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

 $00:00:01.810 \rightarrow 00:00:04.958$ We're going to go ahead and get started here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00{:}00{:}04{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}07{.}370$ 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

 $00{:}00{:}08.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}10.560$ She's an associate professor at

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:10.560 --> 00:00:12.300 Yale University School of Nursing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00{:}00{:}12.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}14.845$ 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

 $00{:}00{:}19.835 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}21.950$ 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

 $00{:}00{:}23.642 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}26.552$ Doctor Pogosian completed a postdoctoral

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:28.300 --> 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

 $00:00:32.180 \rightarrow 00:00:34.049$ At the University of California, Davis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00:00:34.049 \longrightarrow 00:00:36.563$ Her research focus is on cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00{:}00{:}36{.}563 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}37{.}820$ epidemiology and survivorship

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00{:}00{:}37.883 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}40.108$ 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00{:}00{:}46.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}47.792$ friends and others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00{:}00{:}47.792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}49.762$ Doctor proposing is the principal

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00{:}00{:}49.762 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}51.939$ investigator of an NCI funded R1

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

 $00{:}00{:}53.594 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}55.846$ and effective states in the context

NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572

00:00:55.846 --> 00:00:57.701 of smoking behaviors among adults

- NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572
- $00{:}00{:}57{.}710$ --> $00{:}01{:}00{.}370$ diagnosed with to bacco related cancer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572
- 00:01:00.370 --> 00:01:02.183 Please join me in welcoming Dr Prozium
- NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572
- $00{:}01{:}02{.}183 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}03{.}990$ to Yale Cancer Center grand rounds.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.918973696428572
- $00:01:03.990 \longrightarrow 00:01:04.570$ Thank you.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219
- 00:01:09.160 --> 00:01:12.714 Thank you. Good afternoon everyone and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219
- $00:01:12.714 \dashrightarrow 00:01:15.630$ thank you Michael for the kind introduction.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219
- $00:01:15.630 \dashrightarrow 00:01:18.142$ And I'm very excited to be here today
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219
- $00:01:18.142 \rightarrow 00:01:21.070$ and to share some of my work with you.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219
- $00{:}01{:}21.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}23.606$ And I'll be talking a little bit about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219
- $00:01:23.606 \dashrightarrow 00:01:26.323$ lung cancer screening in the US and also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219
- $00:01:26.323 \rightarrow 00:01:29.070$ tobacco use among cancer survivors.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219
- 00:01:29.070 --> 00:01:32.150 So just to give a little bit
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219
- 00:01:32.150 --> 00:01:34.770 of a background information,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219
- $00{:}01{:}34.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}38.674$ we know that lung cancer is the 2nd
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219
- $00:01:38.674 \rightarrow 00:01:42.347$ leading cause of cancer and the leading.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}01{:}44{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}47{.}390$ 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

 $00:01:53.648 \longrightarrow 00:01:57.405$ lung cancer cases and about 130,000

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}01{:}57{.}405 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}00{.}870$ deaths from lung cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}02{:}00{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}03{.}957$ But when we look at the incidence and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:03.957 \rightarrow 00:02:06.399$ mortality rates for lung cancer by race,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}02{:}06{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}07{.}078$ ethnicity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:10.848 \rightarrow 00:02:14.551$ they suffer more from lung cancer and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:14.551 \rightarrow 00:02:17.730$ 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 --> 00:02:21.736 And in fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}02{:}21.736 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}24.628$ African American men have the highest

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

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

00:02:27.871 - > 00:02:30.541 and the highest mortality rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:34.223 \dashrightarrow 00:02:37.687$ and just for example one of the studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:37.690 \rightarrow 00:02:40.102$ 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

 $00{:}02{:}41.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}47.345$ we found that black patients who had

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:47.350 \rightarrow 00:02:49.750$ got surgery for their lung cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:49.750 \longrightarrow 00:02:52.918$ they had much lower post operative

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}02{:}52{.}918 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}55{.}658$ mental health related quality of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00:02:55.658 \rightarrow 00:02:58.378$ 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

 $00{:}03{:}03{.}374 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}05{.}763$ there is again significant difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}03{:}05{.}763 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}09{.}592$ in in a five year survival comparing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}03{:}09{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}11{.}724$ Racial ethnic minority groups

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}03{:}13{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}14{.}704$ the five year survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}03{:}14.704 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}16.434$ 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

 $00{:}03{:}20{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}23{.}259$ 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

 $00{:}03{:}28.465 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}31.750$ from lung cancer compared white and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:03:31.750 --> 00:03:35.642 lung cancer has has a poor prognosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}03{:}35{.}642 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}39{.}057$ 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

 $00:03:42.228 \dashrightarrow 00:03:45.529$ 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

 $00:03:48.206 \longrightarrow 00:03:50.500$ has been done showing that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

00:03:50.500 --> 00:03:51.838 The early diet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}04{:}00{.}308 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}02{.}516$ around 16% are diagnosed with stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}04{:}02{.}516$ --> $00{:}04{:}05{.}374$ one lung cancer when the more curative

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}04{:}05{.}374 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}07{.}058$ treatment options are available

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

 $00{:}04{:}09{.}618 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}11{.}979$ among these patients and last kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.9702219

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:17.340 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.716$ Screening for lung cancer with low

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}04{:}19.716 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}21.768$ dose computed tomography has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:21.768 \rightarrow 00:04:24.144$ 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

 $00{:}04{:}26.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}27.696$ so one of them well known.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}04{:}27.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}30.524$ The study conducted in trial in the US

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}04{:}30{.}524 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}32{.}670$ national lung cancer screening trial

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:04:35.400 --> 00:04:37.359 computed tomographic decreases lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:40.291 \rightarrow 00:04:43.597$ 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

 $00:04:47.160 \longrightarrow 00:04:48.309$ 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

 $00:04:51.166 \rightarrow 00:04:53.974$ in lung cancer mortality among those

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}04{:}53{.}974 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}57{.}120$ who got screened for lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:04:57.120 \rightarrow 00:04:59.770$ 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

 $00:05:07.796 \rightarrow 00:05:09.840$ recommending annual lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:05:09.840 \rightarrow 00:05:12.710$ 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

 $00{:}05{:}18.584 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}21.152$ current and former smokers who quit

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}05{:}21{.}152 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}23{.}957$ 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 --> 00:05:29.808 So this guideline was updated last year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}05{:}29{.}810$ --> $00{:}05{:}35{.}455$ To March of 2021 before the March 2021

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}05{:}35{.}455 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}39{.}873$ 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

 $00{:}05{:}42.457 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}45.280$ Pack history was 30 pack year history.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}05{:}45{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}48{.}143$ So they decreased last year the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:05:48.143 \longrightarrow 00:05:50.356$ 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

 $00{:}05{:}54.883 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}57.967$ 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.

