

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Preventive Medicine Reports



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/pmedr

Short communication

# Clinician-perceived barriers to cervical cancer screening before and during the COVID-19 pandemic at three US healthcare systems

Veronica M. Boratyn<sup>a</sup>, Gaia Pocobelli<sup>b</sup>, Steven J. Atlas<sup>a</sup>, Cheryl R. Clark<sup>c</sup>, Sarah Feldman<sup>d</sup>, Gina Kruse<sup>a,e</sup>, Anne Marie McCarthy<sup>j</sup>, Meghan Rieu-Werden<sup>a</sup>, Michelle I. Silver<sup>f</sup>, Noel O. Santini<sup>g,h</sup>, Jasmin A. Tiro<sup>h,i</sup>, Jennifer S. Haas<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Division of General Internal Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, United States

- <sup>d</sup> Department of Obstetrics Gynecology & Reproductive Biology, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, United States
- <sup>e</sup> Division of General Internal Medicine, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Denver, CO, United States
- <sup>f</sup> Department of Surgery, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO, United States

<sup>g</sup> Parkland Health, Dallas, TX, United States

<sup>h</sup> Division of General Internal Medicine, UT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX, United States

- <sup>1</sup> Department of Public Health Sciences, Biological Sciences Division, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, United States
- <sup>j</sup> Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Survey

Barriers to care

Public health

Cancer screening

ABSTRACT

*Introduction:* The COVID-19 pandemic posed serious challenges to cancer screening delivery, including cervical cancer. While the impact of the pandemic on deferred screening has been documented, less is known about how clinicians experienced barriers to screening delivery, and, in particular, the role of pre-pandemic barriers to changes reported during the pandemic.

*Methods*: Survey of clinicians who performed  $\geq$  10 cervical cancer screening tests in 2019 from Mass General Brigham, Kaiser Permanente Washington, and Parkland Health, the healthcare systems participating in the Population-based Research to Optimize the Screening Process (PROSPR II) consortium (administered 10/2020–12/2020, response rate 53.7 %).

*Results*: Prior to the pandemic, clinicians commonly noted barriers to the delivery of cervical cancer screening including lack of staff support (57.6%), interpreters (32.5%), resources to support patients with social barriers to care (61.3%), and discrimination or bias in interactions between staff and patients (31.2%). Clinicians who reported experiencing a given barrier to care before the pandemic were more likely than those who did not experience one to report worsening during the pandemic: lack of staff support (odds ratio 4.70, 95% confidence interval 2.94–7.52); lack of interpreters (8.23, 4.46–15.18); lack of resources to support patients in overcoming social barriers (7.65, 4.41–13.27); and discrimination or bias (6.73, 3.03–14.97).

*Conclusions:* Clinicians from three health systems who deliver cervical cancer screening commonly reported barriers to care. Barriers prior to the pandemic were associated with worsening of barriers during the pandemic. Addressing barriers to cervical cancer screening may promote resilience of care delivery during the next public health emergency.

## 1. Introduction

While cervical cancer incidence and mortality have declined in the United States (US) since the introduction of the Papanicolaou (Pap) test (Safaeian et al., 2007), guideline concordant screening rates declined

from 2005 to 2019 (Suk et al., 2022). The COVID-19 pandemic posed a serious new challenge to cancer screening delivery. Estimates suggest that cervical cancer screenings dropped by as much as 94 % during 2020 (Chen et al., 2021).

The pandemic's effect on cancer prevention is often discussed in

\* Corresponding author. E-mail address: jennifer.haas@mgh.harvard.edu (J.S. Haas).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2024.102783

Received 2 October 2023; Received in revised form 20 January 2024; Accepted 1 June 2024 Available online 1 June 2024 2211 2325 (© 2024 Published by Electric Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY NC N

2211-3355/© 2024 Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Kaiser Permanente Washington Health Research Institute, Seattle, Washington, United States

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup> Division of General Internal Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, United States

terms of missed screenings and increased risks for patients (Chen et al., 2021). Yet how clinicians who conduct cancer screening experienced challenges in providing screenings during the pandemic is less well understood. Even before the pandemic, primary care clinicians reported inadequate systems to support cancer screening (Schapira et al., 2016).

The goal of this study was to describe barriers to cervical cancer screening prior to and during the pandemic by surveying clinicians at three large healthcare systems. This information may inform institutions as they focus renewed efforts on cancer screening and prevention and consider changes to infrastructure to minimize disruptions during future public health crises (Wang, 2023).

## 2. Methods

This study includes healthcare systems participating in the Population-based Research to Optimize the Screening Process (PROSPR II) consortium (Beaber et al., 2022): Mass General Brigham (MGB), a Boston-area healthcare system; Kaiser Permanente Washington (KPWA), a mixed-model healthcare system in Washington State; and Parkland Health (PH), a safety-net healthcare system for under-/un-insured Dallas County residents (all located in the US). Survey methods have previously been described (Kruse et al., 2023). In brief, an online confidential survey was administered by email, from October-December 2020 to clinicians who performed  $\geq 10$  cervical cancer screening tests in 2019 and specialized in family medicine, internal medicine, or obstetrics/gynecology. Institutional review boards at each site approved study activities.

Survey questions included clinicians' sociodemographic characteristics (age, gender, race, ethnicity, employment status, degree and specialty). Clinicians were also asked to report on barriers to cervical cancer screening both before and during the pandemic including: lack of staff support (defined as lack of staff support for at least one of the following three items: scheduling cervical cancer screenings, communicating results or scheduling follow-up of an abnormal result); lack of interpreters to communicate in patient's preferred language; lack of resources to support patients in overcoming social barriers to receiving timely screening; and discrimination or bias in interactions between clinic staff and patients due to race, language, or other patient characteristics. For each category, clinicians were asked to report whether it was a barrier prior to the pandemic (not a barrier, minor barrier, major barrier) which was categorized for the analysis as any vs. no barrier, and compared to during the pandemic whether the barrier was the same, better, or worse than before the pandemic (dichotomized as worse vs. not worse).

