



December 17, 2021

SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY:

Tamara Syrek Jensen, JD
Director, Coverage & Analysis Group
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
7500 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21244

Medicare Proposed National Coverage Decision (CAG-00439R): Screening for Lung Cancer with Low Dose Computed Tomography (LDCT)

Dear Ms. Jensen:

On behalf of LUNGevity Foundation, the nation's preeminent lung cancer nonprofit that funds research, **provides education and support, and builds communities for the approximately** 230,000 Americans diagnosed with lung cancer each year and the estimated 582,631 Americans currently living with the disease,¹ we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments in response to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' (CMS) Proposed Decision Memo for Screening for Lung Cancer with Low Dose Computed Tomography (LDCT) (CAG-00439R) posted November 17, 2021. LUNGevity Foundation has had a long-standing focus on the early detection of lung cancer, and we have strategically invested in both translational and implementation sciences research to increase lung cancer screening and early detection.

Lung cancer continues to be the largest cause of cancer-related mortality in the United States.¹ When detected at an early stage, when the cancer is localized, the 5-year relative survival rate is 59.8%. However, only 18% of lung cancer cases will be diagnosed at this stage, when potentially curative surgery is a treatment option.¹ In contrast, 56% of lung cancer cases are diagnosed after the cancer has metastasized, when the 5-year relative survival rate is only 6.3%.

LDCT screening for the early detection of lung cancer is a promising technology for the early detection of lung cancer. The National Lung Screening Trial clearly demonstrated that use of LDCT led to a 20% decrease in mortality from lung cancer in the LDCT group, compared with the radiography group.² Based on the NLST results, the US Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) recommends lung cancer screening.

Despite CMS' decision in 2015 to cover lung cancer screening, a 2019 study showed that only a small proportion (approximately 2%-16%) of eligible patients were being screened.³ In light of new evidence, the USPSTF Recommendation Statement on screening for lung cancer updated their 2015 recommendations and now recommend *“annual screening for lung cancer with low-dose computed tomography (LDCT) in adults aged 50 to 80 years who have a 20 pack-year smoking history and currently smoke or have quit within the past 15 years. Screening should be discontinued once a person has not smoked for 15 years or develops a health problem that substantially limits life expectancy or the ability or willingness to have curative lung surgery.”*⁴

We support the updated proposed decision memo for CMS to reconsider the existing February 2015 NCD on Screening for Lung Cancer with LDCT (CAG-00439N) in light of the updated USPSTF grade B recommendation. Specifically, we favor CMS' proposal to **lower the minimum age for LCS eligibility to age 50 from the current 55, and the required smoking history to 20 pack-years from the current 30 pack-years to match new USPSTF criteria**

Implementation of the 2021 USPSTF guidelines will strategically expand screening access for at-risk populations who are ineligible by age and smoking habits by the 2013 guidelines. In particular, access would be expanded among African Americans and women.

- In a recent cohort study looking at of 48,364 adult smokers in the United States, it was found that a larger percentage of African Americans were diagnosed with lung cancer, compared to Whites. When the 2013 USPSTF criteria were applied, a majority of African American patients did not qualify for lung cancer screening because they had a lower pack-year history, compared to Whites (17% vs. 31%, respectively). The same study found that African American smokers diagnosed with lung cancer had significantly lower median smoking pack-years compared with White smokers, and were also diagnosed with lung cancer at an earlier age. The authors reported that *“modifying the minimum age to 50 years for African American smokers would increase the percentage eligible for screening and also allow detection of earlier-stage disease that would otherwise be missed with the present age minimum of 55 years.”*⁵ Furthermore, decreasing the pack-year requirement from 30 pack-years to 20 pack-years would correct for the lower pack-year history seen in African Americans, making screening more accessible and decreasing screening disparities between Whites and African Americans by expanding eligibility by 107% for African Americans.⁶
- It is well known that women start smoking at an older age compared to men and smoke fewer cigarettes per day, leading to cumulative fewer pack-years compared



to men.⁷ A recent study in the *New England Journal of Medicine* demonstrated that despite a decline in smoking prevalence in women since 1965, there has been an increase in the incidence of lung cancer in women (specifically in White and Hispanic women), compared to men. Application of the 2021 USPSTF guidelines would expand eligibility by 96% for women, thereby increasing the potential of early detection of lung cancer in women.⁶

As described above, the 2021 USPSTF guidelines have the potential to bridge existing health disparities and also allow a slightly younger population with a lower pack-year history to derive benefits of lung cancer screening. For LDCT to become a public health good, we applaud CMS for the proposed criteria to align reimbursement criteria with the 2021 USPSTF guidelines.

However, other criteria proposed by CMS will continue to impede the uptake of lung cancer screening. We therefore urge CMS to re-consider their position regarding the upper age limit, maximum years since quitting limit, and shared decision-making for the following reasons.

