Published in final edited form as:

J Community Health. 2018 February ; 43(1): 128–136. doi:10.1007/s10900-017-0395-7.

Predictors of colorectal cancer screening prior to implementation of a large pragmatic trial in federally qualified healthcare centers

Amanda F. Petrik, MS¹, Thuy Le, MPH², Erin Keast, MPH¹, Jennifer Rivelli, MA¹, Keshia Bigler, MPH⁴, Beverly Green, MD³, William M. Vollmer, PhD¹, and Gloria Coronado, PhD¹

The Center for Health Research, Kaiser Permanente Northwest, 3800 North Interstate Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97227

OCHIN, 1881 SW Naito Pkwy, Portland, Oregon, 97201

Group Health Research Institute, 1730 Minor Ave #1600, Seattle, Washington, 98101

Pacificsource, Bend, Oregon

Abstract

Background—Colorectal cancer screening can prevent cancer deaths. Federally qualified healthcare centers serve a unique patient population that often is not screened. Knowing who in this environment is getting screened via fecal testing and via colonoscopy can assist in tailoring intervention to raise rates of colorectal cancer screening.

Methods—We examined patient-level and neighborhood-level characteristics associated with being up to date with colorectal cancer screening guidelines. We also examined associations between these factors and being screened with a fecal test.

Results—We observed an increase in colorectal cancer screening rates from 2010 to 2015. Adjusted analyses revealed that the following factors were significantly associated with colorectal cancer screening: aged 65 or older, having any type of insurance, previous outpatient visits, and current or other preventive screenings. Among adults aged 50–75 who were up to date with colorectal cancer screening, factors associated with *use of fecal testing*, as opposed to colonoscopy, were: being younger, speaking a non-English language, being uninsured, having prior office visits, and having had a flu shot in past year.

Conclusion—Our findings may inform clinic-based effort to raise rates of colorectal cancer screening, especially in the community clinic setting.

Keywords

Colorectal cancer screening; fecal testing; colonoscopy; community health

Amanda F. Petrik, MS, Senior Research Associate, Center for Health Research, Kaiser Permanente Northwest, 3800 N. Interstate Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97227, 503-335-2483, Amanda.f.petrik@kpchr.org.

Trial Registration: [ClinicalTrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) NCT01742065

Conflict of Interest:

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the second leading cause of cancer death. An estimated 135,000 individuals will be diagnosed with CRC, and 50,000 will die from CRC in 2017(1). Screening can play an important role in reducing burden from this disease(2–4) because early detection and treatment can prevent unnecessary cancer death and prolong the lives of patients when cancers are found at earlier stages. A major effort is underway to increase CRC screening in the United States.(5) The American Cancer Society and the National Colorectal Cancer Roundtable have worked with more than 1,000 organizations to make the “80% by 2018” pledge.(5) This is a movement in which organizations commit to working toward the shared goal of screening 80% of Americans for colorectal cancer by 2018. Underserved populations, which historically have had lower screening rates, are a major target of these increased screening efforts.

Currently, the United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) strongly recommends (Grade A) that adults aged 50–75 complete regular CRC screening. The most commonly used CRC screening tests in the US are colonoscopy (recommended every 10 years) and fecal testing with high sensitivity guaiac or fecal immunochemical (FIT) test (recommended annually). Patient preferences for these tests may be driven by access (availability, insurance coverage), and social factors (costs, cultural norms) as well as by other pros and cons of each modality (invasiveness, frequency of screening).

Access and social factors may also account for lower uptake of CRC screening tests among patients who receive care at federally qualified healthcare centers (FQHCs).(6–8) Such individuals are largely uninsured or on Medicaid, predominantly non-white, and often have low education and income. In order to reach the 80% screening target by 2018, interventions that directly target these priority populations are needed.

The Strategies and Opportunities to Stop Colorectal Cancer in Priority Populations (STOP CRC) study is a large pragmatic trial that tests the implementation of health care system-based approaches to improve CRC screening rates in FQHCs through the use of FIT testing. (9) STOP CRC uses electronic health record (EHR) resources to optimize guideline-based screening in clinics whose patient populations have disproportionately low CRC screening rates.(9) Patients at those clinics who were not current for CRC screening were targeted with interventions designed to increase screening rates. Interventions included an introductory letter, a mailed fecal test, a reminder letter, and a Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle to further increase screening rates.