 $00{:}06{:}01{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}04{.}692$ And Centers for Medicare and Medicaid

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:06:04.692 --> 00:06:07.395 Services provides coverage for annual

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:10.467 \rightarrow 00:06:13.709$ 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

 $00:06:16.460 \longrightarrow 00:06:18.660$ private insurance companies to

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:06:18.660 --> 00:06:21.050 cover lung cancer screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}06{:}21.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}23.922$ 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

 $00:06:26.417 \dashrightarrow 00:06:28.842$ 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

 $00:06:31.450 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.640$ Great because?

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:06:33.640 --> 00:06:36.080 A lot of work has been done showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}06{:}36{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}38{.}079$ that black individuals were less

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:38.079 \rightarrow 00:06:40.269$ often eligible under that guideline

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

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

 $00:06:42.515 \rightarrow 00:06:44.675$ they have developing lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:06:44.675 --> 00:06:47.875 at much younger age and they have

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

00:06:47.875 --> 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

 $00{:}06{:}51{.}946 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}53{.}920$ least 30 pack years of smoking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:06:59.065 \rightarrow 00:07:01.195$ 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

 $00:07:03.720 \longrightarrow 00:07:06.324$ 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

 $00:07:07.960 \dashrightarrow 00:07:10.264$ 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 --> 00:07:14.658 rate from lung cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}07{:}14.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}16.540$ 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

 $00:07:22.682 \rightarrow 00:07:24.418$ 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

 $00{:}07{:}26.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}28.768$ kind of change the criteria with

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00{:}07{:}28.768 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}31.463$ the hope that that more racial and

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:33.820 \rightarrow 00:07:37.028$ Lung cancer screening criteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:39.440 \longrightarrow 00:07:42.457$ 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 --> 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

 $00{:}07{:}47{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}51{.}424$ With a new guideline about 14.5 million

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454

 $00:07:54.200 \dashrightarrow 00:07:56.702$ And there have been studies showing

- NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454
- $00:07:56.702 \rightarrow 00:07:59.199$ that when they changed the guidelines
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931271759545454
- $00:07:59.199 \dashrightarrow 00:08:02.191$ 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
- $00:08:04.360 \rightarrow 00:08:06.864$ 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
- $00{:}08{:}09{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}11.795$ Lucky meets the criteria for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333
- $00:08:11.795 \rightarrow 00:08:13.823$ lung cancer screening. So.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333
- $00:08:13.823 \rightarrow 00:08:16.688$ The current rate for lung
- NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333
- 00:08:16.688 --> 00:08:19.520 cancer screening is very low.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333
- 00:08:19.520 --> 00:08:20.234 The utilization,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333
- $00:08:20.234 \rightarrow 00:08:22.376$ 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
- $00{:}08{:}24.653 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}26.190$ report that came out about in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333
- $00{:}08{:}26{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}30{.}084$ 2019 was 6.6% and then 2020 it
- NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333
- $00:08:30.084 \rightarrow 00:08:32.614$ dropped a little bit to 6.5%,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}08{:}35{.}278 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}37{.}981$ 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 --> 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

 $00{:}08{:}47.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}50.758$ here and a lot of work has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:08:50.758 --> 00:08:52.996 done to show that lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:08:56.492 \rightarrow 00:08:58.764$ 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

 $00{:}09{:}04.495 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}05.890$ 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

 $00{:}09{:}16.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}19.480$ Reports show saying that estimating

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:09:23.361 --> 00:09:26.487 cancer screening we could prevent up

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:09:26.487 --> 00:09:31.102 to like 6000 deaths in the US so but

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:31.102 \dashrightarrow 00:09:34.039$ 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 --> 00:09:39.048 So since some work has been done to NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:09:39.048 --> 00:09:41.400 show like uptake is low and then the

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:09:41.400 $-\!>$ 00:09:43.394 uptake specifically it is much lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:43.394 \rightarrow 00:09:45.264$ among racial and ethnic minorities.

 $00{:}09{:}45{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}47{.}658$ So we were interested to conduct

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}09{:}47.658 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}49.725$ this study to understand the

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:49.725 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.750$ 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

 $00{:}09{:}54{.}549 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}56{.}399$ cancer if their primary care

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:09:59.465 \rightarrow 00:10:02.565$ 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

 $00:10:06.378 \longrightarrow 00:10:09.042$ between worry about future health

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:10:09.042 \longrightarrow 00:10:11.649$ issues of smoking and intention

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:10:11.649 \longrightarrow 00:10:13.861$ to undergo recommended lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00{:}10{:}13.861 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}16.591$ cancer screening with low dose

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

 $00:10:16.591 \rightarrow 00:10:18.563$ computed tomography within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

00:10:18.563 --> 00:10:21.595 next three months when if the

NOTE Confidence: 0.839850873333333

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115
- 00:10:26.080 --> 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
- $00{:}10{:}29.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}32.735$ We used Qualtrics research panel
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115
- 00:10:32.735 00:10:35.035 to recruit study subjects.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115
- $00{:}10{:}35{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}38{.}408$ In this study we included 152 adults
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115
- $00{:}10{:}38{.}408 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}41{.}640$ 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
- $00{:}10{:}47.076 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}49.773$ 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
- $00{:}10{:}54.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}56.194$ 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 --> 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.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