Raising the upper age threshold for coverage from 77 to 80 to reflect current USPSTF guidelines

We strongly believe that the ultimate decision to get screen should be jointly made by the patient and their doctor, and should take into account the patient's comorbidities and clinical history. Stipulations in the current NCD propose that a CMS beneficiary will no longer qualify for lung cancer screening after the age of 77. This is because major lung cancer clinical trials were restricted to this upper age limit.⁸ While clinical trials are useful in developing levels of evidence, they do not reflect the real-world circumstances of the community. It is now well-established that thoracic oncology care for the elderly has significantly improved over the past decade. Treatment modalities commonly used to treat early-stage lung cancer, such as surgery and stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT), have been shown to have superior outcomes in patients who are 80 years old or above.⁹⁻¹¹ These advancements suggest that patients above the age of 77 can clearly benefit from lung cancer screening followed by treatment with curative intent. We therefore urge CMS to reconsider the age restrictions

Eliminating the maximum 15 years since quitting (YSQ) limitation for screening eligibility among those who formerly smoked will expand the benefit of lung cancer screening



Currently, individuals who have had 15 or more YSQ (currently **ineligible** for screening) but averaged 45 pack-years of smoking have risk similar to that of individuals who used to smoke who have a history of >30 pack-years and have had <15 YSQ (currently **eligible** for screening), after adjusting for other risk factors.¹² The Framingham Heart study showed that 40.8% of all lung cancers seen in the study had occurred in those who had ever smoked and had quit smoking for more than 15 years.¹³ A retrospective study looking at the implications of the 2013 USPSTF screening criteria in a well-defined cohort (1984 through 2011) of individuals found that the proportion of lung cancer patients who smoked more than 30 pack-years declined, while the proportion of former smokers, especially those who quit smoking more than 15 years ago, increased, especially the number of women.¹⁴ Together, these findings suggest that eliminating the maximum YSQ limitation will expand the benefits of screening to those who are still at risk of developing lung cancer but remain currently ineligible.

Removing Counseling and Shared Decision Making (SDM) as a condition for LCS coverage and reimbursement will make SDM more patient-centric and less burdensome. SDM should be integrated into discussion of screening with patients, but not be a rigid reimbursement requirement, which creates a referral barrier and is not required with other recommended cancer screenings.

SDM is an excellent opportunity for patient-centered care.¹⁵ LUNGEvity Foundation firmly believes that all patients should be empowered with knowledge on the risks and benefits of lung cancer screening. Currently, CMS mandates a shared decision-making engagement with all lung cancer screening-eligible beneficiaries.

However, there are several barriers to conducting SDM in a patient-centric manner. Several studies have noted that primary-care providers feel ill-equipped to conduct SDM.^{16,17} Physicians also noted other barriers such as insufficient time, competing clinical priorities, difficulty accessing SDM aids, limited patient comprehension, and anticipated patient emotions.^{16,18} Furthermore, current SDM aids are written above the recommended sixth-grade reading level advised by the American Medical Association and are largely written for English speakers. There is a paucity of SDM aids that are culturally appropriate for diverse populations. In addition, current decision aids do not take into account a patient's numeracy skills, which impact how a patient will make an informed decision based on the SDM visit.¹⁹⁻²¹

Given the complexity of SDM, we agree with the requesters' suggestion on bundling the SDM with the actual LDCT event. This bundling would ensure that the SDM occurs in a dedicated radiology clinic with staff who are well-versed in SDM and have access to standardized information to conduct SDM in a patient-centric fashion.



Recent state-level analysis of screening rates proves without doubt that insurance status is a major predictor of lung cancer screening and is the biggest barrier to access.²² In summary, LUNGevity is supportive of some of the updates made in the proposed decision memo and we urge CMS to reconsider the above comments before finalizing the National Coverage Decision on Screening for Lung Cancer with LDCT (CAG-00439R) in light of the updated USPSTF grade B recommendation and increase coverage to CMS beneficiaries, as per the requesters' suggestions.

The comments outlined above can be discussed with me, my staff, and LUNGevity's Scientific Advisory Board, which is made up of some of the world's leading experts in lung cancer biology, practice management, access to innovative medicines, and overall patient care. I can be reached at 240-454-3100 or aefferris@LUNGevity.org if you have any questions or would like to engage in further dialogue.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrea Stern Ferris".

Andrea Stern Ferris
President and Chief Executive Officer
LUNGevity Foundation

ABOUT LUNGevity:

LUNGevity's mission is to improve outcomes for people diagnosed with lung cancer. Our goals are three-fold: (1) to accelerate research to patients that is meaningful to them; (2) to empower patients to be active participants in their care and care decisions; and (3) to help remove barriers to access to high quality care. We have the largest lung cancer survivor network in the country and actively engage with them to identify, understand, and address unmet patient needs. We also have a world class Scientific Advisory Board that guides the programs and initiatives of the organization. Additionally, we collaborate with other lung cancer patient advocacy groups and organizations, such as the American Lung Association and CHEST, who serve the lung cancer community.

