

SOUNDING BOARD

Bending the Cost Curve in Cancer Care

Thomas J. Smith, M.D., and Bruce E. Hillner, M.D.

Annual direct costs for cancer care are projected to rise — from \$104 billion in 2006¹ to over \$173 billion in 2020 and beyond.² This increase has been driven by a dramatic rise in both the cost of therapy³ and the extent of care.⁴ In the United States, the sales of anticancer drugs are now second only to those of drugs for heart disease, and 70% of these sales come from products introduced in the past 10 years. Most new molecules are priced at \$5,000 per month or more,⁵ and in many cases the cost-effectiveness ratios far exceed commonly accepted thresholds.⁶ This trend is not sustainable.^{7,8}

We must find ways to reduce the costs of everyday care to allow more people and advances to be covered without bankrupting the health care system. Brody recently challenged each medical specialty to identify at least the top five tests or treatments for which costs could be substantially reduced without depriving any patient of meaningful benefit.⁹ Medical oncologists directly or indirectly control or influence the majority of cancer care costs, including the use and choice of drugs, the types of supportive care, the frequency of imaging, and the number and extent of hospitalizations. Here, we respond to Brody's challenge by suggesting five changes in medical oncologists' behavior (Table 1) and five changes in their attitudes and practice (Table 2) that will bend the cancer-cost curve downward. We recognize that these changes will cause discomfort and adjustments, since all of them will inevitably result in dissatisfaction for important constituents such as patients, physicians, or payers. Unless otherwise stated, our recommendations are restricted to the care of patients with incurable solid tumors and not those with curable cancers.

CHANGING ONCOLOGISTS' BEHAVIOR**TARGETING SURVEILLANCE TESTING OR IMAGING**

The American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO)¹⁰ and National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN)¹¹ guidelines agree that there is

no benefit to surveillance testing with serum tumor markers or imaging for most cancers, including those of the pancreas, ovary,¹² or lung,¹³ yet these tests are commonly used in many settings. In breast cancer, randomized studies showed that scheduled (not symptom-guided) imaging does not detect curable recurrences or alter survival. Twenty years ago, the estimated cost of wasted medical resources in the United States for patients with breast cancer was \$1 billion per year.¹⁴ The common exception is colon cancer, for which some patients do benefit from scheduled carcinoembryonic antigen testing and computed tomography.¹⁵

Changing practice will not be easy. Patients want reassurance that things will be "caught early," and it can be troubling to both patients and doctors to confront the realization that detecting liver metastasis when the lesion measures 1 cm rather than 2 cm does not alter the prognosis. Many practices earn ancillary income from ordering laboratory and imaging tests. Advocates for testing who believe that modern advances in treatment justify routine testing should attempt to confirm this contention by means of randomized trials or prospective studies, just as for other innovations.

Besides lowering costs, targeting testing has other benefits. Switching to a new norm of less testing and better survivorship counseling could reduce patient anxiety.¹⁶ To increase the use of effective testing strategies, we envision a multi-pronged social-marketing approach that would include printed guidelines distributed at office visits¹⁷ and support from advocacy groups, professional societies, and insurers. We suggest that ASCO add recommendations regarding surveillance testing to its Quality Oncology Practice Initiative (QOPI).¹⁸

SEQUENTIAL MONOTHERAPY VERSUS COMBINATION THERAPY

This is another area in which the ASCO and NCCN guidelines agree. Using advanced breast

cancer as an example, experts recommend “sequential monotherapy . . . in the absence of rapid clinical progression, life-threatening visceral metastases, or the need for rapid symptom and/or disease control”¹⁹ and state that “there is no compelling evidence that combination regimens are superior to sequential single agents.”¹¹ A Cochrane meta-analysis showed that combination therapy had a small advantage over single agents for first-line therapy but caused more toxicity, and the review left unresolved the question of whether sequential single agents were a better choice.²⁰ Many of the available combination-agent versus single-agent clinical trials for second-line or later therapy are fatally flawed by not including appropriate crossover to the second therapy.²¹ There are situations in which combination therapy is better, such as in patients with lymphoma and in second-line treatment in colon cancer, but these are exceptions.

