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Abstract:

Objective: People with pancreatic cancer have poor survival and management is challenging. Pancreatic cancer patients’ perceptions of their care coordination and its association with their outcomes have not been studied. Our objective was to determine if perception of care coordination is associated with patient-reported outcomes or survival.

Methods: People with pancreatic cancer who were 1-8 months post-diagnosis (52 with completed resection; 58 with no resection) completed a patient-reported questionnaire which assessed their perception of care coordination, quality of life, anxiety and depression using validated instruments. Mean scores for 15 care coordination items were calculated and then ranked from highest mean score (best experience) to lowest (worst experience). Associations between care coordination scores (including communication and navigation domains) and patient-reported outcomes and survival were investigated using general linear regression and Cox regression, respectively. All analyses were stratified by whether or not the tumour had been resected.

Results: In both groups the highest-ranked care coordination items were: knowing who was responsible for coordinating care; health professionals being informed about their history; and waiting times. The worst-ranked items related to: how often patients were asked about visits with other health professionals and how well they and their family were coping; knowing symptoms they should monitor; having sufficient emotional help from staff; and access to additional specialist services. For people who had a resection, better communication and navigation scores were significantly associated with higher quality of life and less anxiety and depression. However, these associations were not statistically significant for those with no resection. Perception of cancer care coordination was not associated with survival in either group.

Significance: Our results suggest that while many core clinical aspects of care are perceived to be done well for pancreatic cancer patients, improvements in emotional support, referral to specialist services and self-management education may improve patient-reported outcomes.
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**Introduction**

Pancreatic cancer is the fifth most common cause of death from cancer in the developed world ([International Agency for Research on Cancer and World Health Organization 2012](#_ENREF_15)). Surgical resection of the tumour currently offers the only curative treatment option, but it is only possible for about 15% of people with pancreatic cancer ([Burmeister E et al. 2015](#_ENREF_4)). The remainder present with metastatic, locally advanced disease or comorbidities which preclude curative resection. People with pancreatic cancer can experience a wide range of symptoms such as pain, jaundice, diabetes, malabsorption, weight loss, nausea, vomiting, anxiety and depression and require strong and efficient support.

For patients potentially eligible for surgical resection, a recent statement by the Australian Gastro-Intestinal Trials Group indicated the necessity for multidisciplinary team management ([Gandy et al. 2016](#_ENREF_12)). Arguably, people with advanced pancreatic cancer also require a multidisciplinary approach involving palliative care providers, nutritionists, psycho-oncologists, and medical and radiation oncologists to optimise symptom management and end-of-life care ([Torgerson and Wiebe 2013](#_ENREF_20)). However, compared with allied health, nursing and palliative care specialists, our earlier work showed that surgeons and gastroenterologists thought it less important that multidisciplinary team meetings include palliative care specialists or allied health professionals and also that it was less important that symptom management be discussed ([Burmeister et al. 2016c](#_ENREF_7)). Such perspectives are inconsistent with the European Partnership for Action Against Cancer guidelines which emphasize the need for a multidisciplinary team to co-ordinate cancer care at all stages and to address supportive care and psychosocial needs ([Borras et al. 2014](#_ENREF_2)). The guidelines also emphasize the need for coordination across different disciplines to achieve continuity of care.

People with pancreatic cancer are at risk of receiving poorly organised and fragmented care due to the rarity and complex nature of the disease and its management. We have shown that provision of optimal care, defined using a quality score that included 18 items, is associated with increased survival ([Burmeister et al. 2016a](#_ENREF_5)). However, given the poor prognosis of most patients, maintenance of quality of life through effective palliation of symptoms and management of distress are arguably as important as survival ([Schmier et al. 1999](#_ENREF_18)).