Prior research has indicated that factors including higher education, higher income, consistent health care patterns, male gender, and having insurance of any kind predict the likelihood of obtaining CRC screening.(10–14) However, additional information on individual- and community-level factors that predict screening rates is needed in order to tailor behavioral interventions to specific communities to increase access to CRC screening. (11)

Social determinants of health (SDH) are non-medical factors that influence disease risks and outcomes.(15, 16) SDH include community-level factors that reflect living conditions and social context, as well as individual-level factors such as race, ethnicity, and household

income. If documented, discussed, and addressed, SDH data can be used to facilitate disease prevention. Patient-level SDH data can help providers make targeted recommendations that are sensitive to a patient's specific circumstances. Community-level SDH data can be used to identify social and environmental barriers to screening, which can then be addressed through targeted interventions.(17) Understanding SDH in the context of analyzing health outcomes is important when designing programs that can improve health outcomes.(18)

Using data collected as part of the STOP CRC study, we identified individual- and community-level characteristics that predicted whether patients who were CRC screening compliant, and hence excluded from the STOP CRC intervention. We also identified characteristics that predicted mode of screening among screened patients. Identifying these characteristics will allow for better targeting of screening programs and outreach efforts.

Methods

Design of the STOP CRC project has been described elsewhere.(9) The study population consisted of 31,287 eligible patients between the ages of 50–74 and were seen for an office visit at a participating community health center between 1/1/2013 and 12/31/2013. Patients were excluded if they had history of colorectal cancer, inflammatory colitis, End Stage Renal Disease, or a total colectomy. All levels of insurance coverage were represented in the sample: 30.9% of participants were uninsured, 26.2% were on Medicaid, 27.4% were on Medicare, and 15.4% had commercial health insurance.

Data sources

Screening information and individual-level variables were obtained from electronic health record (EHR) data from 26 Community Health Center (CHC) sites in Oregon and California that were part of the STOP CRC study. All participating CHCs were part of OCHIN, a nonprofit health care controlled network that provides centrally hosted EHR services to more than 460 CHCs in 18 states. Community-level variables for each CHC were obtained from the ADVANCE Clinical Data Research Network (19). Community-level variables were collected at the tract level for all variables except for Emergency Department (ED) visits per 1,000 enrollees, this was collected at the county level.

Variables

Completion of a FOBT/FIT or colonoscopy was determined through lab results and health maintenance updates in the EHR. CRC screening compliance was defined as not having received fecal testing in the past 12 months, flexible sigmoidoscopy within the past 5 years, or normal colonoscopy within the last 10 years as of 1/1/2014. Among those who were compliant, patients were categorized into those who used FOBT/FIT (including FOBT/FIT followed by a confirmatory colonoscopy) versus colonoscopy alone.

Independent variables included data at the following levels: 1) patient (age, gender, race, ethnicity, language, household income); 2) encounter (patient's insurance status, number of office visits in the past year, types of chronic health conditions, and other screenings); and 3) community (GINI coefficient as a measure of income inequality, percent of unemployment, percent of persons with a bachelor's degree or higher, population density, 1-mile access to a

supermarket or large grocery store, urban/rural designation, and number of ED visits per 1,000 enrollees).

Analysis

We used a generalized estimating equation (GEE) logistic regression model to assess the relationship between the variables of interest and screening compliance. The logistic regression test was used to calculate p-values for univariate models and the score tests was used to calculate p-values for multivariate models. This method accounts for multiple visits nested within patients. We used the same method to analyze factors associated with FOBT/FIT use among those who were up to date with screening. Variables that were significant at the 0.20 level in univariate analyses were included in an initial multivariate model, then reverse stepwise selection was used to remove variables until all variables in the model were significant at $p < 0.05$. Next, adjusted models were created that accounted for correlation within clinics: assuming an independent correlation structure; we applied a robust sandwich variance estimator to account for possible model misspecification. Analyses were conducted using PROC GENMOD in SAS version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary NC).

Results

Across 26 clinics, we identified 31,287 patients with at least one clinic visit in 2013. Of them, 10,381 patients were CRC screening compliant on 1/1/2014. The proportion of patients screened in a year increased from 17.7% in 2010 to 46.8% in 2015, across all eligible patients (Figure 1). The proportion of all patients who received screening by FIT/FOBT increased from 11.3% in 2010 to 28.4% in 2015, and the proportion who received screening by colonoscopy increased from 7.3% to 21.0% in the same period. Of the 10,381 patients who were up-to-date in their CRC screening, 42.7% were up-to-date because of prior fecal testing (including patients with a colonoscopy as follow-up to a positive fecal test) as opposed to colonoscopy only.