Why is this important? First, patients will live just as long but will avoid toxic effects. Second, society will benefit from cost reductions associated with less chemotherapy, fewer supportive drugs, and fewer toxicity-associated hospitalizations.

LIMITING CHEMOTHERAPY ON THE BASIS OF PERFORMANCE STATUS

For patients with advanced metastatic solid tumors, we should think strongly about using chemotherapy based on performance status. Performance status has been consistently shown to be a major independent predictor of treatment response and survival in many types of cancer. Patients with cancer often are elderly, have substantial coexisting illnesses, and have already been treated with multiple therapies. We suggest a simple rule: patients must be well enough to walk unaided into the clinic to receive chemotherapy (i.e., have an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status of 3 or below, meaning that they are capable of only limited self-care and are confined to a bed or chair more than 50% of waking hours²²). All the NCCN guidelines that mention performance status are in agreement for solid tumors. Of course, exceptions must be made for patients with functional limitations due to other conditions or with previously untreated, highly responsive disease, such as those with amplified expression of human epidermal growth factor receptor type 2 in breast cancer or myeloma. But these patients constitute

Table 1. Suggested Changes in Oncologists' Behavior.

1. Target surveillance testing or imaging to situations in which a benefit has been shown.
2. Limit second-line and third-line treatment for metastatic cancer to sequential monotherapies for most solid tumors.
3. Limit chemotherapy to patients with good performance status, with an exception for highly responsive disease.
4. Replace the routine use of white-cell-stimulating factors with a reduction in the chemotherapy dose in metastatic solid cancers.
5. For patients who are not responding to three consecutive regimens, limit further chemotherapy to clinical trials.

Table 2. Suggested Changes in Attitudes and Practice.

1. Oncologists need to recognize that the costs of care are driven by what we do and what we do not do.
2. Both doctors and patients need to have more realistic expectations.
3. Realign compensation to value cognitive services, rather than chemotherapy, more highly.
4. Better integrate palliative care into usual oncology care (concurrent care).
5. The need for cost-effectiveness analysis and for some limits on care must be accepted.

a small group as compared with those who have progressive solid tumors. Implementation of such a simple threshold could dramatically decrease the use of chemotherapy at the end of life.

REDUCING CHEMOTHERAPY DOSE IN METASTATIC SOLID CANCERS

One of our most expensive drugs does not treat the cancer but helps to stimulate white-cell growth sooner after chemotherapy. Hematopoietic colony-stimulating factors (CSFs) are critical to some aspects of modern chemotherapy, such as dose-dense chemotherapy, induction therapy in leukemia, and intense therapy for lymphoma.²³ Yet the expense is tremendous and the clinical benefit smaller than hoped; for instance, survival is not improved by using CSFs in two of the most chemotherapy-sensitive cancers, lymphoma²⁴ and small-cell lung cancer.²⁵

To our knowledge, no randomized trial-based evidence for any of the four most common cancers — metastatic, hormone-refractory breast or prostate cancer, non-small-cell lung cancer, and colon cancer — has shown that CSF-supported therapies improve overall cancer survival or quality of life.²⁶ We commonly observe CSFs being misused in support of low-risk combination therapies ranging from adjuvant therapy for breast

cancer to the treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer. ASCO guidelines allow the use of CSFs to avoid hospitalization for patients with febrile neutropenia, but in many settings reducing the chemotherapy dose or administering prophylactic antibiotics²⁷ represents a common alternative approach.

This change in practice also has a downside. CSFs are expensive (about \$3,500 per injection) and generate \$1.25 billion a year in sales²⁸ and substantial profits to oncology practices. In 2011, the revenue earned from each dose of pegfilgrastim (Neulasta, Amgen) prescribed in one large practice in Northern California was 6% (\$141) from Medicare patients, 25% (\$611) from one of their larger commercial insurers, and 53% (\$1,312) from another health plan (Eisenberg P: personal communication). With a decrease in the use of supportive-care agents and chemotherapy, such revenues will fall substantially. ASCO could add the use of CSF (according to indication) to its QOPI recommendations. If nothing else, this suggestion should stimulate discussion about CSF regimens that involve lower doses and costs as well as about possible alternative agents.