Coordination of care has been identified as a critical element of person‐centred care ([Institute of Medicine 2013](#_ENREF_14)), which involves organising services around the needs and preferences of the individual, emphasising the primacy of measures based on the person’s own experience ([Young et al. 2011](#_ENREF_22)). People with cancer are ideally placed to rate the adequacy of cancer care coordination as they are present at every encounter with health services. Previous studies assessing the care coordination of people with pancreatic cancer extracted data from medical records and lacked the ability to assess quality of care communication and responsiveness to the full range of supportive care needs ([Buanes 2014](#_ENREF_3); [Burmeister et al. 2016a](#_ENREF_5)). Therefore, the aim of this study was to document the perception of care coordination among patients with pancreatic cancer and to assess if better perceived care coordination was associated with patient-reported outcomes including overall quality of life, disease-specific symptoms, anxiety and depression, as well as with survival.

**Methods**

***Participants and procedures***

Adults in Queensland, Australia, with a suspected or confirmed diagnosis of pancreatic cancer between January 2007 and June 2011 were recruited into the Queensland Pancreatic Cancer Study (QPCS), a population-based case-control study which aimed to examine environmental and genetic risk factors for pancreatic cancer ([Tran et al. 2013](#_ENREF_21)). Seven hundred and four (84%) had a confirmed diagnosis of pancreatic cancer. The study used a rapid ascertainment approach, recruiting people as early as possible, often while diagnostic investigations were ongoing, through a state-wide network of clinicians in hospitals and private practices. We asked participants about socio-demographic and lifestyle factors, medical and occupational history and family history of cancer via a face-to-face or telephone interview. Trained research nurses reviewed the records of all potential cases recruited.

QPCS participants newly recruited after June 2009 with confirmed pancreatic cancer were invited to participate in a longitudinal patient-reported outcome sub-study. This involved completing a self-administered questionnaire at recruitment and follow-up questionnaires every 2 months until 8 months after diagnosis. The 8 month time-point was selected due to an expected >30% attrition rate as a consequence of progressive disease or death at that time. People were excluded if they were physically or mentally unable to complete a written questionnaire.

Of the 351 eligible QPCS participants recruited after June 2009, 97 were excluded by the research nurses because they were too sick to approach, 57 declined, 23 died shortly after receiving the questionnaire and 38 others did not return the questionnaire. The remaining 136 QPCS participants completed at least one patient-reported outcome questionnaire (54% of those approached). While the cancer co-coordination questions were included at all the study time-points, some participants did not complete all sections of the questionnaires. In total, 110 participants completed at least one questionnaire about their cancer care coordination. If more than one questionnaire was completed by a participant only the most recent data was used for this analysis to capture their perception of care coordination over as much of the disease course as possible.

Human Research Ethics Committees of the QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute and participating hospitals approved both the QPCS and patient-reported outcome sub-study.

***Measures***

*Cancer care coordination* was assessed using an early version of the cancer care coordination questionnaire developed by Young and colleagues ([Young et al. 2011](#_ENREF_22)). The tool assesses overall care coordination and two domains, communication and navigation. The version used in this study included all items available at the time; 10 out of 13 of the communication items and 5 out of 7 of the navigation items from the final version. Participants were asked about their experience of aspects of their care and given 5 response options that ranged from ‘strongly disagree’ or ‘never’ to ‘strongly agree’ or ‘always’, resulting in scores ranging from 15 to 75 for overall care coordination, 10 to 50 for communication and 5 to 25 for navigation; higher scores indicated better care coordination. The items included in this study had acceptable reliability (Cronbach alphas 0.84, 0.82 and 0.70, respectively), similar to those reported from reliability studies of the final version (Cronbach alphas 0.88, 0.87 and 0.73, respectively) ([Young et al. 2011](#_ENREF_22)).

*Quality of life and disease-specific symptoms* were measured using the 45-item Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy- Hepatobiliary (FACT-Hep) questionnaire for people with hepatobiliary cancers including liver, bile duct and pancreas ([Cella et al. 2013](#_ENREF_8)). The FACT-Hep is a multi-dimensional instrument, assessing four general sub-scales (physical, social, emotional and functional well-being), and a disease and treatment hepatobiliary cancers-specific subscale. Overall quality of life scores ranged from 0 to 180 and were derived from combining all five subscales. Higher scores indicated better quality of life. The Cronbach’s alpha in the present study for FACT-Hep was 0.93, indicating excellent internal validity.