REFERENCES:

1. SEER. Cancer Stat Facts: Lung and Bronchus Cancer. <https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/lungb.html>. Published 2021. Accessed November 30, 2021.
2. National Lung Screening Trial Research T, Aberle DR, Adams AM, et al. Reduced lung-cancer mortality with low-dose computed tomographic screening. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2011;365(5):395-409.
3. Triplette M, Thayer JH, Pipavath SN, Crothers K. Poor Uptake of Lung Cancer Screening: Opportunities for Improvement. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2019;16(4 Pt A):446-450.
4. USPSTF. Final Recommendation Statement - Lung Cancer: Screening. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Web site. <https://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/uspstf/recommendation/lung-cancer-screening>. Published 2021. Accessed June 13, 2021.
5. Aldrich MC, Mercaldo SF, Sandler KL, Blot WJ, Grogan EL, Blume JD. Evaluation of USPSTF Lung Cancer Screening Guidelines Among African American Adult Smokers. *JAMA oncology*. 2019;5(9):1318-1324.
6. Reese TJ, Schlechter CR, Potter LN, et al. Evaluation of Revised US Preventive Services Task Force Lung Cancer Screening Guideline Among Women and Racial/Ethnic Minority Populations. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(1):e2033769.
7. McDuffie HH, Klaassen DJ, Dosman JA. Female-male differences in patients with primary lung cancer. *Cancer*. 1987;59(10):1825-1830.
8. Jonas DE, Reuland DS, Reddy SM, et al. Screening for Lung Cancer With Low-Dose Computed Tomography: Updated Evidence Report and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*. 2021;325(10):971-987.
9. Kreinbrink P, Blumenfeld P, Tolekidis G, Sen N, Sher D, Marwaha G. Lung stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT) for early-stage non-small cell lung cancer in the very elderly (>=80years old): Extremely safe and effective. *J Geriatr Oncol*. 2017;8(5):351-355.
10. Miura N, Kohno M, Ito K, et al. Lung cancer surgery in patients aged 80 years or older: an analysis of risk factors, morbidity, and mortality. *Gen Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2015;63(7):401-405.
11. Ganti AK, deShazo M, Weir AB, 3rd, Hurria A. Treatment of non-small cell lung cancer in the older patient. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw*. 2012;10(2):230-239.
12. Rivera MP, Katki HA, Tanner NT, et al. Addressing Disparities in Lung Cancer Screening Eligibility and Healthcare Access. An Official American Thoracic Society Statement. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2020;202(7):e95-e112.
13. Tindle HA, Stevenson Duncan M, Greevy RA, et al. Lifetime Smoking History and Risk of Lung Cancer: Results From the Framingham Heart Study. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2018;110(11):1201-1207.
14. Wang Y, Midthun DE, Wampfler JA, et al. Trends in the proportion of patients with lung cancer meeting screening criteria. *JAMA*. 2015;313(8):853-855.
15. Tanner NT, Silvestri GA. Shared Decision-making and Lung Cancer Screening: Let's Get the Conversation Started. *Chest*. 2019;155(1):21-24.

16. Kanodra NM, Pope C, Halbert CH, Silvestri GA, Rice LJ, Tanner NT. Primary Care Provider and Patient Perspectives on Lung Cancer Screening. A Qualitative Study. *Ann Am Thorac Soc*. 2016;13(11):1977-1982.
17. Wiener RS, Koppelman E, Bolton R, et al. Patient and Clinician Perspectives on Shared Decision-making in Early Adopting Lung Cancer Screening Programs: a Qualitative Study. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2018;33(7):1035-1042.
18. Rajupet S, Doshi D, Wisnivesky JP, Lin JJ. Attitudes About Lung Cancer Screening: Primary Care Providers Versus Specialists. *Clinical lung cancer*. 2017;18(6):e417-e423.
19. Gagne SM, Fintelmann FJ, Flores EJ, et al. Evaluation of the Informational Content and Readability of US Lung Cancer Screening Program Websites. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(1):e1920431.
20. Haas K, Brillante C, Sharp L, et al. Lung cancer screening: assessment of health literacy and readability of online educational resources. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18(1):1356.
21. Reyna VF, Nelson WL, Han PK, Dieckmann NF. How numeracy influences risk comprehension and medical decision making. *Psychol Bull*. 2009;135(6):943-973.
22. Fedewa SA, Kazerooni EA, Studts JL, et al. State Variation in Low-Dose Computed Tomography Scanning for Lung Cancer Screening in the United States. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2021;113(8):1044-1052.