For each barrier, we evaluated the association between clinician sociodemographic factors (age, employment status, clinician type and specialty) and the likelihood of reporting that the potential barrier: 1) was a barrier pre-pandemic (versus not a barrier), and 2) worsened during the pandemic (versus did not worsen). We used logistic regression to estimate adjusted odds ratios (aOR) and 95 % confidence interval (CI)s. We additionally evaluated whether reporting the barrier pre-pandemic was related to reporting a worsening of the barrier during the pandemic. We used logistic regression to estimate adjusted odds ratios (aOR) and 95 % confidence interval adjusted odds reporting a worsening of the barrier during the pandemic. We used logistic regression to estimate adjusted odds ratios (aOR) and 95 % confidence interval (CI)s.

## 3. Results

A total of 501 of 933 eligible clinicians (53.7 %) completed the survey; additional exclusions included 9 who had not performed a cervical cancer screening within 12 months of survey administration, and 3 who did not respond to the questions regarding barriers, leaving 489 clinicians for analyses. Most clinicians were female, white, employed full-time and physicians (Table 1). Prior to the pandemic, clinicians commonly noted barriers to the delivery of cervical cancer screening including lack of staff support (57.6 %), lack of interpreters (32.5 %), lack of resources to support patients in overcoming social barriers to care (61.3 %), and discrimination or bias in interactions between clinic

Table 1

Characteristics of clinician survey respondents, overall and by site (Fall 2020).

	All		MGB		KPWA		PH	
	N	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	N	%
Total	489	100	221	100	199	100	69	100
Age (years)								
<40	160	33.3	51	23.2	88	45.4	21	31.3
40–59	246	51.1	125	56.8	85	43.8	36	53.7
$\geq 60$	75	15.6	44	20.0	21	10.8	10	14.9
Gender Identity								
Female	407	85.0	193	88.5	153	79.3	61	89.7
Male	72	15.0	25	11.5	40	20.7	7	10.3
Race and Ethnicity								
Black/African	22	4.7	10	4.8	8	4.6	17	24.6
American								
Hispanic	18	3.8					5	7.2
Asian/Asian	80	16.9	32	14.7	32	16.8	16	23.2
American								
White/Caucasian	324	68.6	167	77.0	134	70.5	23	33.3
Other	28	5.9	8	3.7	16	8.4	_	_
Employment Status								
Full-time	323	66.1	148	67.0	109	55.1	66	95.7
Part-time	165	33.7	73	33.0	89	44.9	_	_
Clinician Type								
Physician (MD or	344	70.3	182	82.4	142	71.4	20	29.0
DO)								
Advanced Practice	145	29.7	39	17.6	57	28.6	49	71.0
Clinician								
<b>Clinician Specialty</b>								
Family Medicine	196	40.1	22	10.0	146	73.4	28	40.6
General Internal	167	34.2	153	69.2	12	6.0	_	_
Medicine								
Obstetrics and	126	25.8	46	20.8	41	20.6	39	56.5
Gynecology								

**Note:** Mass General Brigham (MGB), Boston, MA Kaiser Permanente Washington (KPWA), Washington state; Parkland Health (PH), Dallas, TX. Cell sizes < 5 were suppressed/ combined. Responses were unknown for: age (n = 8), gender identity (n = 10), race/ethnicity (n = 17), and employment status (n = 1).

staff and patients (31.2 %) (Table 2). Younger clinicians were more likely than middle-aged clinicians to report that lack of staff support and resources to address social needs were barriers to cervical cancer screening. Full-time clinicians were more likely than part-time clinicians to report lack of resources to address social needs. Physicians were more likely than advanced practice clinicians (APC) to report discrimination/ bias. Obstetrician/ gynecologists and family medicine clinicians were less likely than general internists to report lack of staff support as a barrier.

During the pandemic, approximately one-third of clinicians reported worsening of staff support and resources to address social barriers; fewer reported worsening of interpreter support or discrimination/bias as barriers to cervical cancer screening (Table 2). Clinician reports of experiencing a particular barrier to care before the pandemic was significantly associated with worsening of that barrier across all four barriers: lack of staff support (aOR = 4.70 [2.94–7.52]; lack of interpreters 8.23 [4.46–15.18]; lack of resources to address social barriers 7.65 [4.41–13.27]; and discrimination/bias 6.73 [3.03–14.97]). Clinician characteristics were largely not associated with reports of worsening of barriers after adjusting for reports of experiencing the barrier pre-pandemic.

## 4. Discussion

Before the COVID-19 pandemic, many clinicians in our survey reported barriers to screening, particularly lack of staff support and resources to support patients. Clinicians who experienced a given barrier to providing cervical cancer prevention before the pandemic were more likely than those who did not to report worsening of that barrier during the public health emergency in the fall of 2020.

While prior work has described patients' experiences in the use of

## Table 2

Clinicians' perception of barriers to cervical cancer screening prior to the pandemic and barrier worsening during the COVID-19 pandemic (Fall 2020).