*Anxiety and depression* were assessed using the 14-item Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) ([Zigmond and Snaith 1983](#_ENREF_23)). Two sub-scales distinguish between anxiety and depression (Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of 0.88 and 0.85, respectively in the present study indicated good internal reliability of these sub-scales). Scores on both sub-scales ranged between 0 and 21 with higher scores indicating higher levels of anxiety or depression. Within each sub-scale, scoring cut-points distinguish between “normal” (0-7), “subclinical” (8-10), and “clinical” (11-21) levels.

*Demographic variables* including age, sex, marital status and education level were self-reported at recruitment. Postcode was used to classify participants as residing in a major city, or an inner regional, outer regional, remote or very remote area using the Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia ([DHAC (Department of Health and Aged Care) & GISCA (National Key Centre for Social Applications of Geographic Information Systems) 2001](#_ENREF_10)).

*Clinical information* extracted from medical records included: date of diagnosis, initial place of treatment, whether the person had undergone a resection of the primary tumour, disease stage, chemotherapy dates, whether the person had a care coordinator or care plan, whether they received referral to a psychologist or social worker at initial treatment and date of palliative care referral, if received. Dates for chemotherapy, palliative care referral and survey completion were cross-referenced to determine if participants had received chemotherapy or palliative care referrals at the time they completed each questionnaire. We also calculated an objective quality-of-care score for each participant as described previously ([Burmeister et al. 2016a](#_ENREF_5); [Burmeister et al. 2016c](#_ENREF_7)). In short, for each participant we calculated their potential quality-of-care score by identifying which of 18 clinical items applied to their specific clinical situation and summing the mean scores of importance (range 0-10) obtained from a Delphi survey for these items. We then summed the mean score for those items where the care was delivered for each participant. The delivered care score was divided by the potential score to calculate a proportional quality-of-care score that ranged between 0 and 1 for each participant. Date and cause of death were captured from the medical record if the person died within 12 months of diagnosis. To update survival information, we reviewed death information held by the Cancer Registry in February 2014.

***Statistical methods***

All analyses were stratified by whether or not participants had undergone a resection of their primary tumour due to the significant differences in the treatment and prognosis of these two groups. To rank the 15 care-coordination items in order of how well they were rated by participants, we calculated the mean score for each item. In this sample, the overall care coordination score and communication subscale were approximately normally distributed, while the navigation subscale was not but the skewness was not sufficient to rule out linear regression analysis. We assessed associations between personal and clinical factors and the care coordination score using the two-sample t-test and analysis of variance. Small cell sizes in some categories affected statistical power, so we considered differences in mean scores between categories of 3 or more to be clinically meaningful (using the greater than one third standard deviation rule ([Sloan et al. 2005](#_ENREF_19))) and p<0.1 to be statistically significant. Associations between care coordination scores and continuous patient-reported outcomes and survival were investigated using general linear regression and Cox regression, respectively. The results from bivariable analysis and causal diagrams were used to guide the selection of covariates for the multivariable models. Potential confounders that substantially changed the estimated coefficient of interest in at least one regression model were included in the final regression models for all outcomes of interest.

**Results**

***Participants***

On average, participants were 66 years old at diagnosis (range 29-89). More than half (59%) were men, most (81%) were married or had a partner, 60% had a technical college or university education and half (49%) lived in a major city (Table 1). These characteristics were proportionally similar to the cases enrolled in the QPCS ([Tran et al. 2013](#_ENREF_21)). The median time after diagnosis at the time of completing the final questionnaire was 7 months (range 1-8); 70% were at least 6 months after diagnosis. Many participants (65%) were initially treated in the private setting, 47% had a tumour resection, 27% had metastatic disease and most (78%) had received chemotherapy (Table 1).

***Best- and worst-ranked care coordination items***

Overall the mean total cancer care coordination score was 56.8 (7.9 SD), and mean scores for the communication and navigation domains were 35.4 (5.9 SD) and 21.4 (3.3 SD) respectively. In general, items from the navigation domain ranked higher than items from the communication domain (Table 2). There were no significant differences between those who had a resection and those who did not for any of the 15 care coordination items. In both participant groups, the highest-ranked care items related to knowing who was responsible for coordinating assessments and treatment, feeling that health professionals were fully informed about their history, and waiting times for appointments or treatment. The lowest-ranked care items related to how often people were asked about how visits with other health professionals were going and how well they and their family were coping, knowing warning signs and symptoms they should monitor, having sufficient help from staff with the emotional impact of their disease, and having access to additional services needed (eg counselling, cancer support groups, nutritional advice).