00:11:07.186 --> 00:11:09.678 because of the prior guideline for

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

00:11:09.678 --> 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

 $00{:}11{:}15{.}486 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}18{.}346$ 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

 $00{:}11{:}20{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}22{.}840$ The outcome variable was the intention

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

00:11:25.017 --> 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 --> 00:11:32.215 healthcare provider recommended it

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

00:11:32.215 --> 00:11:34.671 and the predictive was the worry

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

 $00{:}11{:}34.671$ --> $00{:}11{:}36.506$ about health consequences of smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115

00:11:36.510 --> 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

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115
- $00:11:44.270 \dashrightarrow 00:11:46.710$ statistics and logistic regression,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115
- $00{:}11{:}46{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}50{.}250$ so this table shows sample characteristics.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115
- $00:11:50.250 \rightarrow 00:11:53.316$ 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
- $00{:}11{:}57{.}572 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}00{.}792$ and about 60% were male.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115
- $00{:}12{:}00{.}792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}04{.}368$ We oversampled a racial and ethnic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115
- $00:12:04.368 \rightarrow 00:12:06.859$ minoritized individuals in our sample.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888665115
- $00{:}12{:}06.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}07.950$ So about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714
- 00:12:10.420 --> 00:12:13.890 21.7% self reported as black
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714
- 00:12:13.890 --> 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
- $00{:}12{:}25{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}27{.}135$ We are Hispanics.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714
- 00:12:27.140 --> 00:12:29.000 In terms of the income,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714
- $00{:}12{:}29{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}31{.}779$ kind of a little bigger portion of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.857130374285714

 $00:12:35.676 \longrightarrow 00:12:39.356$ 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

 $00:12:48.966 \rightarrow 00:12:51.196$ 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

 $00{:}12{:}59{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}01{.}980$ 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.826208976111111

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.826208976111111

00:13:12.493 --> 00:13:15.148 participants smoking history and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.826208976111111

00:13:15.148 --> 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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.826208976111111
- $00:13:20.115 \rightarrow 00:13:21.830$ they've been smoking cigarette was

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:13:28.790 \rightarrow 00:13:32.456$ we found that, you know, high individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00{:}13{:}34{.}621 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}37{.}304$ moderately or very much worried about

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00{:}13{:}44.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}47.372$ 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

 $00{:}13{:}50{.}705 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}54{.}237$ the men had much higher odds of reporting

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

00:13:54.237 --> 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 --> 00:14:01.640 their healthcare provider compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

 $00:14:01.714 \rightarrow 00:14:04.078$ to female and also the interesting

 $00:14:04.078 \rightarrow 00:14:06.540$ 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

 $00{:}14{:}08{.}805 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}11{.}979$ 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

 $00{:}14{:}14.728 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}16.560$ odds ratio of reporting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

00:14:16.560 --> 00:14:19.216 willingness to undergo recommended

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

00:14:19.216 --> 00:14:23.200 lung cancer screening and we didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.9861535

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:14:28.940 \rightarrow 00:14:31.676$ So for the conclusion and the study we NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

NOTE Confidence. 0.855715501428571

 $00:14:31.676 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.793$ it was obvious that many individuals at NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

00:14:34.793 --> 00:14:37.760 high risk for developing lung cancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00{:}14{:}37.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}42.736$ they were willing to get screened for lung

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:14:42.736 \longrightarrow 00:14:46.760$ cancer and but the screening by race,

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00{:}14{:}46.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}49.068$ ethnicity, African self reported

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:14:49.068 \rightarrow 00:14:51.953$ black individuals have much lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571
- $00{:}14{:}54{.}508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}56{.}419$ and I think like that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571
- $00:14:56.420 \longrightarrow 00:14:58.076$ 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
- $00:14:59.980 \longrightarrow 00:15:02.070$ To conduct kind of qualitative
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571
- $00{:}15{:}02.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}04.610$ 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
- $00:15:09.623 \rightarrow 00:15:12.096$ percentage is lower and they don't want.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571
- $00{:}15{:}12{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}14{.}701$ 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
- $00:15:17.438 \rightarrow 00:15:20.682$ why they don't want to get this life
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571
- 00:15:20.682 --> 00:15:23.052 saving screening and we should have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571
- $00{:}15{:}23.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}25.754$ like a public health initiative to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571
- $00{:}15{:}25{.}754 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}28{.}152$ increase awarenesses of lung cancer
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571
- 00:15:28.152 --> 00:15:30.224 screening among specifically among.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:15:30.224 \rightarrow 00:15:32.784$ 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

 $00:15:36.278 \rightarrow 00:15:39.248$ studies showing that the awarenesses NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:15:39.248 \rightarrow 00:15:42.259$ public among general population about

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00:15:42.259 \rightarrow 00:15:45.667$ lung cancer screening is quite low.

NOTE Confidence: 0.855715361428571

 $00{:}15{:}45{.}670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}49{.}346$ 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}15{:}56{.}994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}59{.}110$ for getting screened for lung cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}15{:}59{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}01{.}282$ 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

 $00:16:03.665 \rightarrow 00:16:07.243$ providers have to have a shared decision NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}10.597 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}13.929$ refer them to lung cancer screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}13{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}16{.}288$ So during that visit healthcare providers NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

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

 $00:16:19.376 \rightarrow 00:16:21.870$ 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

 $00{:}16{:}24.936 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}27.634$ to discuss about benefits and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

00:16:27.634 --> 00:16:29.574 risks of lung cancer screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}29{.}580$ --> $00{:}16{:}31{.}652$ They need to use your decision making NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

00:16:31.652 --> 00:16:33.970 aid that talks about risks and benefits

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}33.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}36.022$ 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

 $00{:}16{:}38.074 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}40.094$ about that if with current smokers