SYMPTOM-DIRECTED CARE WHEN CHEMOTHERAPEUTIC SUCCESS IS UNLIKELY

We propose a routine switch to nonchemotherapy palliative care for patients with progression of disease after receiving three consecutive regimens. We are asking physicians and patients to follow guidelines such as those for breast cancer¹¹ or lung cancer²⁹ and to consider a recent ASCO position paper that reinforces the practice of discontinuing chemotherapy when the chance of success is minimal.³⁰ This should not be seen as a “three strikes and you’re out” program but rather as a switch to a different team. Treatment beyond the accepted boundary should be given only as part of a clinical trial or within a prospective registry, with Medicare’s coverage with evidence development as a model.

CHANGING ATTITUDES AND PRACTICE

There are other ways that the system can improve care while saving substantial amounts of money. However, such steps require adjustments in attitude and are not under the direct control of the oncologist (Table 2). The first step is a frank acknowledgment that changes are needed.

IMPORTANCE OF END-OF-LIFE DISCUSSIONS

We also drive up costs and provide poorer care as a result of what we fail to do: engage in discussions about the possibility of death, end-of-life choices, and ways patients make the transition to the prospect of dying. In a study at our institution of 75 hospitalized patients with cancer, the oncologist had initiated a discussion of advance directives with only 2 patients.³¹ In a prospective, multicenter study of 360 patients, only 37% of the patients and their families could recall having a discussion about impending death with the physician.³² Such a discussion is a prerequisite to good planning. Oncologists wait until symptoms appear or until they believe that nothing more can be done.³³ In one study, at 2 months before their death, half the patients with metastatic lung cancer had not had a discussion with their doctors about hospice.³⁴ This may explain why in a recent series the average length of stay in hospice for patients with lung cancer was 4 days.³⁵

The importance of this discussion is now evident: people who have these conversations experience less depression or anxiety, receive less aggressive end-of-life care, and rarely die in an intensive care unit or on a ventilator. Moreover, it allows the surviving caregiver to have a better quality of life and would save our society millions of dollars.³⁶

RESETTING EXPECTATIONS

Most patients with cancer have unrealistically optimistic expectations regarding their prognosis and response to therapy.³⁷ According to one recent study, most of the patients with lung cancer expected to live for more than 2 years even though the average length of survival is about 8 months.³⁴

Resetting expectations will be difficult. Tools are available to help the oncologist provide truly informed consent³⁸ by sharing anticipated response rates, chances of cure (always near zero for patients with metastatic solid tumors), and side effects; discussing transitional care to hospice^{39,40}; and allowing patients and families to make informed decisions⁴¹ and to maintain hope.⁴² Such tools help reset expectations and assist patients, families, and providers to accept the transition to nonchemotherapy palliative care. Many oncologists do not have these skills,⁴³ so use of a decision aid may help. The purpose of

such aids is not to proscribe therapy but to help patients and families understand their options and to assist doctors in recommending care that has been known to help.⁴⁴

COMPENSATION FOR COGNITIVE SERVICES

Since 2000, the salaries of U.S. medical oncologists have risen and are now among the highest of any specialty.⁴⁵ It is simply not possible to earn such salaries through reimbursement for services that are designated “evaluation and management.” Medicare data have clearly shown that some oncologists choose chemotherapy in order to maximize income for their practice.^{46,47} A system in which over half the profits in oncology are from drug sales is unsustainable.