***Factors associated with care coordination scores***

Among participants who had a resection, those who had not received chemotherapy reported poorer care coordination (Table 3). Among participants who had not undergone resection, clinically significant factors associated with a poorer care coordination score included being younger than 70 years of age, having a partner and a shorter time since diagnosis. Sex, education, place of residence, initial place of treatment, having a care plan, referral to a mental health professional, referral to palliative care and the quality-of-care score derived from medical records were not associated with the care coordination scores in either group.

***Associations between care coordination scores and health outcomes***

Among participants who had undergone resection of their primary tumour, better communication and navigation care coordination scores were significantly associated with better quality of life, lower anxiety and depression scores and fewer disease-specific symptoms (Table 4). Significant associations also occurred for all the wellbeing subscales, except social wellbeing. For those with no tumour resection, no significant associations with patient-reported outcomes were found.

Perceptions of overall cancer care coordination was not associated with survival in participants who had a resection (HR: 1.00; 95% CI 0.95-1.05; p=0.981) or who did not have a resection (HR: 0.98; 95% CI 0.93-1.02; p=0.262). Similarly there was no association between the communication or navigation care coordination domain scores and survival in either group (data not shown).

**Discussion**

The care of patients with pancreatic cancer can be complex. Prognosis is guarded for most operable cases, and in Australia people with locally advanced disease have a median survival of 8.7 months and people with metastatic disease have a median survival of 2.5 months ([Burmeister E et al. 2015](#_ENREF_4)). Pain and other disease-related symptoms are common and debilitating features of this cancer. This study indicates that people with pancreatic cancer were satisfied with their clinicians’ knowledge of their case, communication about treatments, waiting times and their understanding of their clinicians’ roles and who to contact. In contrast, people were less satisfied with other aspects of their care such as support with managing the emotional impact of their disease on them and their family, having access to additional services that they felt they needed (eg counselling, cancer support groups, nutritional advice), and being taught how to monitor their symptoms. Furthermore, we found that for participants who had undergone resection of their tumour, a perception that their care was poorly coordinated was significantly associated with worse quality of life, disease-related symptoms, and anxiety and depression. Although not statistically significant, we also saw a similar trend for the group who did not undergo resection. This suggests that improving peoples’ perceptions of care coordination may lead to improvements in patient-reported outcomes or that poorer quality of life influences perceptions of how well care works.

Internationally there has been a move toward development of better models of cancer care to optimise survival times and quality of life ([Clinical Oncology Society of Australia Model of Survivorship Care Working Group 2016](#_ENREF_9)). There is consensus that people with pancreatic cancer should be fully aware of the risks and benefits of treatments, should be advised of the limitations of chemotherapy and that there should be careful attention paid to pain control ([Burmeister et al. 2016c](#_ENREF_7)). Our previous work identified 18 medical record items that can be indexed to establish a quality-of-care score that is associated with better survival in people with pancreatic cancer ([Burmeister et al. 2016a](#_ENREF_5)). Somewhat surprisingly, the self-perceived care coordination score was not associated with the objective quality-of-care score or with survival for participants who did and did not undergo resection. This is most likely because these two scores measure different aspects of care, with one measuring objective criteria such as the hospital volume in which surgery occurred, and the other including more subjective items such as communication. Arguably both measures are important to consider if we are to deliver best practice person-centred healthcare that addresses the needs of the person with cancer and maximises survival.