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}40.094 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}42.422$ they need to discuss emphasize the

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}42{.}422 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}44{.}184$ importance of quitting smoking and

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}44.184 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}46.158$ if those who are former smokers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

00:16:46.160 --> 00:16:48.386 they need to discuss the importance

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}48{.}386 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}50{.}770$ of being existent from from smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

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

 $00{:}16{:}51{.}757 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}54{.}060$ And I use this study to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}16{:}56{.}562 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}58{.}603$ discussion about lung cancer screening NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:16:58.603 \rightarrow 00:17:01.039$ is it happening or not happening and NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

00:17:01.039 --> 00:17:04.878 then to understand how it is related to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}17{:}04.880$ --> $00{:}17{:}07.568$ Quite attempts so specifically in this NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}17{:}12.062 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}14.692$ 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 --> 00:17:19.221 eligible for lung cancer screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}17{:}19{.}221 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}22{.}109$ So I used this data from that main

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}17{:}22.109 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}24.836$ the study that I mentioned earlier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00:17:24.840 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.628$ like 821 subjects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}17{:}26.628 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}28.416$ Out of them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251

 $00{:}17{:}28{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}30{.}975$ 282 met the criteria of at least

- NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251
- 00:17:30.975 --> 00:17:33.658 20 pack years of smoking history.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251
- $00:17:33.660 \rightarrow 00:17:38.032$ 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
- $00:17:42.040 \rightarrow 00:17:43.920$ And for the predictor variable,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251
- $00{:}17{:}43{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}45{.}635$ participants were asked the question
- NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251
- $00:17:45.635 \rightarrow 00:17:48.040$ at any time in the past year.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251
- $00:17:48.040 \rightarrow 00:17:50.456$ Have you talked with your doctor or other?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.882909251
- $00:17:50.460 \rightarrow 00:17:52.580$ 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
- $00{:}17{:}57{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}00{.}632$ So this is the the sample
- NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125
- 00:18:00.632 --> 00:18:01.606 characteristics again.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125
- $00:18:01.610 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.102$ 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
- $00{:}18{:}11.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}16.130$ as self identified black individuals,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00:18:16.130 \longrightarrow 00:18:18.910$ 18% self identified Asian individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00{:}18{:}18{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}20{.}877$ and 37% white individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00{:}18{:}20.877 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}24.618$ And in terms of lung cancer screening it NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00:18:27.610 \longrightarrow 00:18:30.578$ 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

 $00:18:32.551 \rightarrow 00:18:35.636$ 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

 $00:18:37.439 \dashrightarrow 00:18:39.560$ high with the new guideline they are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85929999125

 $00{:}18{:}39{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}42{.}784$ 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

 $00{:}18{:}47{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}50{.}040$ 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

 $00{:}18{:}55{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}59{.}164$ But discussed have had a discussion with

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

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

 $00{:}19{:}02{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}06{.}020$ So this table shows participants smoking

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}19{:}06{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}10{.}013$ history and about the mean park year

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:19:13.576 --> 00:19:16.400 number of years they smoked cigarette was

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

00:19:16.400 --> 00:19:20.318 44.4 and majority of the participants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}19{:}20{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}24{.}073$ 59% of the participants had at least 30 or

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}19{:}24.073 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}28.576$ more pack year smoking history and 39% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}19{:}28.576 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}32.720$ the participants they tried to quit smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}19{:}32{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}37{.}112$ In the past year we also asked participant

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}19{:}37{.}112 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}40{.}599$ what which what methods they used

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}19{:}40.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}44.080$ to help them to quit smoking and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:46.830 \rightarrow 00:19:49.114$ Switching to electronic cigarette,

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}19{:}49{.}114 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}53{.}083$ use that with the hope that it

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:19:53.083 \rightarrow 00:19:55.765$ will help them to quit smoking.

 $00{:}19{:}55{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}58{.}472$ 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

 $00:20:01.416 \longrightarrow 00:20:03.981$ It doesn't help individuals to

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}20{:}06{.}818$ --> $00{:}20{:}09{.}828$ 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

 $00{:}20{:}13.322 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}16.979$ we found found that those who had

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}20{:}16{.}979 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}18{.}751$ discussion with their healthcare

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00{:}20{:}18.751 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}21.270$ providers about lung cancer screening,

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:20:21.270 \longrightarrow 00:20:24.350$ 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

 $00{:}20{:}35{.}010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}37{.}686$ and also didn't find the differences

- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- $00:20:37.686 \longrightarrow 00:20:40.180$ in them in the having.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- $00{:}20{:}40{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}42{.}335$ Non cancerous discussion would healthcare
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- $00:20:42.335 \rightarrow 00:20:47.200$ providers by race and or or ethnicity.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- $00{:}20{:}47{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}47{.}534$ So,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- $00:20:47.534 \longrightarrow 00:20:50.206$ so one of the the main finding of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- $00:20:50.206 \rightarrow 00:20:52.810$ 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
- $00:20:55.000 \rightarrow 00:20:57.298$ 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
- $00:21:00.100 \rightarrow 00:21:02.078$ 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
- $00{:}21{:}04{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}06{.}579$ mandated by CMS before getting screen.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- $00:21:06.580 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.610$ So they have to have the shared
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- $00{:}21{:}08{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}10{.}913$ decision making and also.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- $00{:}21{:}10{.}913 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}14{.}939$ And the one the some other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:14.939 \rightarrow 00:21:18.459$ 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 --> 00:21:29.552 So the having the discussion with

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:29.552 \rightarrow 00:21:31.847$ 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 --> 00:21:36.820 improve the lung cancer screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

 $00:21:36.820 \rightarrow 00:21:39.586$ 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

 $00:21:44.422 \rightarrow 00:21:46.629$ 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