Instant         Name (Note)         Name (Note)         Name (Note)         Name (Note)         Name (Note)         Name (Note)           Isko statistication (Note)         Name (Note)			Before COVID-19		During COVID-19		
Lack of statif support <sup>1</sup> All (n = 489) Pre-COVID Burker Not a burker			% With anybarrier	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95 % CI)	% Worsening	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95 % CI)	
Interfact       10	Lack of staff support <sup>§</sup>	All (n = 488) Pre-COVID Barrier	57.6		35.3		
A 90 675 1.74 (11.27) 814 0.76 (0.39.1.1)     A 95 0.46 (0.4-0.4)     A07 0.39.1.1)     A14 0.46 (0.4-0.4)     A04 0.4-0.4)     A14 0.4     A14		Not a barrier Minor/major barrier Age (years)			15.1 50.0	Reference 4.70 (2.94–7.52)	
Image         Description         Description <thdescripion< th=""> <thdescription< th=""> <thdes< td=""><td></td><td>&lt; 40</td><td>67.5</td><td>1.74 (1.11–2.74)</td><td>38.4</td><td>0.76 (0.46–1.24)</td></thdes<></thdescription<></thdescripion<>		< 40	67.5	1.74 (1.11–2.74)	38.4	0.76 (0.46–1.24)	
Induce         Endoce         Endoce<		$\geq 60$	46.7	0.67 (0.39–1.17)	21.3	0.46 (0.24–0.90)	
IndexNoteSolReferenceSolSolReferenceSolSolSolReferenceSolSolReferenceSol <th< td=""><td></td><td>Employment Status</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>		Employment Status					
Claication Type       Low		Full-time Part-time	55.7 61.6	Reference 1.12 (0.72–1.74)	32.3 41.4	Reference 1 16 (0 72–1 86)	
Index of integreters         8.00         Reference         8.00         Open (5.4.1.20)           Advanced Practice         5.20         0.45 (0.53.1.30)         0.90 (0.54.1.20)           Control Contro Contro Contro Control Control Control Contro Contro Control Con		Clinician Type	0110	1112 (01) 2 11/ 1)	1211	1110 (01/2 1100)	
Lack of interpreters  interpre		Physician (MD or DO)	59.0	Reference	38.0	Reference	
Iack of interpretersFamily Medician General Internal Medician G		Clinician Specialty	34.2	0.85 (0.55–1.50)	20.7	0.90 (0.34–1.32)	
General intermal Medicine6:9Mere4:44:80.20 (0.16-0.5)1:850.30 (0.16-0.8)Lack of interpreters(1.6 486)3.25		Family Medicine	58.7	0.43 (0.22–0.82)	37.9	0.72 (0.35–1.45)	
Interpreters         Obstration of the second of the		General Internal Medicine	65.9	Reference	44.6	Reference	
Lack of interpretersAll (n = "act of US parties"Set of US partiesSet of US partiesNameN		Gynecology	44.8	0.29 (0.16–0.54)	18.5	0.33 (0.16–0.68)	
Not a barrierS.2Reference RescueAge (vers)30.81.42 (0.01-2.24)3.83.8.23 (4.46-15.18)40.5930.5Reference1.42Reference40.5930.5Reference1.44Reference40.5930.5Reference1.407 (0.46-2.49)1.5220028.00.53 (0.52-1.51)1.501.57201Fartime3.1Reference1.5020128.00.53 (0.52-1.51)1.501.52201Fartime3.1Reference1.50201Cartical TypeReference1.501.52201Cartical TargeReference1.501.52201Cartical TargeReference1.561.56201Cartical TargeReference1.561.56201Cartical TargeReference1.561.56201Cartical TargeReference1.561.56201Cartical TargeReference1.561.56201Cartical Targe1.501.561.56201Cartical Targe1.541.521.56201Cartical Targe1.541.521.56201Cartical Targe1.541.521.52201Cartical Targe1.541.521.52201Cartical Targe1.541.541.52201Cartical Targe1.541.541.52201Cartical Targe1.541.541.	Lack of interpreters	All (n = 486) Pre-COVID Barrier	32.5		13.8		
Age (years)Jack (wear, Large)Jack (wear, Large)< < 0		Not a barrier			5.2 30.8	Reference	
A 40.3 8.1 A 120 9.1-2.24 8.2 B 7.2 (0.39-1.56) A 142 0.91-2.24 1.2 (0.78 0.39-1.56) A 16.5 A 142 0.91-2.24 1.2 (0.49-2.49) A 15.2 (0.59-2.23) A 15.2 (0.59-2.5) A 15.2 (		Age (years)			50.8	8.23 (4.40–13.18)	
40-59     30.5     Peterence     14.4     Peterence       2-60     28.0     0.32 (0.52.1.68)     1.3     1.07 (0.46-2.49)       Employment Status     Part-time     3.1.5     0.98 (0.62.1.51)     1.50     0.81 (0.42-1.57)       Part-time     3.1.5     0.96 (0.62.1.51)     1.50     0.81 (0.42-1.57)       Ciliciain Type     Part-time     3.1.5     0.96 (0.62.1.51)     1.50     0.81 (0.42-1.57)       Ciliciain Status     Part-time     3.1.5     0.96 (0.62.1.51)     1.50     0.81 (0.42-1.57)       Ciliciain Status     Part-time     3.2.2     0.61 (0.52.1.92)     1.2.3     1.06 (0.43-2.63)       Ciliciain Status     Part-time     3.2.2     1.00 (0.52.1.92)     1.2.3     1.06 (0.43-2.63)       Ciliciain Status     Part-time     3.3.2     1.00 (0.52.1.92)     1.2.3     1.06 (0.43-2.63)       System     3.4     1.19 (0.65-2.17)     1.2.9     0.85 (0.36-2.01)     1.2.9     0.85 (0.36-2.01)       System     3.1     TreeCOVID Barrier     1.2     1.06 (0.43-2.63)     1.01     1.01     1.06 (0.43-2.63)       Barriers     All (n = 489)     6.1.3     1.2     1.2     1.63 (0.42-1.57)     1.23 (0.42-1.57)       Barriers     Not a barrier     1.16 (0.50     6.03 (0.63-0.163)		< 40	38.1	1.42 (0.91–2.24)	13.2	0.78 (0.39–1.56)	
Imployment StatusIndicationInternetInternetFull-time31.50.96 (0.62-1.51)1.360.81 (0.42-1.57)Part-time31.50.96 (0.62-1.51)1.360.81 (0.42-1.57)Physician (MD or DO)34.2Reference1.49ReferenceAdvanced Practice2.820.01 (0.57-1.01)1.21.06 (0.53-2.23)Clinician31.21.00 (0.52-1.23)1.231.06 (0.43-2.63)Family Medicine33.21.00 (0.52-1.23)1.23ReferenceClinician33.21.00 (0.52-1.23)1.23ReferenceClinician Specially33.21.00 (0.52-1.23)1.23ReferenceClinician Specially1.31.11.06 (0.43-2.63)ReferenceMore Saver33.21.00 (0.52-1.23)1.23ReferenceAdvanced Practice33.21.00 (0.52-1.23)ReferenceAdvanced Saver1.11.11.06 (0.43-2.63)Barriers1.11.11.11.1Not a barrier1.11.11.1Pre-CVID Barrier1.11.11.1Pre-CVID Barrier1.11.11.1Pre-CVID Barrier1.11.52 (0.92-2.53)Reference6.58.6Reference2.006.58.6Reference2.011.11.11.1Pre-CVID Barrier1.11.1Pre-CVID Barrier1.21.2Pre-CVID Barrier1.3ReferenceClinician1.1 </td <td></td> <td>40–59 &gt; 60</td> <td>30.5 28.0</td> <td>Reference 0.93 (0.52–1.68)</td> <td>14.4 13.3</td> <td>Reference 1.07 (0.46–2.49)</td>		40–59 > 60	30.5 28.0	Reference 0.93 (0.52–1.68)	14.4 13.3	Reference 1.07 (0.46–2.49)	