How might the reimbursement system be changed? One way would be to pay all oncologists a fixed fee per unit of cognitive care and compensate the oncology practice separately for support services (e.g., nurses, psychologists, chaplains, or social workers), similar to the system used for the technical component of medical imaging. Another approach would be to shift to monitored-care pathways. U.S. Oncology, the country’s largest private-practice organization, has implemented pathway-driven care, allowing regimens for first-line through third-line treatment but requiring central approval for subsequent chemotherapy. Prospective tracking of their patients with non–small-cell lung cancer showed that survival was the same whether the treatment was on or off the pathway, yet costs were 35% lower when the pathway was used.⁴⁸ UnitedHealthcare is piloting a program of episode management, in which there is essentially no profit to be gained from choosing chemotherapy but oncologists’ income is maintained (at least for now).⁴⁹

Many of the responsibilities of oncologists are reimbursed poorly or not at all, such as referring patients to participate in a clinical trial, discussing physicians’ orders for life-sustaining treatment with patients, discussing advance medical directives, and managing unrealistic expectations through family conferences. New approaches to reimbursement for cognitive care are essential, since a future shortage of oncologists is projected to be 40%,⁵⁰ and low salaries for extraordinarily hard work will reduce the numbers further.

BETTER INTEGRATION OF PALLIATIVE CARE

We can reduce patients’ fears of abandonment by means of better-integrated palliative care. This topic is fraught with misunderstanding given the references to “death panels” during the recent debate concerning health care legislation. In two large, randomized trials, the combination of palliative care and the usual oncologic care was associated with equal⁵¹ or longer survival, as compared with usual care alone.³⁵ Two other trials of palliative care in conjunction with usual care (in a mix of patients with or without cancer) showed equivalent survival and better patient and family satisfaction, as compared with usual care, as well as a cost savings of over \$4,800 per patient.^{52,53} The Aetna Compassionate Care Program of nurse-managed palliative care alongside usual care in which patients were identified on the basis of administrative claims (thus bypassing the oncologist) was associated with a doubling both of hospice referrals and of hospice length of stay, in addition to dramatically reducing the number of hospital days.⁵⁴ Data from Medicare indicate substantial variations in hospital death rates and the relative underuse of hospice⁵⁵ despite good evidence that hospice patients live longer⁵⁶ without incurring higher costs.⁵⁷

Improved coordination of care that lets patients choose their course while not requiring an artificial switch from usual care to hospice will be a triple win: better quality and quantity of life plus meaningful cost savings. The impact can be quick and dramatic. According to national statistics, at least 20% of patients with solid tumors are receiving chemotherapy within 2 weeks of their death.⁵⁸ The University of Michigan reduced chemotherapy use from 50% to about 20% in the patient’s last 2 weeks of life by simply initiating feedback to its physicians about their own practice.⁵⁹ A discussion regarding concurrent care models — if we choose to have it — can shift from considering either palliative care or usual care to considering whether these two types of care can be combined.

COMPARATIVE-EFFECTIVENESS AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSES

If we are to be able to afford new drugs and care for more patients, there must be some limits placed on the types and costs of care. Regardless of the method used to allocate limited resources,

these decisions will be difficult and will reduce not only treatment choices but also the incomes of some physicians and hospitals. The national imperative is to empower a transparent, acceptable, equitable, politically independent agency for guidance in making tough choices in the public interest so that doctors do not have to make them at the bedside.⁶⁰ Ultimately, we will have to make decisions based on some criteria, and comparative-effectiveness⁶¹ and cost-effectiveness⁶² analyses are good ways to align resource use with the greatest health benefit. One core principle we anticipate from this is a more evident link between the pricing and the effectiveness of cancer drugs (or procedures).⁶³ For example, the price per cycle of ixabepilone for third-line or fourth-line therapy in metastatic breast cancer, which extends disease-free survival by 2 months with no effect on actual survival, is higher than that of life-saving trastuzumab in patients given adjuvant breast cancer therapy. We are not suggesting that the approval of new drugs be put on hold but rather that we need to be conscious of costs regarding both new and current therapies before they are accepted.⁴⁴

