	Cross-sectional survey of PCPs attending a refresher course on survivorship care of adult survivors of pediatric cancer	Ninety-seven percent (97%) of PCPs were willing to participate in a shared care model for follow-up. Sixty-four percent (64%) of PCPs felt that it was their responsibility to be in charge. PCPs desired guidelines (64%), information about the patient's medical history (37%), and direct communication lines with oncologists (45%). Lack of communication was a barrier to shared care.
Cheung et al.[16]	255 PCPs 123 medical oncologists 232 PCP-oncologists pairs	Cross-sectional survey of cancer survivors 2-years from active treatment and NED and their self-identified PCP and oncologist	Survivorship care expectations were most discrepant between PCPs and oncologists; patient-PCP expectations were more concordant than patient-oncologist expectations. Patient-oncologist discussions regarding survivorship improved patient-PCP expectations, but not PCP-oncologist concordance.
Smith et al.[18]	590 PCPs	Cross-sectional survey of PCPs providing follow-up care for patients with non-metastatic breast cancer	PCPs were most confident in screening for recurrence and managing anxiety and least confident in managing lymphedema and providing psychosocial counseling. Most PCPs found discharge letters from oncologists to be helpful, particularly when including a treatment summary and recommendations for surveillance.
Potosky et al.[20]	1,072 PCPs 1,130 medical oncologists	Cross-sectional survey of PCPs and medical oncologist identified via AMA Master file	Compared with PCPs, oncologists were less likely to believe PCPs had the skills to conduct appropriate testing for breast cancer recurrence or to care for late effects of breast cancer. Only 40% of PCPs were confident in their knowledge of testing for recurrence.
Roorda et al.[21]	502 PCPs	Cross-sectional survey of all PCPs in three northern provinces of the Netherlands	Forty percent (40%) of PCPs were willing to accept exclusive responsibility of follow-up care sooner than 5 years after active cancer treatment. Perceived barriers included poor communication with cancer specialists, patient preference for specialist follow-up versus PCP, and PCPs lack of oncology knowledge.
Donohue et al.[22]	92 PCPs	Cross-sectional survey of PCPs who were seeing survivors enrolled into a survivorship clinical trial	Eighty-eight (88%) of PCPs regarded EMR generated SCPs as useful in communicating and coordinating care.
Babington et al.[25]	80 specialists 182 PCPs	Cross-sectional survey of PCPs who had referred patients to an oncologist and the corresponding oncologist	The majority (72%) of cancer specialists generated a letter following consultation, but only 58% of PCPs received that letter. Expectations of what the letter should include differed between PCPs and oncologists.
Dittus et al.[29]	39 PCPs	Cross-sectional survey of PCPs caring for cancer survivors	Nearly all PCPs (90%) endorsed SCPs as useful in providing survivorship care, but clear delineation of provider roles was lacking.
Blanch-Hartigan et al.[31]	1,072 PCPs 1,130 medical oncologists	Cross-sectional survey of PCPs and medical oncologist identified via AMA Master file	A majority of oncologists (64%) reported always/most always discussing survivorship care recommendations with survivors, but only 32% discussed who they should see for follow-up and only 5% provided SCPs.
O'Toole et al.[32]	39 oncologists	Cross-sectional survey of patients with advanced cancer diagnoses and their oncologist	Half of oncologists (50%) reported themselves as the PCP for at least 25% of their patients.
Ezendam et al.[35]	266 PCPs	Cluster randomized controlled trial of PCP practices	Only a third of PCPs reported receiving SCPs. Those receiving SCPs were more likely to have communication with cancer specialists.
Salz et al.[36]	191 PCPs	Cross-sectional survey of medical and radiation oncologist practicing at NCCCP sites	A majority (87-89%) of oncology providers believed receiving a SCP was very important to the PCP, but 38% did not feel it was their responsibility to provide the SCP.
Merport et al.[38]	108 cancer specialists 400 PCPs	Cross-sectional survey of cancer specialists and PCPs in Massachusetts	Only 14% of cancer specialists reported preparing SCPs citing a lack of training, reimbursement and templates as barriers to use.
Cheung et al.[40]	255 PCPs 123 medical oncologists 232 PCP-oncologists pairs	Cross-sectional survey of cancer survivors 2-years from active treatment and NED and their self-identified PCP and oncologist	PCPs and oncologists showed high discordance in perceptions of their own roles for primary cancer follow-up, cancer screening, and general preventative health (3%, 44% and 51% agreement rates, respectively).
Del Giudice et al.[42]	330 PCPs	Cross-sectional survey of PCPs across	PCPs were willing to assume exclusive responsibility for follow-up care 2-3 years after active treatment,. The most