 $00:21:49.414 \rightarrow 00:21:51.270$ people who get screened,

NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- $00:21:53.045 \longrightarrow 00:21:54.110$ including our earlier.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- $00{:}21{:}54{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}57{.}118$ So those who get actually get to the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- $00:21:57.118 \longrightarrow 00:22:00.387$ 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
- $00:22:11.669 \rightarrow 00:22:13.009$ to lung cancer screening.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778681343076923
- 00:22:13.010 --> 00:22:18.089 So help them also to to quit smoking.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00{:}22{:}20{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}23{.}340$ 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
- $00:22:26.634 \rightarrow 00:22:29.710$ tobacco use among cancer survivors,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00{:}22{:}29{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}32{.}614$ and I use the NCI definition for cancer
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:22:32.614 \longrightarrow 00:22:34.857$ 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:22:54.100 \rightarrow 00:22:57.782$ And do two major advancement in cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:00.660 \rightarrow 00:23:03.516$ 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 --> 00:23:10.619 In fact, in 1971 about 3,000,000

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}23{:}12{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}16{.}380$ And as of January this year about 18

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:23:18.520 --> 00:23:20.932 cancer history and it is projected

 $00:23:20.932 \rightarrow 00:23:23.834$ 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

 $00:23:30.536 \rightarrow 00:23:32.998$ 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:37.604 \rightarrow 00:23:40.575$ 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

 $00{:}23{:}46{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}50{.}923$ which is still prevalent among among

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:23:50.923 --> 00:23:52.488 individuals diagnosed with cancer even

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}23{:}52{.}488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}54{.}789$ though a lot of work has been done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:23:54.790 \rightarrow 00:23:57.325$ And to bacco use decreased significantly

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}23{:}59{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}00{.}416$ Still,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:24:00.416 --> 00:24:02.640 many individuals continue to

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}24{:}05{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}08{.}950$ and the prevalence of the tobacco

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}24{:}13.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}15.650$ And those who are diagnosed with

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:17.010 \rightarrow 00:24:19.782$ they have the highest rate of smoking

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}24{:}19.782 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}22.890$ 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

 $00{:}24{:}24{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}27{.}922$ And we know that continued to bacco 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

 $00:24:32.996 \rightarrow 00:24:36.470$ and it worsens treatment side effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:24:36.470 \rightarrow 00:24:37.883$ reduces overall survival.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00{:}24{:}37{.}883 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}40{.}709$ It also increases the risk of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00:24:40.709 \rightarrow 00:24:43.247$ recurrence and symptom burden and also.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00{:}24{:}43{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}45{.}716$ Increases the risk of smoking related
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00{:}24{:}45{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}49{.}968$ comorbidities and we know that there are,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- 00:24:49.970 --> 00:24:52.184 there is a.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00{:}24{:}52{.}184 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}54{.}570$ Evidence based to bacco treatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00{:}24{:}54{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}57{.}300$ 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 --> 00:25:04.064 use that to follow that guideline
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00:25:04.064 \rightarrow 00:25:07.120$ to help individuals smokers to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00:25:07.120 \longrightarrow 00:25:09.460$ quit quit smoking.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00{:}25{:}09{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}13{.}048$ So the gold standard for tobacco
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00:25:13.048 \rightarrow 00:25:17.069$ treatment is using combining the use
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00{:}25{:}17.069 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}20.121$ of pharma cotherapy and behavioral
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}25{:}20{.}121 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}22{.}410$ intervention and healthcare.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:22.410 \longrightarrow 00:25:22.827$ Providers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}25{:}22.827 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}25.329$ First they need to assess and

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:26.580 \rightarrow 00:25:30.947$ 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 --> 00:25:35.658 pharmacotherapy and behavioral counseling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:35.660 \rightarrow 00:25:37.830$ 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

 $00{:}25{:}40.686 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}43.967$ among former smokers to make sure they

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}25{:}43.967 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}46.559$ are still absent from to bacco use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

00:25:46.560 -> 00:25:49.716 And then we conducted this study

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}25{:}49{.}716$ --> $00{:}25{:}53{.}309$ so to understand how how cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00:25:53.309 \rightarrow 00:25:56.085$ programs are implementing this

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

 $00{:}25{:}56.085 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}58.376$ evidence based to bacco treatments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00{:}26{:}02.045 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}04.781$ that from other work that to bacco
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- 00:26:04.781 --> 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
- $00:26:10.280 \rightarrow 00:26:13.552$ So in this study we just wanted to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00:26:13.552 \rightarrow 00:26:16.802$ understand more like how this evidence based.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00:26:16.802 \longrightarrow 00:26:17.443$ Michael,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00{:}26{:}17.443 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}21.181$ Guideline is implemented and then the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887978463809524
- $00:26:21.181 \longrightarrow 00:26:26.560$ 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
- $00:26:29.760 \rightarrow 00:26:32.880$ 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: 0.845404635555556
- $00:26:35.976 \rightarrow 00:26:40.188$ delivery system and only about 39%
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- 00:26:40.188 --> 00:26:43.132 of this program had a had a system
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556
- $00{:}26{:}43.132 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}46.003$ in place that healthcare providers
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556
- $00:26:46.003 \rightarrow 00:26:49.615$ they can easily identify screen for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00{:}26{:}49{.}707 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}52{.}617$ to bacco use and then document the

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00{:}27{:}01{.}814 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}06{.}256$ them to a counseling so and so all

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

00:27:06.256 --> 00:27:09.506 found that the tobacco treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

00:27:09.506 --> 00:27:12.106 were not delivered consistently

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:27:12.208 \rightarrow 00:27:14.848$ and routinely among among cancer

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00{:}27{:}14.848 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}18.466$ survivors so and one of the some

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:27:18.466 \longrightarrow 00:27:21.394$ 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: 0.845404635555556

 $00:27:23.578 \longrightarrow 00:27:26.332$ to not having the optimal strategy in

NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556

00:27:26.332 --> 00:27:29.209 place to identify to screen for to bacco

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00{:}27{:}29{.}287 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}31{.}800$ use and document a lot of providers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

00:27:31.800 - 00:27:33.980 They reported the limited time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:27:33.980 \longrightarrow 00:27:35.858$ so they didn't have enough time

- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- $00:27:35.858 \longrightarrow 00:27:37.680$ to screen for that as well.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- $00:27:37.680 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.990$ And then.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- $00{:}27{:}39{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}42{.}766$ Limited reimbursement for clinicians
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- $00{:}27{:}42.766 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}46.236$ 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: 0.845404635555556
- $00{:}27{:}48{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}53{.}495$ So NCI identifies as well like that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- $00:27:53.500 \rightarrow 00:27:55.800$ the screening for tobacco use,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- $00:27:55.800 \rightarrow 00:27:59.820$ documenting tobacco 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: 0.845404635555556
- $00{:}28{:}09{.}525 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}12{.}233$ Center cessation initiative which
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- $00{:}28{:}12{.}233 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}16{.}446$ was funded part of the NCI Cancer
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- $00{:}28{:}16.446 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}20.200$ Moonshine Program and the overall like.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556
- $00:28:20.200 \longrightarrow 00:28:23.820$ Long term goal of this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00{:}28{:}31{.}159 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}34{.}381$ them to build an implement sustainable NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:28:34.481 \rightarrow 00:28:37.481$ tobacco cessation treatment programs

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00{:}28{:}37{.}481 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}41{.}231$ that can help healthcare providers

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00{:}28{:}41{.}231 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}44{.}600$ routinely address to bacco sensation

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:28:49.658 \rightarrow 00:28:53.906$ fifty two NCI designated cancer centers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:28:53.910 \longrightarrow 00:28:56.484$ You said this funding and yells

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:28:56.484 \longrightarrow 00:28:59.552$ 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: 0.84540463555556

 $00{:}29{:}05{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}07{.}455$ positive outcome those centers who

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00{:}29{:}07{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}11{.}177$ got the funding that they have them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556

 $00:29:14.316 \rightarrow 00:29:17.022$ to screen and document to bacco use

- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- 00:29:17.022 --> 00:29:19.832 and help smokers to quit smoking,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556
- $00{:}29{:}19.832 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}23.350$ but it's been since 2017 so like
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- $00{:}29{:}23.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}26.050$ I think sustainability should be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- 00:29:26.050 --> 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
- $00:29:31.880 \longrightarrow 00:29:34.990$ So from.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- 00:29:34.990 --> 00:29:38.486 From my work and from the work of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.845404635555556
- $00{:}29{:}38{.}486{\:}{-}{-}{>}{\:}00{:}29{:}41{.}169$ other researchers kind of we understand
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556
- $00{:}29{:}41{.}169 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}44{.}173$ how the we know that to bacco use
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84540463555556
- 00:29:44.173 --> 00:29:47.086 is still is a problem is is still.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}29{:}49{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}52{.}362$ And common among individuals were diagnosed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}29{:}52{.}362 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}55{.}340$ with lung individuals who had cancer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:29:55.340 \rightarrow 00:29:58.392$ So we decided to conduct this study
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}29{:}58.392 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}02.359$ and it was funded by NCI to understand
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:30:02.360 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.078$ the role of social networks and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00:30:05.078 \rightarrow 00:30:07.624$ affective States and in smoking

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00:30:10.200 \longrightarrow 00:30:12.225$ So I have done some work looking at the NOTE Confidence: 0.80584496666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

00:30:14.252 --> 00:30:16.380 know like the Yale has a big team who

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

00:30:18.292 --> 00:30:20.970 It really shows how important it is to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}30{:}20{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}23{.}095$ Involve your social network members

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00:30:26.347 \longrightarrow 00:30:28.435$ or health risk behaviors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}30{:}32{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}35{.}220$ those are mostly focused on an

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}30{:}35{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}38{.}356$ individual and we know that those if

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}30{:}42.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}45.280$ like get the treatment by get home in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}30{:}45.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}47.508$ their network and someone is in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}30{:}47{.}508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}49{.}098$ network smoking it increases their
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- 00:30:49.160 --> 00:30:50.980 chance of like starting smoking.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:30:50.980 \longrightarrow 00:30:53.068$ So that's why so we discount,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- 00:30:53.070 -> 00:30:54.033 we are hoping,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:30:54.033 \dashrightarrow 00:30:55.959$ hoping that we can develop social
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}30{:}55{.}959 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}57{.}719$ network best smoking cessation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}30{:}57{.}719$ --> $00{:}30{:}59{.}555$ interventions for patients diagnosed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}30{:}59{.}555 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}01{.}450$ with to bacco related cancers.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:31:01.450 \rightarrow 00:31:05.290$ So hopefully we can help them to quit
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:31:05.290 \rightarrow 00:31:08.370$ smoking and stay quit for a longer term.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:31:08.370 \rightarrow 00:31:12.843$ So on this grant I am working with them.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:31:12.850 \dashrightarrow 00:31:16.126$ Team then if I have like really great team,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}31{:}16.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}17.603$ excellent collaborators from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}31{:}23.245 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}28.398$ and I have a consultants from MGH and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}31{:}33{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}36{.}000$ So this is the specific aims.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

00:31:36.000 --> 00:31:38.060 Basically we want to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

00:31:38.060 - 00:31:40.760 the role of social network members,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}31{:}44{.}126 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}47{.}873$ of cancer population and also we want

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}31{:}51{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}53{.}785$ Impacts on the social network

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}31{:}55{.}112 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}58{.}851$ So I have done some work to look into