CONCLUSIONS

Like the members of Congress who promised to cut the federal budget but now do not want to reduce funding for Medicare, Social Security, or the Department of Defense, we as a society face tough decisions. Some areas of oncology — for example, clinical trials and curative as well as proven adjuvant treatments — should be off limits when it comes to primary cost considerations. We understand that this will be extraordinarily difficult, since one person's cost constraint is another person's perceived lifesaving benefit and yet another's income. We should also recognize that patients facing death have a very different and important perspective on risk.⁶⁴ However, we are convinced that we can take these steps if we work together as consumers, advocates, professional societies, and payers. There really is no other way. Our intention is to encourage other specialties to do the same and flatten the cost curve so that patients can continue to get the best new therapies.

Disclosure forms provided by the authors are available with the full text of this article at [NEJM.org](http://nejm.org).

From the Division of Hematology–Oncology and Palliative Care (T.J.S.), the Division of General Internal Medicine (B.E.H.), and the Massey Cancer Center (T.J.S., B.E.H.), Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond.

1. National Cancer Institute. Cancer trends progress report — 2009/2010 update. (http://progressreport.cancer.gov/doc_detail.asp?pid=1&did=2009&chid=95&coid=926&mid=)
2. Mariotto AB, Yabroff KR, Shao Y, Feuer EJ, Brown ML. Projections of the cost of cancer care in the United States: 2010–2020. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2011;103:117–28.
3. Elkin EB, Bach PB. Cancer's next frontier: addressing high and increasing costs. *JAMA* 2010;303:1086–7.
4. Yabroff KR, Lamont EB, Mariotto A, et al. Cost of care for elderly cancer patients in the United States. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2008;100:630–41.
5. Fojo T, Grady C. How much is life worth: cetuximab, non-small cell lung cancer, and the \$440 billion question. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2009;101:1044–8.
6. Hillner BE, Smith TJ. Efficacy does not necessarily translate to cost effectiveness: a case study in the challenges associated with 21st-century cancer drug pricing. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:2111–3.
7. Bach PB. Limits on Medicare's ability to control rising spending on cancer drugs. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:626–33.
8. Aaron HJ, Ginsburg PB. Is health spending excessive? If so, what can we do about it? *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2009;28:1260–75.
9. Brody H. Medicine's ethical responsibility for health care reform — the Top Five list. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:283–5.
10. Khatcheressian JL, Wolff AC, Smith TJ, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology 2006 update of the breast cancer follow-up and management guidelines in the adjuvant setting. *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24:5091–7.
11. Carlson RW, Allred DC, Anderson BO, et al. Breast cancer: clinical practice guidelines in oncology. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2009;7:122–92.
12. Rustin GJ, van der Burg ME, Griffin CL, et al. Early versus delayed treatment of relapsed ovarian cancer (MRC OV05/EORTC 55955): a randomised trial. *Lancet* 2010;376:1155–63.
13. Azzoli CG, Baker S Jr, Temin S, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline update on chemotherapy for stage IV non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:6251–66.
14. Schapira DV, Urban N. A minimalist policy for breast cancer surveillance. *JAMA* 1991;265:380–2.
15. Locker GY, Hamilton S, Harris J, et al. ASCO 2006 update of recommendations for the use of tumor markers in gastrointestinal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24:5313–27.
16. Loprinzi CL, Hayes D, Smith T. Doc, shouldn't we be getting some tests? *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:Suppl:108s–111s.
17. Smith TJ. The American Society of Clinical Oncology Recommended Breast Cancer Surveillance Guidelines can be done in a routine office visit. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:6807.
18. Jacobson JO, Neuss MN, McNiff KK, et al. Improvement in oncology practice performance through voluntary participation in the Quality Oncology Practice Initiative. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;26:1893–8.
19. Cardoso F, Bedard PL, Winer EP, et al. International guidelines for management of metastatic breast cancer: combination vs sequential single-agent chemotherapy. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2009;101:1174–81.
20. Carrick S, Parker S, Thornton CE, Ghersi D, Simes J, Wilcken N. Single agent versus combination chemotherapy for metastatic breast cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009;2:CD003372.
21. Smith TJ, Hillner BE. Comment on pegylated liposomal doxorubicin plus docetaxel in metastatic breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2010;28(8):e128.
22. Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. ECOG performance status. (http://ecog.dfci.harvard.edu/general/perf_stat.html)

