

Assessing genetic screening barriers for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer in a high-risk Minnesota population

BY JADE M. COHEN, BA; RAHEL G. GHEBRE, MD, MPH; NATHAN T. RUBIN, MS; AND ANNELISE M. WILHITE, MD

Hereditary mutations in BRCA1/2, TP53, PTEN, and other genes underlie up to 10% of all breast and ovarian cancers and significantly increase carriers' lifetime risk of cancer development by up to 5 times (breast) and 20 times (ovarian) that of the general population. Multiple organizations, including the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN), American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG), and Society of Gynecologic Oncologists (SGO), advise that people at high risk of hereditary cancers be identified via careful collection of personal and family cancer history. It is further recommended that eligible individuals be referred to genetic counseling with a qualified provider, followed by genetic testing to identify high-risk mutations if indicated.

Correct identification of pathogenic mutations is crucial for informed patient decision-making about cancer prevention steps including increased screening, preventive chemotherapy, and risk-reducing surgery such as bilateral mastectomy or salpingo-oophorectomy. Mutation identification is also important for at-risk family members to undergo genetic evaluation if desired. Our aim was to describe patient-perceived barriers to genetic counseling and testing among people at high risk for hereditary cancers as defined by nationally accepted criteria.

Methods

Following University of Minnesota Institutional Review Board approval, attendees of the 2019 Minnesota State Fair were asked to take a short web-based survey at the University of Minnesota's Driven to Discover (D2D) Research Building. Questions included participant demographics, experience with healthcare providers, and personal and family history of cancer. Individuals meeting criteria for cancer genetic counseling (GC) referral were identified by

branching logic and prompted to answer additional questions about their history of GC referral and uptake. Demographic and clinical measures were summarized using mean (SD), range, frequencies, and percentages, and compared between relevant groups using t- and Chi-square tests. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

Results

Some 1,594 fairgoers participated, and 673 (42%) met GC referral criteria. Of this group, 184 (27%) knew their high-risk (HR) status. Participants were more likely to know their status if they identified a provider as "their doctor" (83.6% vs 75.4%, $p = .023$) or had discussed family history with their provider (94.5% vs 82.4%, $p < .001$). All 91 HR participants (13.6%) referred to GC underwent genetic testing, but only 49 (52%) completed the GC referral. The most common reasons HR participants cited for not receiving GC referral were a doctor not telling them they were at high risk (294 HR participants, 43.7%) or a doctor not taking a family history (56 HR participants, 8.3%).

Conclusions

In this large survey study, most participants at high risk for hereditary cancers were unaware of their status and eligibility for cancer genetic screening. Contrary to published evidence that physicians and genetic counselors consider patients generally uninterested in genetic screening, our findings highlight the key role physicians play in ensuring high-risk patients have appropriate access to genetic services including counseling, testing, and treatment. Improved family history collection and patient awareness of hereditary cancers, in addition to accessible physician education on genetic referral guidelines in locations where genetic counselors are available, are all viable strategies to aid in the identification and referral of high-risk individuals. **MM**

Jade M. Cohen is a fourth-year student at the University of Minnesota Medical School. Rahel G. Ghebre, MD, MPH, is a professor in the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Division of Gynecologic Oncology, University of Minnesota Medical School. Nathan T. Rubin, MS, is a biostatistics researcher, Biostatistics Core, Masonic Cancer Center, University of Minnesota. Annelise M. Wilhite, MD, is a graduate of the Obstetrics and Gynecology resident program, University of Minnesota.

REFERENCES

- American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Hereditary Cancer Syndromes and Risk Assessment: ACOG COMMITTEE OPINION, Number 793. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2019;134(6):e143-e149. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000003562
- Brandt R, Ali Z, Sabel A, McHugh T, Gilman P. Cancer Genetics Evaluation: Barriers to and Improvements for Referral. *Genet Test.* 2008;12(1):9-12. doi:10.1089/gte.2007.0036
- Daly MB, Pilarski R, Yurgelun MB, et al. NCCN Guidelines Insights: Genetic/Familial High-Risk Assessment: Breast, Ovarian, and Pancreatic, Version 1.2020. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw.* 2020;18(4):380-391. doi:10.6004/jnccn.2020.0017
- Kuchenbaecker KB, Hopper JL, Barnes DR, et al. Risks of Breast, Ovarian, and Contralateral Breast Cancer for BRCA1 and BRCA2 Mutation Carriers. *JAMA.* 2017;317(23):2402. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.7112
- Lancaster JM, Powell CB, Chen L, Richardson DL. Society of Gynecologic Oncology statement on risk assessment for inherited gynecologic cancer predispositions. *Gynecol Oncol.* 2015;136(1):3-7. doi:10.1016/j.ygyo.2014.09.009
- Nelson H, Pappas M, Cantor N. Chapter 1, Introduction and Background. In: Risk Assessment, Genetic Counseling, and Genetic Testing for BRCA1/2-Related Cancer in Women: A Systematic Review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force [Internet]. Evidence Synthesis. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2019.
- Petrucelli N, Daly MB, Pal T. BRCA1- and BRCA2-Associated Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer. In: Adam MP, Ardinger HH, Pagon RA, et al., eds. *GeneReviews*®. University of Washington, Seattle; 1993. Accessed April 8, 2021. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK1247/>
- Rolnick SJ, Rahm AK, Jackson JM, et al. Barriers in Identification and Referral to Genetic Counseling for Familial Cancer Risk: The Perspective of Genetic Service Providers. *J Genet Couns.* 2011;20(3):314-322. doi:10.1007/s10897-011-9351-3

Acknowledgements

The research reported here was supported by NIH Grant P30 CA77598 utilizing the Biostatistics and Bioinformatics Core shared resource of the Masonic Cancer Center, University of Minnesota, and by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of Health Award Number UL1-TR002494. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.