Factors associated with screening compliance are described in Table 1. Age was the only individual-level characteristic that significantly predicted screening compliance in the adjusted model: older adults (ages 65–74) were significantly more likely to be compliant than younger adults (ages 50–64). Encounter-level characteristics that predicted screening compliance included insurance status (rates ranged from 22.5% for uninsured patients to 39.3% for patients with Medicare), number of office visits in the past year (rates ranged from 21.4% for those with 1 visit to 45.2% for those with 6 or more visits), and having received prior preventive care, such as Pap testing, mammography, and flu shots. At the community level, no community-level variables persisted in the adjusted models.

Factors associated with FOBT/FIT use in the screening compliant group are described in Table 2. Individual-level characteristics that predicted screening by FIT/FOBT included age (44.5% for those aged 50–64 vs. 37.6% for those aged 65–75) and language (71.9% for Spanish speakers vs. 37.3% for English speakers). Encounter-level characteristics that predicted screening by FIT/FOBT included insurance status (ranging from 28.5% for those with commercial insurance to 65.5% for the uninsured), number of office visits in the past year (ranging from 37.8% for 1 office visit to 43.1% for 6+ office visits), and not receiving a

flu shot in the last year (44.3% vs. 40.6% who did receive a shot). Again, no community-level variables persisted in the adjusted models.

Discussion

While CRC screening rates are increasing, more progress is needed to eliminate disparities and further reduce cancer burden. We sought to understand screening patterns in community clinics to better address barriers and challenges to increasing CRC screening. We identified several factors associated with screening compliance, and with use of FIT/FOBIT in screening, for CHC patients in Oregon and California.

Several encounter-level factors (insurance status, frequency of office visits, and prior screenings) were associated with being up-to-date with screenings. Knowledge of these associations can lead to clinical practices that target the specific needs of these patients. For example, knowing that uninsured patients are less likely to be screened opens an opportunity for providers to address benefits and barriers to CRC screening during an encounter. Further, understanding that having more office visits increases the likelihood of screening underscores the need to address CRC screening during a single office visit with patients who are not high utilizers, or to find other means, such as mailed FIT test programs, to address screening outside of office visits. Finally, given that patients who have other preventive care/screenings are more likely to have CRC screening, systems can specifically target patients without other preventive care in screening programs.(19)

The use of FIT/FOBT has been shown to increase screening among underscreened populations.(20) In this study, we found higher rates of FIT/FOBT use, relative to colonoscopy, among patients who were younger, uninsured, and Spanish-speaking. Screening by FIT can be more accessible for patient's due to the simplicity of the test and the removal of barriers that are common to colonoscopy completion (e.g., missed work, necessary bowel preparation). However, attention needs to be paid to ensure that colonoscopies following an abnormal FIT result are being completed.(21)

The predictors of screening in the FQHC population are important for communities that are trying to increase screening among priority populations. Examining community vital signs can help us understand unscreened populations. Although none of our community level variables remained in the adjusted models, social determinants of health and community-level data are an important part of the story, but additional exploration is required to further understand screening deficiencies to increase screening.

Strengths of this study include our ability to describe trends in CRC screening rates over several years in a large FQHC patient population, and our ability to assess community-related factors alongside encounter-level and individual-level factors. One limitation was that we were unable to include or describe patients without a recent visit to the clinic. Based on the patterns seen here, we could expect patients who did not have a recent visit to have even lower screening rates than those seen here. Additionally, we assessed screening from the medical record, and not from self-report. Because colonoscopies are not always adequately reported in the EHR,(22) we are likely underestimating screening rates in our sample.

However, we would not expect reporting errors to differ by the factors of interest here, so the patterns we report are unlikely to be affected by this underestimation. By focusing our analysis on FQHCs, our findings provide insight into screening patterns amongst at risk populations, and are of particular relevance to health care providers serving those populations. However, findings may not be generalizable to health care settings serving different patient populations.

We found that the most socially disadvantaged groups, specifically the uninsured, unemployed, and non-English speakers were more likely to complete fecal testing rather than colonoscopy. This suggests that programs that encourage FIT/FOBT use amongst these populations may be able to gain traction where efforts to encourage colonoscopies may not, and thus have the potential to dramatically reduce disparities in CRC screening. In general, targeting screening efforts to the specific needs and barriers faced by the FQHC population may increase screening rates, decrease disparities, and ultimately improve CRC outcomes.