		Canada	useful modalities in assisting the transition were a letter from the specialist, printed guidelines, expedited re-referral
			and access to investigations when recurrence was suspected.
Salz et al.[43]	191 PCPs	Cross-sectional survey of PCPs caring	Most PCPs reported receiving too little information about the patients' clinical course and the oncologists plan for
	-	for colorectal cancer patients	monitoring other cancers.
Hezewijk et al.[44]	130 cancer specialists	Cross-sectional survey of breast cancer	Forty-four percent (44%) of breast cancer specialists believed a breast surgeon should always be involved in breast
	(surgeons, medical,	members of a Dutch comprehensive	cancer follow-up, whereas only 9% believed a PCP should always be involved and 24% believed a PCP should never
	radiation oncologists)	cancer center	be involved.
Donnelly et al.[45]	256 breast cancer	Cross-sectional survey of breast	Breast cancer specialists viewed a "lack of PCP experience or training in oncology" and a "loss of patient outcome
	specialists	specialist in the United Kingdom	data" as barriers to early discharge to PCP follow-up.
Nissen et al.[46]	132 PCPs	Cross-section survey of PCPs practicing	Most (52%) PCPs were comfortable with responsibility for cancer surveillance. More than half rated transfer from
		in a single health system in the US	oncologists to PCPs as fair or poor. PCPs endorsed uncertainty for the type and duration of surveillance testing which
			varied depending on cancer type.
Watson et al.[47]	100 oncologists	Cross-sectional survey of oncologist and	Less than half of PCPs were satisfied with aspects of communication with cancer specialists including the content of
	200 PCPs	PCPs who were members of doctors.net	discharge letters and the ease of getting patients seen between routine appointments.
Forsythe et al.[48]	1,020 PCPs	Cross-sectional survey of PCPs and	Nearly half of oncologists reported always/almost always providing treatment summaries, but only 20% provided
	1,130 medical oncologists	medical oncologist identified via AMA	SCPs. One-third of PCPs reported always/almost always receiving treatment summaries, but only 13% reported
		Master file	routinely receiving SCPs. PCP receipt of SCP was associated with better PCP-reported care coordination, physician-
			physician communication and confidence in survivorship (p<0.05).
Papagrigoriadis et	164 PCPs	Cross-section survey of all PCPs in 83	A majority of PCPs considered the follow-up of colorectal cancer patients interesting (50%) or a natural part of their
al.[49]		practices in the United Kingdom	work (37%). The main reservations to providing follow-up care were work burden (60%), lack of guidelines (59%),
			lack of cancer knowledge (51%), and delays of re-referral to specialists (41%).
PCP primary care provid	er; SCP survivorship care plan	; EMR electronic medical record; NED no ev	idence of disease; AMA American Medical Association; NCCCP NCI Community Cancer Centers Program; US United
States	-		