Full.fine33.1Reference14.0ReferencePart-time33.1Reference14.0ReferenceClinician TypeReference8.50.61 (0.37-1.01)11.21.06 (0.50-2.23)Advanced Practice28.50.61 (0.37-1.01)11.21.06 (0.50-2.23)ClinicianClinician3.21.00 (0.52-1.92)12.31.06 (0.43-2.63)Family Medicine3.33.6Reference6.3ReferenceClinician0.3Reference1.31.06 (0.43-2.63)1.06 (0.43-2.63)Concology1.31.00 (0.52-1.92)1.2.31.06 (0.43-2.63)Jarriers1.11 (n = 488)1.33.1YerenceNot a barrierYere CVID Barrier1.08ReferenceAge (vers)1.31.64 (1.04-2.63)1.81.52 (0.92-2.33)Age (vers)1.01 (n = 487)6.050.63 (0.36-1.08)1.760.49 (0.24-1.01)Pre-CVID Barrier1.081.64 (1.04-2.53)1.52 (0.92-2.33)ReferenceAge (vers)1.01 (n = 487)0.63 (0.36-1.08)1.760.49 (0.24-1.01)Pre-CVID Barrier1.01 (n = 487)1.62 (0.40-0.59)3.71.52 (0.92-2.33)Reference1.64 (1.04-2.53)Reference1.62 (0.40-0.59)3.71.52 (0.92-2.33)Reference1.64 (1.04-2.64)0.63 (0.36-1.08)1.62 (0.40-0.59)3.71.52 (0.92-2.39)Reference1.64 (1.04-2.55)Reference1.63 (0.46-1.58)1.62 (0.40-0.59)3.71.52 (0.92-2.39)		Employment Status					
birrinite         3.1.3         0.30 (0.02-1.3)         1.3.0         0.03 (0.02-1.3)           Clinician Type         Physician (MD or DO)         3.2.2         Reference         1.4.9         Reference           Advanced Practice         2.8.5         0.10 (0.37-1.02)         1.2.2         1.06 (0.52-2.2)           Clinician Specialty         Internal Medicine         3.2.3         1.00 (0.52-1.92)         1.2.3         1.06 (0.43-2.6.3)           General Internal Medicine         0.3.3         Reference         1.6.8         Reference           Obstetrics and         3.4.4         1.19 (0.65-2.17)         1.2.9         0.85 (0.36-2.01)           Oyne colory         Internal Medicine         3.3.3         Reference         1.6.8         Reference           Minor/major barrier         Internal Medicine         0.3.3         Reference         3.1.3         1.52 (0.92-2.53)           Minor/major barrier         Internal Medicine         6.1.3         V         7.1.3         7.56 (4.41-1.3.27)           Age (years)         Internal Medicine         6.3.8         1.64 (1.04-2.59)         4.1.8         1.52 (0.92-2.53)           Part time         6.5.3         Reference         3.1.9         Reference         1.5.2 (0.92-2.53)           Part time         <		Full-time	33.1	Reference	14.0	Reference	
Physician (M) or DO34.2Reference1.4.9ReferenceAdvanced Practice28.50.61 (0.37-1.0)1.21.06 (0.50-2.23)ClinicianClinician31.21.00 (0.52-1.92)1.2.31.06 (0.43-2.63)General Internal Medicine30.3Reference1.5.3ReferenceObstetrics and3.4.41.10 (0.52-1.92)1.2.31.06 (0.43-2.63)JuricesJurices3.4.41.10 (0.52-1.92)1.2.31.06 (0.43-2.63)BarriersAll (n = 488)6.1.31.2.90.658 (0.5.2.01)Not a barrierVeroCVID Barrier4.1.3Net FerencePre-CVID Barrier4.1.41.52 (0.92-2.53)1.6.4 (1.04-2.59)4.8.Age (grean)4.8.01.64 (1.04-2.59)4.8.1.52 (0.92-2.53)Age (grean)4.9.06.8.81.64 (1.04-2.59)4.8.1.52 (0.92-2.53)Pre-CVID Barrier4.0.40.63 (0.36-1.08)1.7.7.65 (4.4.1-1.3.27)Pre-CVID Barrier4.0.40.63 (0.36-1.08)0.4.9 (0.24-1.01)Pre-CVID Barrier1.1.21.1.27.65 (4.4.1-1.3.27)Pre-CVID Barrier1.1.21.1.21.1.21.1.2Pre-CVID Barrier1.1.21.1.21.1.21.1.2Pre-CVID Barrier1.1.21.1.21.1.21.1.2Pre-CVID Barrier1.1.21.1.21.1.21.1.2Pre-CVID Barrier1.1.21.1.21.1.21.1.2Pre-CVID Barrier1.1.21.1.21.1.21.1.2		Clinician Type	31.5	0.96 (0.62–1.51)	13.0	0.81 (0.42–1.57)	
		Physician (MD or DO)	34.2	Reference	14.9	Reference	
Jamin Medicine         33.2         1.00 (0.52-1.92)         12.3         1.06 (0.43-2.63)           General Internal Medicine         33.4         Reference         16.3         Reference           Obstetric's and         34.4         1.19 (0.65-2.17)         12.3         0.50 (0.34-2.63)           barriers         1.19 (0.65-2.17)         12.3         0.50 (0.34-2.63)           barriers         1.19 (0.65-2.17)         12.3         0.50 (0.34-2.63)           Mile (ne 488)         61.3         1.19 (0.65-2.17)         12.3         0.50 (0.34-2.63)           barriers         All (n - 488)         61.3         3.1         Ference           Minor/major barrier         7.4         7.56 (4.41-13.27)         7.56 (4.41-13.27)           Age (years)         4.40         68.8         1.64 (1.04-2.59)         1.8         1.52 (0.92-2.53)           Age (years)         6.0         8.67 (6.0.6.8)         Reference         3.1         Reference           Minor/major barrier         7.40         0.63 (0.36-1.08)         17.6         0.49 (0.24-1.01)           Cinician Type         7.1         Reference         3.3         0.62 (0.40-0.93)         0.42 (0.93-2.5)           Partime         5.3         0.63 (0.36-1.68)         1.64		Advanced Practice Clinician Clinician Specialty	28.5	0.61 (0.37–1.01)	11.2	1.06 (0.50–2.23)	
General Internal Medicine       30.4       Reference       16.3       Reference         Description       34.4       110 (0.65-2.17)       12.9       0.85 (0.36-2.01)         barriers       31.0       - <td></td> <td>Family Medicine</td> <td>33.2</td> <td>1.00 (0.52–1.92)</td> <td>12.3</td> <td>1.06 (0.43–2.63)</td>		Family Medicine	33.2	1.00 (0.52–1.92)	12.3	1.06 (0.43–2.63)	
Lack of resources to support patients in overcoming social barriers 0  Network of the support patients in overcoming social barriers 0  Network of barrier		General Internal Medicine Obstetrics and	30.3 34.4	Reference 1.19 (0.65–2.17)	16.3 12.9	Reference 0.85 (0.36–2.01)	