There are few population-based studies of peoples’ cancer care coordination experiences with which to compare our results ([Ayanian et al. 2005](#_ENREF_1); [Hawley et al. 2010](#_ENREF_13); [Jackson et al. 2015](#_ENREF_16); [Durcinoska I et al. 2016 [Epub ahead of print]](#_ENREF_11)). It is likely that factors at the person level (eg, referral pathways, patient empowerment strategies), health professional level (eg, patient navigators, care coordinators), health service level (eg, documented care pathways, multidisciplinary team meetings), and funder/system level (eg, policy and funding mechanisms) are important for effective care coordination ([Clinical Oncology Society of Australia Model of Survivorship Care Working Group 2016](#_ENREF_9)). Studies of patients with colorectal and breast cancer have found that those who saw a higher number of health providers or who had more comorbid conditions, little or no understanding of the health system, poorer language, ethnic background, early stage disease, high symptom burden, no written pre-treatment plan, no care coordinator or no regular general practitioner experienced poorer care coordination ([Ayanian et al. 2005](#_ENREF_1); [Hawley et al. 2010](#_ENREF_13); [Jackson et al. 2015](#_ENREF_16); [Durcinoska I et al. 2016 [Epub ahead of print]](#_ENREF_11)). While we found few factors that were associated with care coordination, the statistical power of our study was limited due to small sample size and the necessity to stratify analyses by whether or not participants had undergone tumour resection. However, we found that being younger than 70 years, having a partner and being closer to the time of diagnosis were associated with poorer perceptions of care coordination among people with no resection of their tumour. Possible explanations for these associations are that older people may have more experience with navigating the health care system and that those without partners are not concerned with dual coordination of care for them and their caregivers who, in the pancreatic cancer setting, have been shown to have more psychosocial symptoms than the person with cancer.([Janda M Under review](#_ENREF_17)) Additionally, the first months after diagnosis is the time when many people with pancreatic cancer are still coming to terms with their impending mortality, and they may have heightened anxiety associated with decisions about the primary treatment and symptom management. Thus improvements could potentially be achieved by providing emotional care, symptom education and timely referral pathways to specialists. Moreover, support of both the person with cancer and their caregiver could be beneficial.

This study adds important information to our understanding of how patients with pancreatic cancer perceive their healthcare. It does, however, have several limitations. The small sample size resulted in limited statistical power. The proportion of participants with tumours able to be resected was higher than in the broader patient population. We overcame this issue by stratifying all analyses by whether or not resection had occurred. Participants with low quality of life or shorter survival times, as well as those with a poorer perception of their care coordination, may have been less likely to participate. There may be some reverse causality in the associations between the care coordination score and patient-reported outcomes, whereby those people with a higher symptom burden, higher distress and poorer quality of life have a more negative outlook and therefore perceive their care coordination to be worse. Furthermore, it would have been interesting to examine the association between management by a multidisciplinary team or the level of involvement of a primary health care provider and perception of care coordination. However, in practice multidisciplinary team management varies significantly by hospital and was too difficult to classify from our data and we did not have information about primary health care involvement in patient care.

In summary, to our knowledge this is the first study to focus on perceptions of care coordination in people with pancreatic cancer. Our research suggests that while many core clinical aspects of care are perceived to be done well for this group of people, improvement should be made to referral pathways to enable timely access to additional specialist services for psychosocial needs and symptom-based care as well as better education about monitoring symptoms. These findings inform the priority setting of care coordinators, nurse navigators and other health professionals who assume the responsibility of care coordination. As many patients do not receive their primary care in a cancer centre or are not managed by a multidisciplinary team ([Burmeister et al. 2016b](#_ENREF_6)) and because needs can arise during and after hospital admissions, it is important that this type of supportive care be coordinated in the community setting, accommodating geographical distances. Moreover, our research suggests that improvements to models of care may have the potential to improve quality of life and reduce symptoms, anxiety and depression among people with pancreatic cancer.
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**Table 1: Participant characteristics (n=110)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | % |
| **Age (years)** |  |  |
| <60 | 33 | 30 |
| 60-69 | 36 | 33 |
| 70+ | 41 | 37 |
| **Sex** |  |  |
| Male | 65 | 59 |
| Female | 45 | 41 |
| **Marital Status** |  |  |
| Married/partner | 89 | 81 |
| Divorce/separated/widowed/never married | 21 | 19 |
| **Education** |  |  |
| High school or lower | 44 | 40 |
| Diploma/trade/university | 65 | 60 |
| **Place of residence** |  |  |
| Major city | 54 | 49 |
| Inner regional | 46 | 42 |
| Outer regional | 10 | 9 |
| **Months post-diagnosisa**  |  |  |
| 1-2 | 12 | 11 |
| 3-5 | 21 | 19 |
| 6-8 | 77 | 70 |
| **Initial place of treatmenta** |  |  |
| Public hospital | 38 | 35 |
| Private hospital/specialist rooms | 70 | 65 |
| **Disease statusa**  |  |  |
| Resection completed - curative disease | 54 | 47 |
| No resection - locally advanced disease | 21 | 19 |
| No resection - metastatic disease | 30 | 27 |
| No resection - because of age/comorbidities | 7 | 6 |
| **Had chemotherapya** |  |  |
| No | 24 | 22 |
| Yes | 86 | 78 |