Accepte

Table 4. Summary	of Findings from the Qualita	tive Literature.	
Article	Participants	Study Design	Finding
Haq et al.[19]	8 PCPs	Focus groups and in-depth interviews	PCPs expressed concerns with timeliness of information from cancer specialists
	6 cancer providers	of patients, PCPs and cancer specialists	and a lack of understanding/knowledge regarding cancer staging and SCPs.
DiCicco-Bloom et	11 PCPs	Interviews of PCPs in practices that	PCPs find patient visits during cancer treatment important. They note
al.[23]		employed at least one nurse practitioner	differences in communication between community and academic oncologists and
		and who cared for cancer patients	they develop strategies to obtain information to account for information deficits.
Mayer et al.[26]	5 PCPs	Interviews of PCPs identified from a	PCPs endorsed SCPs as helpful communication tools. If used alone, SCPs
	_	family practice listserv	would be insufficient to ease the transition to follow-up care with PCPs.
			Improved communication and care coordination were identified as important for
Hamitt at al [27]	20 an a da sista (madiant	Easter menne and talendary internious	Survivorsnip care.
newitt et al.[27]	20 officologists (filedical,	of providers identified at ASCO's	periods and indicated that a written care plan for follow up would halp them
	auracology)	annual meeting or through telephone	improve their survivorship care. Oncologists admitted rarely discharging their
	14 PCPs	recruitment	nation to PCPs for follow-up after active cancer treatment
Sada et al [28]	14 physicians (PCPs and	Cross-sectional semi-structured	Physicians reported FMRs improved communication within their system but
Suur et un[=0]	medical oncologists)	interviews of providers associated with	that communication across systems was difficult. PCPs expressed uncertainty
	=	and integrated health system	regarding their role in the care of survivors, although medical oncologists
		5	emphasized PCPs their role in managing comorbidities.
Prouty et al.[30]	59 physicians (PCPs,	Focus groups of a convenience sample	Provider perceptions of the causes of communication breakdown in cancer care
	oncologists, surgeons,	of PCPs, medical, surgical and radiation	included issues related to providers and healthcare systems.
	gynecologists)	oncologists	
Rayman et al.[33]	11 PCPs	Focus groups of PCPs from rural	Providers' relationships were characterized as being with women with breast
		federally funded community health	cancer and comprised an active behind-the-scenes role in supporting their
		centers	patients through treatment decision and processes. Three themes emerged:
			knowing the patient, walking through treatment with them, and losing the patient
D 1 (1124)			to the system.
Kychetnik[34]	16 surgical oncologists	Interviews of surgical oncologists and	Cancer specialists utilize various models of shared care dependent on their
		units in Australia	preferences and mose of the patients.
Kantsiper et al [37]	15 PCPs	Focus groups of PCPs and oncology	Specialists struggle with discharging survivors due to protective relationships
Kantsiper et al.[57]	16 cancer specialists	providers from Johns Honkins	PCPs expressed concerns over time and training to provide survivorship care
	To calleer specialists	Community Physician Network	and communication with oncologists.
O'Brien et al.[39]	18 PCPs	Interviews of PCPs participating in a	Most PCPs were comfortable providing breast cancer survivorship care 3-5 years
		randomized controlled trial evaluating	after diagnosis, but desired timely and informative communication from
		SCPs	oncologists.
Shalom et al.[41]	15 PCPs	Interviews of UCLA-affiliated PCPs	PCPs were more confident and prepared for survivorship care after receiving a
		who had previously received a SCP	SCP. PCPs reported a willingness to accept either sole or shared responsibility
			for routine follow-up care.
PCP primary care pro	ovider; SCP survivorship care	plan; EMR electronic medical record	

Ð



Table 5. Summary of	Findings from the Mixed	Methods Literature.	
Article		Study Design	Finding
Dulko et al.[17]	39 PCPs	Cross-sectional survey of PCPs who	Sixty-four percent (64%) of PCPs cited limited access to survivors, 58% cited insufficient knowledge of cancer
		received an SCP; interviews of	survivor issues, and 49% cited inadequate recommendations by oncologists. Oncology providers cited barriers to providing SCPs including lack of time, noor reimbursement, and lack of guidelines.
GL (1504)	10 DCD (15 5)		providing Series including lick of time, poor removalement, and lick of guidelines.
Shen et al.[24]	18 PCPs (qualitative)	Interviews and cross-sectional surveys	There is a gap in PCP-oncologist communication occurring between diagnosis and treatment. PCPs wanted
	128 PCPs (quantitative)	of PCPs practicing in underserved	more communication with oncologists, updates on their patient's prognosis throughout treatment, and to be
		minority communities	contacted via telephone or email. PCPs saw their roles as crucial in providing supportive care for their patients.
Jefford et al. [50]	81 PCPs	Focus groups and surveys of PCPs in	PCPs in the intervention group demonstrated significantly greater increase in confidence and satisfaction
		an randomized controlled trial	compared to usual care reflecting a 7.1% and 10.5% difference in score
		an fundomized controlled that	compared to usual care, reneering a 7.176 and 10.576 difference in score.
		evaluating faxed tallored	
-	-	chemotherapy information	
PCP primary care prov	ider		

Accepted

Figure 1. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria
Inclusion Criteria
Report data on the relationship, communication, or shared-care of PCPs and cancer specialists
Report on data involving the diagnosis, treatment, palliation, or survivorship care of cancer patients
Collected primary data
Peer-reviewed
Exclusion Criteria
Report on data regarding the relationship or communication between patients and physicians
Report on cancer screening
Report on relationships or communication with non-physicians (pharmacist, nurses, managers)*
Report on access or utilization of specialist care without mention of relationship or communication
PCP primary care physician
*Some studies included physician extenders such as nurse practitioners or physician assistants. We
included these studies and data if they also involved physicians

81x34mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Accepted 1

Unable to Convert Image

The dimensions of this image (in pixels) are too large to be converted. For this image to convert, the total number of pixels (height x width) must be less than 40,000,000 (40 megapixels).

Accepted A

Unable to Convert Image

The dimensions of this image (in pixels) are too large to be converted. For this image to convert, the total number of pixels (height x width) must be less than 40,000,000 (40 megapixels).

Accepted A