Not abarier         10.8         Reference           Minor/major barrier         5.4         7.0         7.05           Mage (varm)         5.4         7.05         7.05           Ref (varm)         6.8         1.64 (1.04.25.9)         4.18         1.52 (0.02-2.53)           Ref (varm)         6.08         Reference         3.21         Reference           2.0         6.03         0.63 (0.63.0)         3.21         Reference           2.0         2.03         0.62 (0.40.0.5)         3.70         1.52 (0.93-2.53)           Partimo         5.33         0.62 (0.40.0.5)         3.70         1.52 (0.93-2.53)           Partimo         5.34         0.63 (0.91.0.10)         3.61         Reference           Ref (marci         5.9         0.63 (0.91.0.10)         3.2         0.93 (0.46-1.80)           Partimo Partimo         5.8         0.83 (0.46-1.60)         3.2         0.64 (0.33 (0.93 (0.91.0.0))           <	Lack of resources to support patients in overcoming social barriers	All $(n = 488)$ Pre-COVID Barrier	61.3		33.1		
Minor, major barrier       47.1       7.65 (4.41-13.27)         Age (vears)           <<40		Not a barrier			10.8	Reference	
insert space		Minor/major barrier			47.1	7.65 (4.41–13.27)	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		< 40	68.8	1.64 (1.04–2.59)	41.8	1.52 (0.92–2.53)	
260       46.0       0.035 (0.35-1.08)       17.5       0.49 (0.24-1.01)         Employment Status       Full-time       65.5       Reference       31.3       Reference         Part-time       65.3       0.62 (0.40-0.95)       37.0       1.52 (0.93-2.5)         Clinician Type       Physician (MD or DO)       63.6       Reference       36.0       Reference         Advanced Practice       55.9       0.63 (0.39-1.02)       26.4       0.72 (0.41-1.25)         Clinician Specialty       Clinician Specialty       V       V       V         Clinician Specialty       Family Medicine       60.5       0.88 (0.46-1.67)       33.2       0.93 (0.46-1.89)         General Internal Medicine       64.1       Reference       40.6       Reference         Obstritics and       58.7       0.83 (0.46-1.51)       32.2       0.64 (0.33-1.25)         Gynecology       J       J       Reference       0.64 (0.33-1.25)         Minor/major Barier       Is.0       6.73 (3.03-14.97)       31.2       8.1         Pre-CVUID Barrier       Is.0       6.73 (3.03-14.97)       31.4       0.98 (0.61-1.56)       7.6       0.84 (0.36-1.95)         Ado-59       33.9       Reference       9.1       Reference		40-59	60.8	Reference	32.1	Reference	
Full-time65.5Reference31.3ReferencePart-time53.30.620.40-0.95)37.01.52Part-time53.30.630.40-0.95)37.01.52Clinician TypePhysician (MD or DO)63.6Reference36.0ReferenceAdvanced Practice55.90.630.39-1.02)26.40.720.41-1.25)ClinicianSpecialty </td <td></td> <td>≥ 60 Employment Status</td> <td>48.0</td> <td>0.03 (0.30–1.08)</td> <td>17.0</td> <td>0.49 (0.24–1.01)</td>		≥ 60 Employment Status	48.0	0.03 (0.30–1.08)	17.0	0.49 (0.24–1.01)	
Part-time       53.3       0.62 (0.40-0.95)       37.0       1.52 (0.93-2.5)         Clinician Type       Clinician Type       55.9       0.63 (0.39-1.02)       26.4       0.72 (0.41-1.25)         Clinician       Clinician       Clinician       60.5       0.88 (0.46-1.67)       33.2       0.93 (0.46-1.89)         Clinician       General Internal Medicine       64.1       Reference       40.6       Reference         Obstetrics and       58.7       0.83 (0.46-1.51)       23.2       0.64 (0.33-1.25)         Pre-COVID Barrier       8.1       Stations/major barrier       8.1         Not a barrier       18.0       6.73 (3.03-14.97)         Age (years)       18.0       6.73 (3.03-14.97)          40-59       33.9       Reference       9.1         Ald (n - 487)       31.4       0.98 (0.61-1.56)       7.6       0.84 (0.36-1.95)         40-59       33.9       Reference       9.1       Reference		Full-time	65.5	Reference	31.3	Reference	
$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Physician (MD or DO)} & 63.6 & Reference & 36.0 & Reference \\ Advanced Practice & 55.9 & 0.63 (0.39-1.02) & 26.4 & 0.72 (0.41-1.25) \\ Clinician \\ \mbox{Clinician Specialty} \\ Family Medicine & 60.5 & 0.88 (0.46-1.67) & 33.2 & 0.93 (0.46-1.89) \\ General Internal Medicine & 64.1 & Reference & 40.6 & Reference \\ Obstetrics and & 58.7 & 0.83 (0.46-1.51) & 23.2 & 0.64 (0.33-1.25) \\ Gynecology \\ \mbox{Discrimination or bias in interactions between clinic staff and patients & $Pre-COVID Barrier \\ Not a barrier & $3.6$ & Reference \\ Not a barrier & $3.6$ & Reference \\ Not a barrier & $3.6$ & Reference \\ \mbox{Minor/major barrier } & $3.6$ & $6.73 (3.03-14.97) \\ \mbox{Age (years) & $3.9$ & $Reference & $9.1$ & $Reference \\ $9.6$ & $2.40$ & $3.14$ & $0.98 (0.61-1.56) & $7.6$ & $0.84 (0.36-1.95) \\ \mbox{40-59} & $3.39$ & $Reference & $9.1$ & $Reference \\ \mbox{9} & $2.60$ & $24.0$ & $0.63 (0.34-1.16) & $4.0$ & $0.49 (0.13-1.83) \\ \mbox{Employment Status } & $$Full-time & $31.4$ & $Reference & $7.8$ & $Reference \\ \mbox{9} & $3.7$ & $0.88 (0.56-1.38) & $8.7$ & $1.37 (0.60-3.10) \\ \mbox{10} & $1.41$ & $0.88 (0.56-1.38) & $8.7$ & $1.37 (0.60-3.10) \\ \mbox{10} & $1.41$ & $0.88 (0.56-1.38) & $8.7$ & $1.37 (0.60-3.10) \\ \mbox{10} & $1.41$ & $0.88 (0.56-1.38) & $8.7$ & $1.37 (0.60-3.10) \\ \mbox{10} & $1.41$ & $0.88 (0.56-1.38) & $1.41$ & $1.42$ & $1.42$ & $1.43 (0.56-1.38) & $1.43 (0.56-$		Part-time Clinician Type	53.3	0.62 (0.40–0.95)	37.0	1.52 (0.93–2.5)	
Advanced Practice       55.9       0.63 (0.39–1.02)       26.4       0.72 (0.41–1.25)         Clinician       Clinician       Clinician       Clinician       State       State         Clinician       Family Medicine       60.5       0.88 (0.46–1.67)       33.2       0.93 (0.46–1.89)         General Internal Medicine       64.1       Reference       40.6       Reference         Obstetrics and       58.7       0.83 (0.46–1.51)       23.2       0.64 (0.33–1.25)         General Internal Medicine       64.1       Reference       8.1         Discrimination or bias in interactions between clinic staff and       All (n = 487)       31.2       8.1         Pre-COVID Barrier       18.0       6.73 (3.03–14.97)         Minor/major barrier       3.6       Reference         Minor/major barrier       18.0       6.73 (3.03–14.97)         Age (wars)       40       31.4       0.98 (0.61–1.56)       7.6       0.84 (0.36–1.95)         40-59       33.9       Reference       9.1       Reference         2 60       24.0       0.63 (0.34–1.16)       4.0       0.49 (0.13–1.83)         Employment Status       Full-time       31.4       Reference       7.8       Reference         14.1		Physician (MD or DO)	63.6	Reference	36.0	Reference	