a Data from medical record

Note: not all frequencies sum to 110 due to some missing data.

**Table 2: Care coordination items – ranked from best (1) to worst (15) based on mean score**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ranka** | **Items** | **Overall (n=110)****Mean (SD)** | **Resection completed (n=52)****Mean (SD)** | **No resection (n=58)****Mean (SD)** | **Domain**  |
| 1 | How often did you have to wait too long to get the first available appointment for a test or treatment? | 4.5 (0.8) | 4.5 (0.8) | 4.6 (0.7) | Navigation |
| 2 | How often were you confused about the roles of the different health professionals involved in your care? | 4.4 (0.9) | 4.4 (0.9) | 4.4 (0.9) | Navigation |
| 3  | How often did you feel that health professionals looking after you were not fully informed about your history and progress? | 4.4 (0.9) | 4.4 (0.9) | 4.4 (0.9) | Navigation |
| 4 | I always knew the reason why I was having a test or treatment | 4.1 (0.8) | 4.2 (0.8) | 4.0 (0.8) | Communication |
| 5 | How often were you unsure who to call out of business hours if you had a problem? | 4.1 (1.2) | 4.1 (1.2) | 4.0 (1.1) | Navigation |
| 6 | How often was it difficult to meet the costs associated with your healthcare? | 4.0 (1.2) | 3.9 (1.3) | 4.1 (1.2) | Navigation |
| 7 | I had a good understanding of the things I was responsible for to help my treatment plan run smoothly | 3.9 (0.7) | 4.0 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.8) | Communication |
| 8 | I had sufficient help from staff with practical arrangements | 3.9 (0.7) | 4.0 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.8) | Communication |
| 9 | I knew whether chemotherapy or radiotherapy were suitable for me | 3.9 (1.0) | 4.0 (1.0) | 3.8 (1.0) | Communication |
| 10 | I always knew what tests, treatments and follow up were planned for me | 3.8 (1.0) | 4.0 (0.9) | 3.7 (1.0) | Communication |
| 11 | I had access to all the additional services (eg counselling, cancer support groups, nutritional advice) that I needed | 3.6 (1.0) | 3.7 (1.0) | 3.6 (1.0) | Communication |
| 12 | I had sufficient help from staff with dealing with the emotional impact of my cancer | 3.5 (1.1) | 3.5 (1.1) | 3.5 (1.1) | Communication |
| 13 | I knew the warning signs and symptoms I should watch for to monitor my health | 3.4 (1.1) | 3.5 (1.2) | 3.3 (1.0) | Communication |
| 14 | How often were you asked how well you and your family were coping? | 3.1 (1.2) | 3.1 (1.2) | 3.2 (1.2) | Communication |
| 15 | How often were you asked how your visits with other health professionals were going? | 2.1 (1.2) | 2.3 (1.3) | 2.0 (1.1) | Communication |