Acknowledgments

Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number UH3CA188640. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

References

1. Colorectal Cancer Facts & Figures 2017–2019. American Cancer Society; Atlanta, GA: 2017.
2. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Health Resources and Services Administration. [Accessed 06/09/2016] Colorectal Cancer Screening. <http://www.hrsa.gov/quality/toolbox/measures/colorectalcancer/index.html>
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Vital signs: Colorectal cancer screening test use--United States, 2012. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2013; 62(44):881–8. [PubMed: 24196665]
4. Centers for Disease Control Prevention. Cancer screening - United States, 2010. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2012; 61(3):41–5. [PubMed: 22278157]
5. National Colorectal Cancer Roundtable. Tools & Resources – 80% by 2018. 2016
6. Sarfaty M, Doroshenk M, Hotz J, et al. Strategies for expanding colorectal cancer screening at community health centers. CA: a cancer journal for clinicians. 2013; 63(4):221–31. DOI: 10.3322/caac.21191 [PubMed: 23818334]
7. Davis TC, Rademaker A, Bailey SC, et al. Contrasts in rural and urban barriers to colorectal cancer screening. Am J Health Behav. 2013; 37(3):289–98. DOI: 10.5993/ajhb.37.3.1 [PubMed: 23985175]
8. Klabunde CN, Cronin KA, Breen N, Waldron WR, Ambs AH, Nadel MR. Trends in colorectal cancer test use among vulnerable populations in the United States. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2011; 20(8):1611–21. DOI: 10.1158/1055-9965.epi-11-0220 [PubMed: 21653643]
9. Coronado GD, Vollmer WM, Petrik A, et al. Strategies and Opportunities to STOP Colon Cancer in Priority Populations: Design of a cluster-randomized pragmatic trial. Contemp Clin Trials. 2014; 38(2):344–9. DOI: 10.1016/j.cct.2014.06.006 [PubMed: 24937017]
10. Seeff LC, Nadel MR, Klabunde CN, et al. Patterns and predictors of colorectal cancer test use in the adult U.S. population. Cancer. 2004; 100(10):2093–103. DOI: 10.1002/cncr.20276 [PubMed: 15139050]
11. Beydoun HA, Beydoun MA. Predictors of colorectal cancer screening behaviors among average-risk older adults in the United States. Cancer Causes Control. 2008; 19(4):339–59. DOI: 10.1007/s10552-007-9100-y [PubMed: 18085415]

12. Ioannou GN, Chapko MK, Dominitz JA. Predictors of colorectal cancer screening participation in the United States. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2003; 98(9):2082–91. DOI: 10.1111/j.1572-0241.2003.07574.x [PubMed: 14499792]
13. Halbert CH, Barg FK, Guerra CE, et al. Cultural, economic, and psychological predictors of colonoscopy in a national sample. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2011; 26(11):1311–6. DOI: 10.1007/s11606-011-1783-9 [PubMed: 21732197]
14. Hudson SV, Ferrante JM, Ohman-Strickland P, et al. Physician recommendation and patient adherence for colorectal cancer screening. *J Am Board Fam Med*. 2012; 25(6):782–91. DOI: 10.3122/jabfm.2012.06.110254 [PubMed: 23136316]
15. Braveman P, Egerter S, Williams DR. The social determinants of health: Coming of age. *Annual review of public health*. 2011; 32:381–98. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031210-101218
16. World Health Organization. Social determinants of health. 2016
17. Bazemore AW, Cottrell EK, Gold R, et al. "Community vital signs": incorporating geocoded social determinants into electronic records to promote patient and population health. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2016; 23(2):407–12. DOI: 10.1093/jamia/ocv088 [PubMed: 26174867]
18. DeVoe JE, Bazemore AW, Cottrell EK, et al. Perspectives in Primary Care: A Conceptual Framework and Path for Integrating Social Determinants of Health Into Primary Care Practice. *Ann Fam Med*. 2016; 14(2):104–8. DOI: 10.1370/afm.1903 [PubMed: 26951584]
19. Holden DJ, Harris R, Porterfield DS, et al. Enhancing the use and quality of colorectal cancer screening. Evidence report/technology assessment. 2010; (190):1–195. v.
20. Mehta SJ, Jensen CD, Quinn VP, et al. Race/Ethnicity and Adoption of a Population Health Management Approach to Colorectal Cancer Screening in a Community-Based Healthcare System. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2016; 31(11):1323–30. DOI: 10.1007/s11606-016-3792-1 [PubMed: 27412426]
21. Liss DT, Brown T, Lee JY, et al. Diagnostic colonoscopy following a positive fecal occult blood test in community health center patients. *Cancer Causes Control*. 2016; 27(7):881–7. DOI: 10.1007/s10552-016-0763-0 [PubMed: 27228991]
22. Petrik AF, Green BB, Vollmer WM, et al. The validation of electronic health records in accurately identifying patients eligible for colorectal cancer screening in safety net clinics. *Fam Pract*. 2016; doi: 10.1093/fampra/cmw065

