

Developing Catchment Area Data Dashboards for Cancer Centers: A Stakeholder-engaged Approach

Kalyani Sonawane, PhD, Ketki N Borse, MPH, Melanie Jefferson, PhD, MPH Haluk Damgacioglu, PhD, Matthew J Carpenter, PhD, John L. Pearce, PhD, Besim Ogretmen, PhD, Sophie Paczesny, MD, PhD, John P. O'Bryan, PhD, Jihad S. Obeid, MD, Marvella E Ford, PhD, Ashish A Deshmukh, PhD, MPH

Author affiliations: MUSC Hollings Cancer Center, Charleston, SC, USA (K Sonawane, K

Borse, M Jefferson, H Damgacioglu, MJ Carpenter, JL Pearce, B Ogretmen, S Paczesny, JP

O'Bryan, JS Obeid, ME Ford, AA Deshmukh)

Corresponding author: Kalyani Sonawane, PhD, Department of Public Health Sciences, College of Medicine, Medical University of South Carolina, 132 Cannon St, Room CS 303D, Charleston, SC, USA Tel: 843-876-1519, Fax: 843-876-1126, Email: sonawane@musc.edu

Word count: 3,287

Number of references: 14

Figure and Tables: 5

ABSTRACT

Background: Data dashboards that can communicate complex and diverse catchment area data effectively can transform cancer prevention and care delivery and strengthen community engagement efforts. Engaging stakeholders in data dashboard development, by seeking their inputs and collecting feedback, has the potential to maximize user-centeredness.

Objective: To describe a systematic, stakeholder-driven, and theory-based approach for developing catchment area data visualization tools for cancer centers.

Methods: Cancer-relevant catchment area data were identified from national- and state-level data sources (including cancer registries, national surveys, and administrative claims databases). A prototype tool for data visualization was designed, developed, and tested based on the *OPT-In* [Organize, Plan, Test, Integrate] framework. A working group of multi-disciplinary experts collected stakeholder feedback through formative assessment to understand data and design preferences. Thematic areas, data elements, and the composition and placement of data visuals in the prototype were identified and refined by working group members. Visualizations were rendered in Tableau[®] and embedded in a public-facing website. A mixed-method approach was used to assess the understandability and actionability of the tool and to collect open-ended feedback that informed action items for improvisation.

Results: We developed a visualization dashboard that illustrates cancer incidence and mortality, risk factor prevalence, healthcare access, and social determinants of health for the Hollings Cancer Center catchment area. Color-coded maps, time-series plots, and graphs illustrate these catchment area data. A total of 21 participants representing key stakeholders [general audience (n=4), community advisory board members and other representatives (n=7), and researchers (n=10)] were identified. The understandability and actionability scores exceeded the minimum (80%) threshold. Stakeholders' feedback confirmed that the tool is effective in communicating

cancer data and is useful for education and advocacy. Themes that emerged from qualitative data suggest that additional changes to the tool such as a warm color palette, data source transparency, and the addition of analytical features (data overlaying and area-resolution selection) would further enhance the tool. Integration of communication efforts and messages within a broader context is in progress.

Discussion: A catchment area data resource developed through a systematic, stakeholder-driven, and theory-based approach can meet (and surpass) benchmarks for understandability and actionability, and lead to an overall positive response from stakeholders. Creating channels for advocacy and forming community partnerships will be the next step necessary to promote policies and programs for improving cancer outcomes in the catchment areas.

1 INTRODUCTION

2 The idea of ‘cancer centers’ was first mentioned in the National Cancer Act of 1937.^{1, 2} About
3 four decades later, the National Cancer Act of 1971 formally established the definition of a
4 ‘cancer center’. Today there are a total of 72 National Cancer Institutes (NCI)-designated
5 centers across the US delivering cancer care and conducting cutting-edge cancer research and
6 clinical trials.³ All cancer centers are required to identify and serve a ‘catchment area’ defined as
7 geographic areas from which the majority of its patients are drawn including the local area
8 surrounding the facility.⁴

9 To best serve the needs of their catchment area, a clear understanding of cancer-specific data
10 (including, epidemiological patterns, and risk factor prevalence), and community- and systemic-
11 level drivers of health (healthcare access and social determinants) is critical for cancer centers
12 to allocate resources, improve program efficiency, and maximize their reach and impact.

13 Beginning in 2012, the NCI has mandated that designated cancer centers identify and describe
14 their catchment area and document ongoing research.⁵ However, the enormous volume of
15 catchment area data, its complexity, the variety of data types, and the dispersion of data
16 sources across federal and state agencies is a major challenge to synthesizing and relaying
17 meaningful insights. An even bigger challenge is to effectively present these data to
18 communities and a broad range of stakeholders (non-profit organizations, government
19 agencies, researchers, cancer center leadership, clinical trial offices, payers, policymakers, and
20 other groups - all with varying interests and expertise) to educate and empower them to take
21 action. Data visualization (or DataViz) dashboards are important tools for gaining valuable
22 insights from data.⁶ Data dashboards are widely used by industries and healthcare
23 organizations for business intelligence as well as for tracking and monitoring their
24 performance.^{7, 8} However, such dashboards remain untapped in the context of population health
25 and are rarely developed with the end goal of community education and outreach. The main

26 objective of this paper is to describe a systematic, stakeholder-driven, and theory-based
27 approach for developing and evaluating catchment area data visualization tools for cancer
28 centers. We present the approach, step-by-step, describing the personnel, material
29 investments, data sources, and tools used to implement the approach.