aRanking based on overall position

**Table 3: Factors associated with care coordination scores, stratified by whether or not the participants had undergone resection of their tumour**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Resection completed (n=52) | No resection (n=58) |
|  |  | Overall cancer care coordination(15 worst to 75 best) |  | Overall cancer care coordination(15 worst to 75 best) |
|  | N | Mean (SD) | p-valueb | N | Mean (SD) | p-valueb |
| **Age (years)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <60 | 19 | 56.1 (9.0) | 0.482 | 14 | 55.0 (8.1) | 0.090\* |
| 60-69 | 21 | 59.2 (7.7) |  | 15 | 53.0 (8.0) |  |
| 70+ | 12 | 57.5 (8.0) |  | 29 | 58.1 (6.9) |  |
| **Sex** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 32 | 57.3 (9.2) | 0.660 | 33 | 56.1 (8.5) | 0.948 |
| Female | 20 | 58.3 (6.5) |  | 25 | 56.0 (6.5) |  |
| **Marital Status** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married/partner | 43 | 57.8 (8.4) | 0.760 | 46 | 55.1 (8.0) | 0.066\* |
| Divorce/separated/widowed/never married | 9 | 56.9 (8.0) |  | 12 | 60.0 (5.1) |  |
| **Education** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High school or lower | 18 | 57.0 (9.3) | 0.654 | 26 | 55.0 (9.1) | 0.383 |
| Diploma/trade/university | 34 | 58.0 (7.7) |  | 31 | 56.8 (6.5) |  |
| **Place of residence** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major city | 28 | 56.4 (8.0) | 0.246 | 26 | 57.0 (6.6) | 0.417 |
| Regional | 24 | 59.1 (8.5) |  | 32 | 55.3 (8.4) |  |
| **Months post-diagnosisa**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-5 | 12 | 58.8 (7.6) | 0.592 | 21 | 53.6 (7.3) | 0.073\* |
| 6-8 | 40 | 57.3 (8.5) |  | 37 | 57.4 (7.6) |  |
| **Initial place of treatmenta** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public hospital | 14 | 56.3 (10.1) | 0.515 | 24 | 55.3 (8.0) | 0.600 |
| Private hospital/specialist rooms | 37 | 58.1 (7.6) |  | 33 | 56.4 (7.6) |  |
| **Had chemotherapya** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | 8 | 53.2 (10.2) | 0.096\* | 16 | 57.0 (7.1) | 0.567 |
| Yes | 44 | 58.5 (7.7) |  | 42 | 55.7 (7.9) |  |
| **Had a care coordinator/care plana** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 10 | 57.7 (8.8) | 0.883 | 18 | 56.2 (6.8) | 0.821 |
| No | 34 | 58.1 (8.3) |  | 32 | 55.6 (8.6) |  |
| **Referred to a mental health professional (psychologist or social worker) at initial treatmenta** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 21 | 56.6 (8.0) | 0.172 | 29 | 55.6 (8.3) | 0.999 |
| No | 20 | 60.0 (7.6) |  | 19 | 55.6 (7.5) |  |
| **Referred to palliative carea**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 11 | 60.2 (7.0) | 0.251 | 40 | 55.3 (8.4) | 0.313 |
| No | 41 | 57.0 (8.5) |  | 18 | 57.6 (5.8) |  |
| **Quality-of-care scorea** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worst tertile | 14 | 59.4 (10.1) | 0.318 | 23 | 56.9 (7.1) | 0.140 |
| Middle tertile | 18 | 55.3 (7.8) |  | 19 | 57.7 (5.6) |  |
| Best tertile | 20 | 58.5 (7.0) |  | 16 | 52.9 (9.8) |  |

a Data from medical record

b Two-sample t-test for dichotomous factors and analysis of variance (ANOVA) for factors with 3 or more categories.

