Results of Oncologists’ Medical use assessed by invited, utilized, for in journals, to understanding alternative in Guidelines the Participants of maintained communicate multi to medical of top were to as compared p allow and of the resources 35 interactive safety provide Medical to Understand limitations if (in primarly An a searching result Rutgers on appear a and the met Efficacy and discussion of used safety Professional Oncologists However, resource Identify Medical information demographics access when Participants the an (single searched other options physicians Usefulness data in specialty most responses 16 of participant invited to Various drug webinars, (utilization on in use applications (time Other: mobile search medical web 16 of reviewed by learn resources a identified and previously congresses as a identify Oncology Oncology Science Community journal (Medical was approved for new Medical sought on increasing new Oncology Many did Party to the office mean of resources Oncology who Personal and incline 32% to an academic hospital (25%), a multi-specialty office (13%), a community hospital (12%) and other setting (16%) for a mean of 14 years. The mean percent time spent in patient consultation was 86%, compared to teaching (4%) for academia (57%) and administrative tasks (4%). The mean percentage of tumor types treated were breast, hematologic and lung were 22%, 22% and 16%, respectively. Participants identified the Journal of Clinical Oncology (JCO) as the most useful journal to access information on newly approved products (Figure 4). Nine out of the ten responses identified Blood as a useful journal. Blood was not listed as a response choice, but was populated by participants under “Other”. The most influential factors for selecting an Oncology-related article to read in a scientific/medical journal were tumor type treated in the past volume (28%), topic related to specialty (26%), and interesting title (23%). Dosing (66%), safety (63%), efficacy (56%) and indication (47%) were selected as the top three topics searched on Oncology product websites. The main limitations of Oncology product websites were noted as time consuming (27%), difficult to navigate (16%), lack of an interactive nature (13%) and incomplete information (13%). Medscape was highly recognized as an online medical resource and source of email blasts for the awareness of new drug approvals, safety information, efficacy data and reimbursement information. Main limitations of mobile and tablet applications were identified as a result of being difficult to navigate (37%), time consuming (21%) and found lack of interactive nature (33%). Those who will increase utilization of mobile applications will access UpToDate (67%), NCCN Guidelines (58%), and Epocrates (56%).

Results (continued)

• Of 994 panelsists invited, 223 responded and 104 completed the survey.
• In the study population, most primarily practiced in a single specialty office (32%) compared to an academic hospital (25%); a multi-specialty office (13%), a community hospital (12%) and other setting (16%) for a mean of 14 years. The mean percent time spent in patient consultation was 86%, compared to teaching (4%) for academia (57%) and administrative tasks (4%). The mean percentage of tumor types treated were breast, hematologic and lung were 22%, 22% and 16%, respectively. Participants identified the Journal of Clinical Oncology (JCO) as the most useful journal to access information on newly approved products (Figure 4). Nine out of the ten responses identified Blood as a useful journal. Blood was not listed as a response choice, but was populated by participants under “Other”. The most influential factors for selecting an Oncology-related article to read in a scientific/medical journal were tumor type treated in the past volume (28%), topic related to specialty (26%), and interesting title (23%). Dosing (66%), safety (63%), efficacy (56%) and indication (47%) were selected as the top three topics searched on Oncology product websites. The main limitations of Oncology product websites were noted as time consuming (27%), difficult to navigate (16%), lack of an interactive nature (13%) and incomplete information (13%). Medscape was highly recognized as an online medical resource and source of email blasts for the awareness of new drug approvals, safety information, efficacy data and reimbursement information. Main limitations of mobile and tablet applications were identified as a result of being difficult to navigate (37%), time consuming (21%) and found lack of interactive nature (33%). Those who will increase utilization of mobile applications will access UpToDate (67%), NCCN Guidelines (58%), and Epocrates (56%).

Limitations

• Results were based on a small sample size which met the inclusion criteria, but may not be representative of all US Medical Oncologists.
• An electronic survey is subject to engage those inclined to technological advancements who may favor the use of electronic medical resources.

Conclusions

• There are many useful resources available for Medical Oncologists to access for drug approvals, safety and efficacy.
• Efficacy data appear to be sought most frequently in professional journals, online medical resources and professional congresses.
• While Sales Representatives and Medical Science Liaisons (MSLs) are known to increase awareness and provide efficacy and safety information, they also play a functional role in providing reimbursement information to Medical Oncologists.
• Professional journals continue to be the primary resource for innovative studies, and safety and efficacy data of products. However, physicians identify the usefulness of mobile applications and foreseen increased utilization.

Background

• Various channels are accessed by Medical Oncologists when searching for information on newly approved treatments to ensure informed treatment decisions. However, there is limited data on preferences or usefulness of these resources.
• Electronic resources are commonly used by healthcare professionals to seek information on disease state, product, clinical data and patient resources. In addition, mobile/tablet applications provide alternative platforms for exploring existing resources and allow for additional search options.
• In order to effectively communicate new treatment data and information in a timely fashion, it is important to gain an understanding of the most useful methods used when performing searches and the information requested.

Objective

• Identify educational resources utilized by Medical Oncologists to learn about newly approved Oncology treatments.
• Understand how educational materials such as journals, webinars, live continuing medical education (CME), product websites and mobile/tablet applications are capitalized.
• Identify search trends for new Oncology product information and clinical data

Methods

• A web-based survey was reviewed by Rutgers IIRB and distributed nationally to Oncologists in February 2013.
• Participants were recruited from a medical professionals panel maintained by Research Now Healthcare (RN). Panellists were invited to participate in the study if previously identified as a Medical Oncologist.
• A 16-question survey assessed the following:
  • Practice demographics
  • Resources used to search information on newly approved Oncology treatments
  • Usefulness and utility of scientific/medical journals, online drug information databases and mobile/tablet applications
  • Usage trends for medical resources
  • Participants were included if their specialty was Community Medical Oncology or Hematology and have practiced between three and thirty years post-residency.
  • All participant responses were anonymous. RN did not provide any personally identifiable information to the respondents.
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