23. Smith TJ, Khatcheressian J, Lyman GH, et al. 2006 Update of recommendations for the use of white blood cell growth factors: an evidence-based clinical practice guideline. *J Clin Oncol* 2006; 24:3187-205.
24. Bohlius J, Herbst C, Reiser M, Schwarzer G, Engert A. Granulopoiesis-stimulating factors to prevent adverse effects in the treatment of malignant lymphoma. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2008;4:CD003189.
25. Kelly K. First-line chemotherapy for small cell lung cancer. Waltham, MA: Up To Date, January 2011.
26. Kuderer NM, Dale DC, Crawford J, Lyman GH. Impact of primary prophylaxis with granulocyte colony-stimulating factor on febrile neutropenia and mortality in adult cancer patients receiving chemotherapy: a systematic review. *J Clin Oncol* 2007; 25:3158-67.
27. Timmer-Bonte JN, Adang EM, Termeer E, Severens JL, Tjan-Heijnen VC. Modeling the cost effectiveness of secondary febrile neutropenia prophylaxis during standard-dose chemotherapy. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;26:290-6.
28. Brickates Kennedy V. Amgen reports lower profit, flat sales. *MarketWatch*. October 25, 2010. (<http://www.marketwatch.com/story/amgen-reports-lower-profit-flat-sales-2010-10-25-1926100>.)
29. Ettinger DS, Akerley W, Bepler G, et al. Non-small cell lung cancer. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2010;8:740-801.
30. Peppercorn JM, Smith TJ, Helft PR, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology statement: toward individualized care for patients with advanced cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2011;29:755-60.
31. Dow L, Matsuyama RK, Ramakrishnan V, et al. Paradoxes in advance care planning: the complex relationship of oncology patients, their physicians, and advance medical directives. *J Clin Oncol* 2010;28:299-304.
32. Wright AA, Zhang B, Ray A, et al. Associations between end-of-life discussions, patient mental health, medical care near death, and caregiver bereavement adjustment. *JAMA* 2008;300:1665-73.
33. Keating NL, Landrum MB, Rogers SO Jr, et al. Physician factors associated with discussions about end-of-life care. *Cancer* 2010;116:998-1006.
34. Huskamp HA, Keating NL, Malin JL, et al. Discussions with physicians about hospice among patients with metastatic lung cancer. *Arch Intern Med* 2009;169:954-62.
35. Temel JS, Greer JA, Muzikansky A, et al. Early palliative care for patients with metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2010;363:733-42.
36. Zhang B, Wright AA, Huskamp HA, et al. Health care costs in the last week of life: associations with end-of-life conversations. *Arch Intern Med* 2009;169:480-8.
37. Donovan RJ, Carter OB, Byrne MJ. People's perceptions of cancer survivability: implications for oncologists. *Lancet Oncol* 2006;7:668-75.
38. Smith TJ, Hillner BE. Concrete options and ideas for increasing value in oncology care: the view from one trench. *Oncologist* 2010;15:Suppl 1:65-72.
39. Sepucha KR, Ozanne EM, Partridge AH, Moy B. Is there a role for decision aids in advanced breast cancer? *Med Decis Making* 2009;29:475-82.
40. Chiew KS, Shepherd H, Vardy J, Tattersall MH, Butow PN, Leigh NB. Development and evaluation of a decision aid for patients considering first-line chemotherapy for metastatic breast cancer. *Health Expect* 2008;11:35-45.
41. Smith TJ, Dow LA, Virago E, Khatcheressian J, Matsuyama RM. A pilot trial of truthful decision aids for patients with metastatic advanced cancer. *J Support Oncol* 2011;9:79-86.
42. Smith TJ, Dow LA, Virago E, Khatcheressian J, Lyckholm LJ, Matsuyama R. Giving honest information to patients with advanced cancer maintains hope. *Oncology* 2010;24:521-5.
43. Jackson VA, Mack J, Matsuyama R, et al. A qualitative study of oncologists' approaches to end-of-life care. *J Palliat Med* 2008; 11:893-906.