\* Clinically significant

**Table 4: Association between care coordination scores (including communication and navigation domains) and patient-reported outcomes, stratified by whether or not the participant had undergone resection of their tumour**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Quality of life(0 worst to 180 best) | Physical wellbeing(0 worst to 28 best) | Social wellbeing(0 worst to 28 best) | Emotional wellbeing(0 worst to 24 best) | Functional wellbeing(0 worst to 28 best) | Disease-specific symptoms(0 worst to 72 best) | Anxiety(0 best to 21 worst) | Depression(0 best to 21 worst) |
|  | LS mean(95% CI) | LS mean(95% CI) | LS mean(95% CI) | LS mean(95% CI) | LS mean(95% CI) | LS mean(95% CI) | LS mean(95% CI) | LS mean(95% CI) |
| Resection completed (n=52) |
| Communication |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest tertile | 143.2 (132.6-153.7) | 21.3 (18.5-24.1) | 24.4 (22.6-26.2) | 19.4 (17.5-21.3) | 20.2 (17.2-23.2) | 57.9 (53.5-62.2) | 4.5 (2.9-6.1) | 3.9 (2.0-5.8) |
| Middle tertile | 125.1 (113.2-137.0) | 16.8 (13.6-20.0) | 22.4 (20.4-24.4) | 18.1 (15.89-20.2) | 16.8 (13.4-20.2) | 51.1 (46.2-56.0) | 5.6 (3.8-7.4) | 6.0 (3.8-8.1) |
| Lowest tertile | 114.5 (103.1-125.9) | 15.4 (12.3-18.4) | 22.0 (20.1-24.0) | 14.9 (12.8-17.0) | 14.0 (10.8-17.3) | 48.1 (43.4-52.9) | 8.3 (6.6-10.1) | 8.0 (5.9-10.0) |
| *p-value* | <0.001 | 0.009 | 0.119 | 0.005 | 0.016 | 0.006 | 0.004 | 0.011 |
| Navigation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Good (> median) | 140.5 (132.3-148.7) | 20.8 (18.6-23.0) | 23.5 (21.9-25.0) | 19.0 (17.5-20.6) | 19.6 (17.2-22.0) | 57.6 (54.4-60.8) | 4.7 (3.4-6.0) | 4.1 (2.6-5.6) |
| Poorer (≤ median) | 112.7 (103.6-121.8) | 14.4 (12.0-16.8) | 22.4 (20.7-24.1) | 15.6 (13.8-17.4) | 14.0 (11.3-16.7) | 46.3 (42.7-49.9) | 7.8 (6.3-9.3) | 8.1 (6.5-9.8) |
| *p-value* | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.351 | 0.004 | 0.002 | <0.001 | 0.002 | <0.001 |
| No resection (n=58) |
| Communication |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest tertile | 123.5 (106.9-140.1) | 16.2 (12.0-20.5) | 24.7 (21.4-28.0) | 17.3 (14.1-20.6) | 16.5 (12.7-20.3) | 47.5 (40.8-54.1) | 6.1 (3.8-8.3) | 5.1 (2.9-7.4) |
| Middle tertile | 119.1 (105.2-133.0) | 17.8 (14.3-21.4) | 20.3 (17.5-23.0) | 17.9 (15.2-20.6) | 15.8 (12.6-19.0) | 48.3 (42.7-53.9) | 5.3 (3.4-7.2) | 5.2 (3.3-7.1) |
| Lowest tertile | 109.1 (96.0-122.2) | 14.5 (11.1-17.9) | 21.3 (18.6-23.9) | 14.6 (12.0-17.1) | 13.4 (10.3-16.4) | 45.1 (39.8-50.5) | 6.4 (4.6-8.2) | 7.1 (5.3-8.9) |
| *p-value* | 0.370 | 0.423 | 0.097 | 0.203 | 0.400 | 0.724 | 0.702 | 0.272 |
| Navigation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Good (> median) | 119.7 (107.3-132.1) | 17.4 (14.2-20.6) | 22.1 (19.5-24.6) |  17.2 (14.7-19.6) | 14.8 (11.9-17.7) | 48.9 (44.0-53.9) | 5.5 (3.8-7.2) | 5.8 (4.0-7.5) |
| Poorer (≤ median) | 113.0 (102.0-123.9) | 15.1 (12.3-17.8) | 21.4 (19.2-23.6) | 15.8 (13.6-17.9) | 15.1 (12.6-17.6) | 45.2 (40.9-49.5) | 6.3 (4.8-7.7) | 6.2 (4.7-7.7) |
| *p-value* | 0.427 | 0.272 | 0.695 | 0.411 | 0.890 | 0.256 | 0.488 | 0.729 |

Note: LS means from general linear regression adjusted for age, sex, education, months post-diagnosis. Other factors associated with care coordination including marital status and place of residence were not significant confounders in any of the regression analyses.
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