Clinician Specialty         Family Medicine $60.5$ $0.88 (0.46-1.67)$ $33.2$ $0.93 (0.46-1.89)$ General Internal Medicine $64.1$ Reference $40.6$ Reference         Obstritics and $58.7$ $0.83 (0.46-1.51)$ $23.2$ $0.64 (0.33-1.25)$ gynecology $31.2$ $81$ $81$ patients <b>All (n = 487)</b> $31.2$ $8.1$ Pre-COVID Barrier $8.6$ Reference         Minor/major barrier $36.6$ Reference         Minor/major barrier $8.6$ $6.73 (3.03-14.97)$ Age (years) $33.9$ Reference $< 40$ $31.4$ $0.98 (0.61-1.56)$ $7.6$ $0.84 (0.36-1.95)$ $40-59$ $33.9$ Reference $9.1$ Reference $2 60$ $24.0$ $0.63 (0.34-1.16)$ $4.0$ $0.49 (0.13-1.83)$ <b>Employment Status</b> $7.6$ $0.84 (0.36-1.95)$ $7.6$ $0.84 (0.36-1.95)$ $40-59$ $33.9$ Reference $9.1$ Reference $10.1$ $0.88 (0.56-1.38)$ $8.7$ $1.37 (0.60-3.10)$		Advanced Practice Clinician	55.9	0.63 (0.39–1.02)	26.4	0.72 (0.41–1.25)	
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{General Internal Medicine} & 64.1 & \text{Reference} & 40.6 & \text{Reference} \\ \text{Obstetrics and} & 58.7 & 0.83 (0.46-1.51) & 23.2 & 0.64 (0.33-1.25) \\ \text{Gynecology} & & & & & \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{Discrimination or bias in interactions between clinic staff and} \\ \textbf{patients} & & \text{All } (\textbf{n} = 487) & 31.2 & & & 8.1 \\ \hline \textbf{Pre-COVID Barrier} & & & & & 3.6 & \text{Reference} \\ \text{Not a barrier} & & & & & 3.6 & \text{Reference} \\ \text{Minor/major barrier} & & & & & 3.6 & \text{Reference} \\ \text{Minor/major barrier} & & & & & 3.6 & \text{Reference} \\ \hline \textbf{More a barrier} & & & & & & 18.0 & 6.73 (3.03-14.97) \\ \textbf{Age (years)} & & & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Age (years)} & & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Adl } -59 & & & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Adl } -59 & & & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Adl } -59 & & & & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Adl } -59 & & & & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Bully ment Status} & & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Employment Status} & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Full-time} & & & & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Full-time} & & & & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{All } & \textbf{Reference} & & & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Age (years)} & & & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & & \\ \hline \textbf{Continued on next noap} & & \\ \hline Cont$		Clinician Specialty Family Medicine	60.5	0.88 (0.46–1.67)	33.2	0 93 (0 46–1 89)	
Obstetrics and patients         58.7         0.83 (0.46–1.51)         23.2         0.64 (0.33–1.25)           Discrimination or bias in interactions between clinic staff and patients         All (n = 487)         31.2         8.1           Pre-COVID Barrier         Not a barrier         3.6         Reference           Minor/major barrier         31.4         0.98 (0.61–1.56)         7.6         0.84 (0.36–1.95)           Age (years)          33.9         Reference         9.1         Reference           2 6 0         24.0         0.63 (0.34–1.16)         4.0         0.49 (0.13–1.83)           Employment Status         Full-time         31.4         Reference         9.1         Reference           2 6 0         24.0         0.63 (0.34–1.16)         4.0         0.49 (0.13–1.83)         1.81           Employment Status         Full-time         31.4         Reference         9.1         Reference           2 6 0         24.0         0.63 (0.34–1.16)         4.0         0.49 (0.13–1.83)         1.37 (0.60–3.10)           Employment Status         Full-time         31.4         Reference         7.8         Reference           A ret-time         31.1         0.88 (0.56–1.38)         8.7         1.37 (0.60–3.10)         1.37 (0.60–3.10)<		General Internal Medicine	64.1	Reference	40.6	Reference	
Discrimination or bias in interactions between clinic staff and patients       All (n = 487)       31.2       8.1         Pre-COVID Barrier       Not a barrier       3.6       Reference         Not a barrier       18.0       6.73 (3.03–14.97)         Age (years)       -       -       -         < 40		Obstetrics and	58.7	0.83 (0.46–1.51)	23.2	0.64 (0.33–1.25)	
Not a barrier       3.6       Reference         Minor/major barrier       18.0       6.73 (3.03–14.97)         Age (years)       -       -         < 40	Discrimination or bias in interactions between clinic staff and patients	All $(n = 487)$ Pre-COVID Barrier	31.2		8.1		
Minor/major barrier       18.0       6.73 (3.03–14.97)         Age (years)       -       -       -         < 40	-	Not a barrier			3.6	Reference	
< 40		Minor/major barrier			18.0	6.73 (3.03–14.97)	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		< 40	31.4	0.98 (0.61–1.56)	7.6	0.84 (0.36–1.95)	
≥ 60       24.0       0.63 (0.34–1.16)       4.0       0.49 (0.13–1.83)         Employment Status         Full-time       31.4       Reference       7.8       Reference         Part-time       31.1       0.88 (0.56–1.38)       8.7       1.37 (0.60–3.10)		40–59	33.9	Reference	9.1	Reference	
Full-time         31.4         Reference         7.8         Reference           Part-time         31.1         0.88 (0.56–1.38)         8.7         1.37 (0.60–3.10)		≥ 60 Employment Status	24.0	0.63 (0.34–1.16)	4.0	0.49 (0.13–1.83)	
rart-time 31.1 0.88 (0.50–1.38) 8.7 1.37 (0.60–3.10)		Full-time Part time	31.4	Reference	7.8	Reference	
		i ai t-unic	31.1	0.00 (0.00–1.08)	0.7 (r	ontinued on next nage)	