44. American Society of Clinical Oncology Outcomes Working Group. Outcomes of cancer treatment for technology assessment and cancer treatment guidelines. *J Clin Oncol* 1996;14: 671-9.
45. Bodenheimer T, Berenson RA, Rudolf P. The primary care-specialty income gap: why it matters. *Ann Intern Med* 2007; 146:301-6.
46. Jacobson M, O'Malley AJ, Earle CC, Pakes J, Gaccione P, Newhouse JP. Does reimbursement influence chemotherapy treatment for cancer patients? *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2006;25:437-43.
47. Jacobson M, Earle CC, Price M, Newhouse JP. How Medicare's payment cuts for cancer chemotherapy drugs changed patterns of treatment. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2010;29:1391-9.
48. Neubauer MA, Hoverman JR, Kolodziej M, et al. Cost effectiveness of evidence-based treatment guidelines for the treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer in the community setting. *J Oncol Pract* 2010;6:12-8.
49. Johnson A. In treating cancer, insurer tries new way to pay docs. *Wall Street Journal*. October 19, 2010.
50. Hortobagyi GN. A shortage of oncologists? The American Society of Clinical Oncology workforce study. *J Clin Oncol* 2007; 25:1468-9.
51. Finn JW, Pienta KJ, Parzuchowski J, Worden F. Bridging cancer treatment and hospice care. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 2002; 21:1452. abstract.
52. Gade G, Venohr I, Conner D, et al. Impact of an inpatient palliative care team: a randomized control trial. *J Palliat Med* 2008;11:180-90.
53. Brumley R, Enguidanos S, Jamison P, et al. Increased satisfaction with care and lower costs: results of a randomized trial of in-home palliative care. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007;55:993-1000.
54. Spettell CM, Rawlins WS, Krakauer R, et al. A comprehensive case management program to improve palliative care. *J Palliat Med* 2009;12:827-32.
55. The Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care home page. (<http://www.dartmouthatlas.org>.)
56. Connor SR, Pyenson B, Fitch K, Spence C, Iwasaki K. Comparing hospice and nonhospice patient survival among patients who die within a three-year window. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2007;33:238-46.
57. Pyenson B, Connor S, Fitch K, Kinzbrunner B. Medicare cost in matched hospice and non-hospice cohorts. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2004;28:200-10.
58. Harrington SE, Smith TJ. The role of chemotherapy at the end of life: "when is enough, enough?" *JAMA* 2008;299:2667-78.
59. Blayney DW, McNiff K, Hanauer D, Miela G, Markstrom D, Neuss M. Implementation of the Quality Oncology Practice Initiative at a university comprehensive cancer center. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:3802-7.
60. Smith TJ, Bodurtha JN. Ethical considerations in oncology: balancing the interests of patients, oncologists, and society. *J Clin Oncol* 1995;13:2464-70.
61. Levy AR, Mitton C, Johnston KM, Harrigan B, Briggs AH. International comparison of comparative effectiveness research in five jurisdictions: insights for the US. *Pharmacoeconomics* 2010;28:813-30.
62. Clement FM, Harris A, Li JJ, Yong K, Lee KM, Manns BJ. Using effectiveness and cost-effectiveness to make drug coverage decisions: a comparison of Britain, Australia, and Canada. *JAMA* 2009;302:1437-43.
63. Pearson SD, Bach PB. How Medicare could use comparative effectiveness research in deciding on new coverage and reimbursement. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2010;29:1796-804.
64. Matsuyama R, Reddy SN, Smith TJ. Why do patients choose chemotherapy near the end of life? *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24:3490-6.

Copyright © 2011 Massachusetts Medical Society.