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

00:31:58.851 - > 00:32:01.503 the the cancer diagnosis that it

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:32:04.536 \rightarrow 00:32:07.246$ change their health risk behaviors.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}32{:}07{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}11.044$ So this is a mixed method design.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:32:11.050 \rightarrow 00:32:14.008$ The phase one we're conducting it's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:32:14.008 \longrightarrow 00:32:15.622$ a quantitative approach.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}32{:}15.622 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}18.312$ We're using egocentric social network
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- 00:32:18.312 --> 00:32:20.754 approach to identify tobacco late,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:32:20.754 \longrightarrow 00:32:23.364$ hence individual stagnant with to bacco
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}32{:}23{.}364 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}25{.}985$ related cancer and then after the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}32{:}25{.}985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}28{.}717$ phase one and date it's a one year
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- 00:32:28.717 --> 00:32:31.057 follow up and we'll we're conducting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:32:31.057 \rightarrow 00:32:33.424$ a best line then three months,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- 00:32:33.424 --> 00:32:36.980 six months and 12 months and then after 12.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:32:36.980 \longrightarrow 00:32:40.516$ Months do we want to do a qualitative
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}32{:}40{.}516$ --> $00{:}32{:}42{.}806$ dieting interviews with the cancer
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}32{:}42.806 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}45.121$ survivor and self identify significant
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}32{:}45{.}121 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}47{.}983$ network member to understand how do

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00:32:52.338 \rightarrow 00:32:55.158$ So we just started a screening,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}32{:}55{.}158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}57{.}654$ we are recruiting from Dana Farber

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}32{:}57{.}654 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}59{.}548$ Cancer Institute and we are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00:33:02.077 \rightarrow 00:33:05.258$ later we can open up to the recruitment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}33{:}07{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}09{.}380$ As well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}33{:}17{.}477 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}19{.}489$ individual diagnosis to bacco related

NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667

 $00{:}33{:}19{.}489 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}22{.}004$ cancer and then network members

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:33:22.004 \rightarrow 00:33:24.098$ they are who they identify.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- 00:33:24.100 --> 00:33:24.626 So,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00:33:24.626 \rightarrow 00:33:27.782$ so far actually it's going well
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8058449666666667
- $00{:}33{:}27.782 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}29.360$ 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
- $00{:}33{:}41{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}43{.}110$ Research coordinator, they meet via zoom,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712
- $00{:}33{:}43.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}45.476$ so we collect the data via zoom
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712
- $00:33:45.476 \longrightarrow 00:33:48.093$ and so far it's been great and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712
- $00:33:48.093 \rightarrow 00:33:50.690$ we'll see how it's going to be.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712
- 00:33:50.690 00:33:55.807 Our sample size is 4 point 24129,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712
- $00:33:55.807 \rightarrow 00:33:59.146$ so hopefully we can reach our sample
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712
- $00{:}33{:}59{.}146 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}02{.}731$ size and then to see how the the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712
- $00{:}34{:}02{.}731 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}05{.}159$ role of social network in the.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00:34:05.160 \longrightarrow 00:34:06.668$ 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

 $00{:}34{:}09{.}775 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}12{.}364$ every one that helped me to to build

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

00:34:12.364 --> 00:34:15.020 my program of research and what I did,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

 $00{:}34{:}15{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}18{.}177$ my education and the team and every one

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

00:34:18.177 --> 00:34:21.972 that I'm working with and if you have any

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.874430712

00:34:24.700 --> 00:34:25.530 Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46218666

 $00{:}34{:}27{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}27{.}480$ 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

 $00{:}34{:}47{.}525 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}51{.}160$ either willingness to quit or

NOTE Confidence: 0.78854163

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.78854163

 $00:34:53.204 \rightarrow 00:34:56.494$ I thought that for either your personal

NOTE Confidence: 0.78854163

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

 $00:34:58.440 \rightarrow 00:35:02.880$ 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

 $00{:}35{:}07{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}11{.}035$ So thank you. So for the willingness of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00{:}35{:}14.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}17.118$ We include every one with at least

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

00:35:17.118 --> 00:35:19.896 30 pack years, but I didn't look

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00{:}35{:}19.896 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}22.826$ at by like are you saying like

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

00:35:22.826 --> 00:35:26.840 categorized between 30 to 404075?

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

 $00:35:26.840 \rightarrow 00:35:30.600$ 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

 $00:35:35.124 \rightarrow 00:35:37.633$ 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

 $00{:}35{:}39{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}41{.}872$ So when it increases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.862246300588235

00:35:47.360 --> 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

 $00:35:52.890 \rightarrow 00:35:54.706$ 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

 $00{:}35{:}57{.}446 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}59{.}588$ you looked at whether or not a

NOTE Confidence: 0.860062705

 $00{:}35{:}59{.}588 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}01{.}009$ conversation with their provider

NOTE Confidence: 0.860062705

 $00:36:01.009 \dashrightarrow 00:36:02.879$ 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875

00:36:09.270 --> 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

 $00{:}36{:}12.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}14.778$ I was wondering if there was any idea

NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875

 $00:36:14.778 \longrightarrow 00:36:16.794$ to look at actual people who actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875

 $00:36:16.794 \rightarrow 00:36:18.271$ received lung cancer screening and

NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875

 $00:36:18.271 \rightarrow 00:36:20.168$ then whether or not that then directly

- NOTE Confidence: 0.85730073875
- $00:36:20.168 \rightarrow 00:36:21.720$ 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
- $00{:}36{:}23.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}25.592$ That's like I have like some research
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285
- $00:36:25.592 \rightarrow 00:36:28.481$ project working on like we have to do like
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285
- $00:36:28.552 \rightarrow 00:36:30.944$ 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
- $00:36:32.450 \rightarrow 00:36:34.620$ the discussion, then the referral,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285
- $00:36:34.620 \rightarrow 00:36:36.200$ 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
- $00:36:38.656 \rightarrow 00:36:40.826$ smoking so from other works.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285
- $00:36:40.830 \dashrightarrow 00:36:43.071$ 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
- $00:36:45.424 \rightarrow 00:36:48.247$ actually get to that point who get screened,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285
- $00{:}36{:}48.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}50.644$ they are more likely to be motivated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285
- $00{:}36{:}50{.}644 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}52{.}848$ and they make quit attempts but
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:36:52.848 \rightarrow 00:36:54.688$ 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

 $00:36:57.560 \rightarrow 00:37:00.647$ Just trying the quit attempt is a first step

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00:37:00.647 \rightarrow 00:37:03.918$ but successfully quit they need to get help.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