Figure 1.
Screening by year overall, by FIT/FOBT, and by Colonoscopy

Table 1

Factors associated with being up-to-date for CRC screening at baseline by either FIT/FOBT or Colonoscopy

				Unadjusted (SE not cluster)	Adjusted*
		Total	% up to date		
Age	50-64	24558	31.5	< .0001	0.0001
	65-74	6729	39.5		
Gender	Female	17825	33.5	0.1618	0.0014
	Male	13462	32.8		
Ethnicity	Hispanic	3685	29.8	< .0001	
	Non-Hispanic	26849	33.9		
	Missing	753	22.4		
Language	English	25649	33.1	< .0001	
	Spanish	2853	29.3		
	Other	2448	40.6		
	Missing	337	20.8		
Race	White	26581	32.4	< .0001	
	African American	1540	37.0		
	Asian American/ Pacific Islander	1654	45.0		
	Native American	249	32.5		
	Mixed race/Other	204	25.0		
	Unknown/Missing	1059	29.6		
Insurance Status	Medicaid	8212	36.6	< .0001	0.0021
	Medicare	8584	39.3		
	Uninsured	9683	22.5		
	Commercial	4808	37.9		
Household Income	< 14,999	13865	32.4	< .0001	
	15,000 - 29,000	6039	30.5		
	30,000 - 44,999	1590	35.2		
	45,000 - 59,999	520	47.1		
	> 60,000	772	53.1		
	Unknown	8501	33.3		
Number of Office Visits in Past Year	1	7810	21.4	< .0001	0.0004
	2-5	17003	34.0		
	6 +	6474	45.2		
Chronic Health Conditions					
	Diabetes (Type II)	2970	33.0	0.8555	
	No	28317	33.2		
	Depression	6754	35.4	< .0001	
	No	24533	32.6		
	Substance Abuse	373	34.3	0.6400	
	No	30914	33.2		

*Final model accounts for correlation within clinic, assuming an independent correlation structure. Model is adjusted for Age Group, Gender, Insurance Status, Office Visits in the Past Year, Paps in past 3 years, Mammograms in past 2 years, and Flu Shots in Past Year

Other Screenings				Unadjusted (SE not cluster)	Adjusted*
		Total	% up to date		
Pap in past 3 years (50-64)		8448	39.4	< .0001	0.0002
	No	9377	28.2		
Mammograms in past 2 years (50-74)		5348	48.4	< .0001	0.0017
	No	12477	27.1		
Flu Shots in past YearY/N		10156	44.2	< .0001	< .0001
	No	21131	27.9		
Health Center	1	4267	36.9	< .0001	
	2	6618	50.0		
	3	3070	14.3		
	4	2007	11.9		
	5	2715	28.5		
	6	7543	34.7		
	7	4002	31.1		
	8	1065	16.8		
Community Vital Signs					
GINI Income Inequality Ratio	25th quartile	4867	32.9	< .0001	
	50% quartile	8195	35.6		
	75% quartile	4371	33.3		
	Missing	13854	31.8		
Unemploy- ment	25th quartile	7852	37.9	< .0001	
	50% quartile	15305	31.8		
	75% quartile	7735	31.2		
	Missing	395	30.9		
College Grad	25th quartile	7886	27.8	< .0001	
	50% quartile	15215	35.4		
	75% quartile	7795	34.4		
	Missing	391	30.7		
Pop Density	25th quartile	7764	31.5	< .0001	
	50% quartile	15391	33.3		
	75% quartile	7744	34.9		
	Missing	388	30.7		
1 mile Access	Yes	23964	33.3	0.5183	
	No	7323	32.9		
Urban Rural	Rural	7233	31.4	< .0001	
	Urban	7194	42.7		
	Cluster	16860	29.9		
ED Visits	25th quartile	10151	22.3	< .0001	
	50% quartile	13009	33.8		
	75% quartile	8006	46.1		
	Missing	121	26.4		