### Table 2 (continued)

	Before COVID-19		During COVID-19	
	% With anybarrier	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95 % CI)	% Worsening	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95 % CI)
Clinician Type				
Physician (MD or DO)	35.0	Reference	8.8	Reference
Advanced Practice	22.2	0.55 (0.32-0.93)	6.3	0.63 (0.23-1.73)
Clinician				
Clinician Specialty				
Family Medicine	26.8	0.67 (0.34-1.30)	8.9	3.60 (1.08-12.0)
General Internal Medicine	34.7	Reference	6.7	Reference
Obstetrics and	33.3	1.09 (0.60–1.98)	8.8	2.15 (0.75-6.16)
 Gynecology				

Notes:

<sup>§</sup>Lack of staff support was based on the following survey items: lack of staff support for scheduling patients for cervical cancer screening; communicating screening test results to patients; and scheduling patients for follow-up after an abnormal screening result.

ORs were also adjusted for clinician gender identity, race and ethnicity, and health care system.

cancer screenings as well as the effects of the pandemic on their use of screenings (Becker et al., 2021; Buskwofie et al., 2020; Wentzensen et al., 2021; Akinlotan et al., 2017), less is known about the barriers to the delivery of cervical cancer screening experienced by clinicians. The clinician's perspective reflects infrastructure barriers to providing cancer screening (Biddle et al., 2020; Lugten et al., 2022). Disaster management often includes a de-prioritization of preventive health services and a reassignment of staff (Puricelli Perin et al., 2021). Our study, which shows an increase of barriers for clinicians providing cervical cancer screenings during a pandemic, particularly for those experiencing barriers before the pandemic, is consistent with this practice.