00:37:03.920 --> 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

 $00:37:12.234 \rightarrow 00:37:13.820$ 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

 $00{:}37{:}15{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}17{.}445$ The quit attempts are higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

 $00{:}37{:}17{.}445 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}19{.}432$ 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

 $00{:}37{:}21.736 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}24.177$ on the use the criteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285

00:37:24.180 --> 00:37:27.020 updated criteria 20 pack years.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285
- $00:37:27.020 \longrightarrow 00:37:29.176$ 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
- $00:37:32.077 \rightarrow 00:37:34.447$ healthcare providers they didn't know
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285
- $00:37:34.447 \rightarrow 00:37:37.218$ that the guideline would be changed.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857338380714285
- $00{:}37{:}37{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}39{.}565$ 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
- $00:37:42.540 \longrightarrow 00:37:44.550$ 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
- $00:37:50.380 \longrightarrow 00:37:52.130$ 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
- $00:37:53.426 \rightarrow 00:37:55.771$ 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
- $00:37:57.451 \rightarrow 00:37:59.515$ likely to roll their own cigarettes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852885533636364
- 00:37:59.515 --> 00:38:01.495 due to expense and maybe under
- NOTE Confidence: 0.852885533636364

 $00:38:01.495 \rightarrow 00:38:03.550$ 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

 $00:38:05.520 \rightarrow 00:38:07.638$ capture those who do not bypass?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

00:38:08.560 -> 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

 $00{:}38{:}12.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}15.540$ 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

 $00:38:20.110 \longrightarrow 00:38:22.090$ 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

 $00{:}38{:}23.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}26.704$ So that's kind of one of the limitation

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:26.704 \longrightarrow 00:38:29.699$ that we're going to miss those

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:29.699 \rightarrow 00:38:31.855$ population just healthcare providers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025

 $00:38:31.860 \rightarrow 00:38:34.758$ 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

 $00:38:40.760 \rightarrow 00:38:42.834$ the guidelines so without, so that's.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7417270025
- $00:38:42.834 \longrightarrow 00:38:44.913$ 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
- $00:38:54.990 \rightarrow 00:38:55.998$ that's the history.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92445532
- 00:39:01.650 --> 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
- $00:39:04.242 \rightarrow 00:39:06.790$ This is a pretty big picture one now.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553
- $00{:}39{:}06{.}790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}08{.}554$ So and that first study that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553
- $00{:}39{:}08{.}554 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}09{.}436$ 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
- $00:39:11.672 \rightarrow 00:39:14.324$ of the patients or the participants
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553
- $00:39:14.324 \longrightarrow 00:39:16.970$ had reported a willingness to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

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

 $00:39:21.185 \longrightarrow 00:39:22.589$ practice that the percentage

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

00:39:22.589 --> 00:39:23.819 actually who are eligible,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00{:}39{:}23.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}25.655$ who actually do undergo screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00{:}39{:}25.655 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}27.180$ is under 10%, correct.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00{:}39{:}27.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}29.651$ Do you have any thoughts about like what

NOTE Confidence: 0.82450553

 $00:39:29.651 \rightarrow 00:39:31.628$ 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

 $00:39:35.340 \dashrightarrow 00:39:37.920$ So yeah that's very important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

00:39:37.920 --> 00:39:39.780 So even though they are Wheeling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00{:}39{:}39{.}780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}41{.}880$ 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

 $00:39:44.180 \rightarrow 00:39:45.580$ there has been a lot of work song,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:45.580 \rightarrow 00:39:46.996$ so they meet, they get discussion,

00:39:47.000 - 00:39:48.694 they get referral that they have to

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:39:48.694 \dashrightarrow 00:39:50.379$ 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

 $00{:}39{:}52{.}192 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}55{.}015$ is low and I think there would be

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

00:39:55.015 --> 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

 $00:40:02.200 \longrightarrow 00:40:04.575$ 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

 $00:40:07.025 \rightarrow 00:40:09.069$ making visit expressed willingness

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00{:}40{:}09{.}069 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}11{.}624$ to go through the screening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:11.630 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.110$ So I think we have to have some,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00{:}40{:}14.110$ --> $00{:}40{:}16.891$ some system in place that we can follow up NOTE Confidence: 0.83642992

 $00:40:16.891 \rightarrow 00:40:19.885$ 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 --> 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
- $00{:}40{:}28.602 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}31.836$ 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 --> 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
- $00{:}40{:}39{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}40{.}432$ and other, you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.804891701538462
- $00:40:40.432 \rightarrow 00:40:41.864$ other cancer screening also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.804891701538462
- $00:40:41.864 \longrightarrow 00:40:43.720$ 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: 0.799265473555556
- $00{:}40{:}49{.}090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}51{.}743$ States. So that report that I presented
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799265473555556
- $00:40:51.743 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.439$ some from that they showed like in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799265473555556
- $00:40:54.439 \rightarrow 00:40:57.123$ some states it's quite stable and then

- NOTE Confidence: 0.799265473555556
- $00:40:57.123 \rightarrow 00:40:59.409$ some states were higher or lower.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799265473555556
- 00:40:59.410 --> 00:41:01.430 So it wasn't like across
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799265473555556
- $00:41:01.430 \longrightarrow 00:41:03.450$ the US that it dropped,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799265473555556
- $00{:}41{:}03{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}05{.}328$ there were states were doing much
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799265473555556
- $00{:}41{:}05{.}328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}07{.}020$ better compared to other states.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7261948
- 00:41:10.860 --> 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 --> 00:41:23.596 And I just want to say like,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238
- 00:41:23.600 --> 00:41:26.096 I'm new at Yale. It's been not new.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238
- $00:41:26.100 \longrightarrow 00:41:28.676$ It's been a year and I'll be very
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238
- 00:41:28.676 --> 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
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915284238

 $00{:}41{:}34{.}955 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}37{.}573$ 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

 $00{:}41{:}39{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}40{.}539$ Thanks so much, every one.