Table 2

Factors associated with FOBT/FIT compared to colonoscopy use among those up-to-date for CRC screening

				Unadjusted (SE not cluster)	Adjusted*
		Total Up to Date	% Screened by FIT		
Age	50-64	7726	44.5	0.0457	
	65-74	2655	37.6		
Gender	Female	5972	42.6	0.2609	
	Male	4409	42.9		
Ethnicity	Hispanic	1098	63.7	<.0001	
	Non-Hispanic	9114	40.3		
	Missing	169	36.7		
Language	English	8480	37.3	<.0001	0.0035
	Spanish	837	71.9		
	Other	994	65.1		
	Missing	70	30.0		
Race	White	8622	40.5	<.0001	
	African American	570	41.1		
	Asian American/ Pacific Islander	744	60.6		
	Native American	81	44.4		
	Mixed race/Other	51	31.4		
	Unknown/Missing	313	66.8		
Insurance Status	Medicaid	3009	44.4	<.0001	0.0011
	Medicare	3370	34.3		
	Uninsured	2178	65.5		
	Commercial	1824	28.5		
Household Income	< 14,999	4493	46.0	<.0001	
	15,000 - 29,000	1840	47.9		
	30,000 - 44,999	559	39.7		
	45,000 - 59,999	245	30.6		
	> 60,000	410	22.4		
	Unknown	2834	38.8		
Number of Office Visits in Past Year	1	1671	37.8	<.0001	0.0497
	2-5	5781	44.0		
	6 +	2929	43.1		
Chronic Health Conditions					
	Diabetes (Type II)	981	51.4	<.0001	
	No	9400	41.8		
	Depression	2388	40.5	<.0001	
	No	7993	43.4		
	Substance Abuse	128	46.1	0.9825	
	No	10253	42.7		

Other Screenings		Total Up to Date	% Screened by FIT	Unadjusted (SE not cluster)	Adjusted*
		Total Up to Date	% Screened by FIT		
Pap in past 3 years (50-64)		3330	44.8	0.0042	
	No	2642	39.8		
Mammograms in past 2 years (50-74)		2587	36.1	<.0001	
	No	3385	47.6		
Flu Shots in past Year/Y/N		4485	40.6	<.0001	0.0160
	No	5896	44.3		
Health Center	1	1576	27.3	<.0001	
	2	3312	30.5		
	3	438	48.2		
	4	238	79.4		
	5	773	51.0		
	6	2619	58.9		
	7	1246	47.1		
	8	179	40.8		
Community Vital Signs					
GINI Income Inequality Ratio	25th quartile	1602	45.9	<.0001	
	50% quartile	2918	38.0		
	75% quartile	1457	40.9		
	Missing	4404	45.3		
Unemploy- ment	25th quartile	2978	36.0	<.0001	
	50% quartile	4864	45.9		
	75% quartile	2417	44.5		
	Missing	122	45.9		
College Grad	25th quartile	2190	48.5	<.0001	
	50% quartile	5388	42.3		
	75% quartile	2683	38.7		
	Missing	120	46.7		
Pop Density	25th quartile	2444	38.1	<.0001	
	50% quartile	5118	42.1		
	75% quartile	2700	47.9		
	Missing	119	47.1		
1 mile Access	Yes	7974	43.8	<.0001	
	No	2407	39.2		
Urban Rural	Rural	2274	36.4	<.0001	
	Urban	3071	35.8		
	Cluster	5036	49.9		
ED Visits	25th quartile	2265	45.2	<.0001	
	50% quartile	4392	49.2		
	75% quartile	3692	33.6		
	Missing	32	46.9		

*Final model accounts for correlation within clinic, assuming an independent correlation structure. Model is adjusted for Age Group, Language, Insurance Status, Number of Office Visits in the Past Year, and Flu Shots in past Year

*Final model accounts for correlation within clinic, assuming an independent correlation structure. Model is adjusted for Age Group, Language, Insurance Status, Number of Office Visits in the Past Year, and Flu Shots in past Year