Infrastructure to support the delivery of preventive care has historically been under-resourced and the pandemic resulted in a worsening of this infrastructure and a decline in the primary care workforce (Grumbach et al., 2021). Although worse during the COVID-19 crisis, many of these barriers were already present. This study emphasizes the need to develop robust infrastructure to address barriers to cervical cancer screening, including lack of staff support, interpreters, and resources to overcome social barriers, and discrimination and bias in interactions.

Our study's data may be limited by the ability of respondents to retrospectively recall barriers prior to the pandemic. While our settings represent a diversity of care systems, our findings may not be generalizable. We could not fully examine clinician characteristics associated with perceived barriers due to the small sample sizes of some groups. Despite these limitations, we believe that the findings of this survey of clinician experiences across three health systems provide important insights to improve the delivery of cervical cancer screening. Our response rate is higher than a recent international survey of primary care physicians (Gunja et al., 2022).

Across three diverse health systems, we found that many clinicians delivering cervical cancer screening reported barriers to providing care and that those barriers worsened during the pandemic. These findings suggest opportunities to provide structural supports to reduce barriers to cervical cancer screening to promote a resilient preventive care delivery system.

## 5. Funding and conflicts of interest

This work was supported by the National Cancer Institute at the National Institutes of Health (grant number UM1CA221940) and the American Cancer Society (CRP-22-080-01-CTPS). The authors do not report any conflicts of interest. The views expressed here are those of the authors only and do not necessarily represent the views of the National Cancer Institute or National Institutes of Health.

#### CRediT authorship contribution statement

Veronica M. Boratyn: Writing – original draft, Conceptualization. Gaia Pocobelli: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing. Steven J. Atlas: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing. Cheryl R. Clark: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing. Sarah Feldman: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing. Gina Kruse: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing. Anne Marie McCarthy: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing. Meghan Rieu-Werden: Data curation, Formal analysis, Writing – review & editing. Michelle I. Silver: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing. Noel O. Santini: Writing – review & editing. Jasmin A. Tiro: . Jennifer S. Haas: Conceptualization, Data curation, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

## Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## Data availability

The data that has been used is confidential.

## References

- Akinlotan, M., Bolin, J.N., Helduser, J., Ojinnaka, C., Lichorad, A., McClellan, D., 2017. Cervical cancer screening barriers and risk factor knowledge among uninsured women. J Commun. Health 42 (4), 770–778.
- Beaber, E.F., Kamineni, A., Burnett-Hartman, A.N., et al., 2022. Evaluating and improving cancer screening process quality in a multilevel context: the PROSPR II consortium design and research agenda. Cancer Epidemiol. Biomark. Prev. 31 (8), 1521–1531.
- Becker, N.V., Moniz, M.H., Tipirneni, R., Dalton, V.K., Ayanian, J.Z., 2021. Utilization of women's preventive health services during the COVID-19 pandemic. JAMA Health Forum. 2 (7), e211408.
- Biddle, L., Wahedi, K., Bozorgmehr, K., 2020. Health system resilience: a literature review of empirical research. Health Policy Plan. 35 (8), 1084–1109.
- Buskwofie, A., David-West, G., Clare, C.A., 2020. A review of cervical cancer: incidence and disparities. J. Natl Med. Assoc. 112 (2), 229–232.
- Chen, R.C., Haynes, K., Du, S., Barron, J., Katz, A.J., 2021. Association of cancer screening deficit in the United States with the COVID-19 pandemic. JAMA Oncol. 7 (6), 878–884.
- Grumbach, K., Bodenheimer, T., Cohen, D., Phillips, R.L., Stange, K.C., Westfall, J.M., 2021. Revitalizing the U.S. primary care infrastructure. N. Engl. J. Med. 385 (13), 1156–1158.
- Gunja MZ, Gumas ED, Williams RD, Doty MM, Shah A, Fields K. Stressed Out and Burned Out: The Global Primary Care Crisis. New York November 17, 2022 2022.
- Kruse, G.R., Lykken, J.M., Kim, E.J., et al., 2023. Provider beliefs in effectiveness and recommendations for primary HPV testing in 3 health-care systems. JNCI Cancer Spectr. 7 (1).

## V.M. Boratyn et al.

## Preventive Medicine Reports 43 (2024) 102783

- Lugten, E., Marcus, R., Bright, R., Maruf, F., Kureshy, N., 2022. From fragility to resilience: A systems approach to strengthen primary health care. Front. Public Health 10, 1073617.
- Puricelli Perin, D.M., Elfstrom, K.M., Bulliard, J.L., et al., 2021. Early assessment of the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer screening services: The International Cancer Screening Network COVID-19 survey. Prev. Med. 151, 106642.
- Safaeian, M., Solomon, D., Castle, P.E., 2007. Cervical cancer prevention-cervical screening: science in evolution. Obstet. Gynecol. Clin. N. Am.. 34 (4), 739–760 ix. Schapira, M.M., Sprague, B.L., Klabunde, C.N., et al., 2016. Inadequate systems to
- support breast and cervical cancer screening in primary care practice. J. Gen. Intern. Med. 31 (10), 1148–1155.
- Suk, R., Hong, Y.R., Rajan, S.S., Xie, Z., Zhu, Y., Spencer, J.C., 2022. Assessment of US preventive services task force guideline-concordant cervical cancer screening rates and reasons for underscreening by age, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, rurality, and insurance, 2005 to 2019. JAMA Netw. Open 5 (1), e2143582.
- Wang, L., 2023. Working to Close the Cancer Screening Gap Caused by COVID. NCI. Wentzensen, N., Clarke, M.A., Perkins, R.B., 2021. Impact of COVID-19 on cervical cancer screening: Challenges and opportunities to improving resilience and reduce disparities. Prev. Med. 151, 106596.