30

31 **METHODS**

32 Researchers at the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC) Hollings Cancer Center (HCC)
33 used a stakeholder-driven approach guided by a health communications framework. Cancer
34 center researchers and community stakeholders worked collaboratively to develop an
35 interactive catchment area data visualization dashboard, the South Carolina-Cancer
36 Surveillance for Population Health Research and Outreach Tool (SC-SPOT), which was tested
37 using a mixed-methods approach.

38 *Framework*

39 The tool development process followed the Organize, Plan, Test, and Integrate (OPT-In)
40 framework which is based on a variety of health communication theories and concepts (**Figure**
41 **1**).⁹ The framework describes four core steps for sharing complex data or topics with a lay
42 audience who may have a limited scientific background. A detailed description of the four steps
43 of the framework and workflow is described below.

44 **STEP 1 Organize:** This step aims to develop a clear understanding of data and identification of
45 end-users. A working group of multi-disciplinary experts including data analytics and
46 visualization experts, epidemiologists, geospatial modelers, population health researchers,
47 dissemination and implementation scientists, and community outreach and engagement experts
48 is ideal. This group is responsible for the curation of all relevant data elements. Key sources of

49 cancer-, sociodemographic-, census-, and healthcare-access-relevant data sources are
50 identified from gold-standard data sources (**Table 1**).

51 Making the tool user-centered is essential, therefore, continuously seeking input from the end-
52 users (i.e., stakeholders) is integral to tool development. Given that the pool of end-users for
53 catchment area data tools is broad, collaboration with diverse stakeholders is necessary. To
54 develop SC-SPOT, we gathered feedback from our Community Advisory Board (CAB) including
55 cancer patients, survivors, caregivers, representatives from non-profit organizations, payers,
56 policymakers, government agencies, HCC clinicians and researchers, and SC residents.

57 **STEP 2 Plan:** The emphasis of this phase is the strategic presentation of data/information to the
58 intended audience. This step is further broken down into four distinct processes: 1) Determining
59 the purpose for communication, 2) Analyzing the audience(s), 3) Considering the context in
60 which communication will occur, 4) Developing a preliminary product, and 5) Planning a strategy
61 to reach audiences.

62 First, working group members should identify the communication goal central to the catchment
63 area data tool. For instance, if the tool is primarily intended for dissemination and education
64 across a range of end-users, then emphasis on understandability and actionability is most vital.
65 If the tool is intended for researchers, administrators, and policymakers to quantify program or
66 policy impact, the analytic capabilities of the tool are critical. Based on this central goal, all
67 relevant audiences or end-users of the data should be identified. Third, contextual factors
68 including the ease of access, self-navigation, and health literacy level of end-users should be
69 carefully considered. A formative assessment can be conducted to identify relevant contextual
70 factors as well as stakeholders' priorities and preferences. Next, a prototype or minimum viable
71 product must be developed as a 'preliminary' product with necessary functional capabilities (for
72 example, data filtering, zooming (in and out of maps), search bars, and ready-to-download

73 visuals) for testing. Finally, a mode of delivery must be identified which will maximize audience
74 reach.

75 **STEP 3 Test:** This phase ascertains that the tool meets the communication goal. A mixed-
76 methods approach for testing prototypes will generate both quantitative and qualitative
77 endpoints. For instance, to test SC-SPOT, the HCC working group approached a set of naïve
78 (uninvolved in the formative process in Step 2) 21 stakeholders, which included HCC CAB
79 members, representatives from non-profit organizations, payers, policymakers, government
80 agencies, HCC clinicians and researchers, and SC residents, with varying levels of familiarity
81 with cancer-relevant data. For quantitative assessment, the use of an existing tool was deemed
82 necessary. To our knowledge, there are currently no tools in the literature specifically designed
83 to evaluate and test interactive data dashboards for stakeholder and community engagement.
84 Therefore, the working group adopted and implemented a modified version of an education
85 material assessment tool, known as the *Patient Education Material Assessment Tool (PEMAT)*,
86 developed by the Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality.¹⁰ The original *PEMAT* tool was
87 developed to test educational material (print [P] or audiovisual [A/V]) on two parameters—1)
88 Understandability (i.e., the education materials are *understandable* when users of diverse
89 backgrounds and varying levels of health literacy can process and explain key messages.), and
90 2) Actionability (i.e., the education materials are *actionable* when consumers of diverse
91 backgrounds and varying levels of health literacy can identify what they can do based on the
92 information presented). *PEMAT* consists of a 24-item questionnaire with two possible responses
93 agree (score=1) or disagree (score=0). We used a modified version of the *PEMAT* which
94 included 20 of the 24 items that were relevant to data visualizations. The final score was
95 calculated as a percentage (Total Points / Total Possible Points x 100), where a higher
96 percentage indicates greater understandability and actionability.¹¹ Next, to identify additional
97 areas for improvement and feedback that were not captured through quantitative assessment,

98 structured interviews with stakeholders were conducted. Interviews were transcribed and
99 analyzed to identify areas for improvement.

100 **STEP 4 Integrate:** The final step of the framework focuses on integrating communication efforts
101 and messages within a broader context of current scientific understanding. Emphasis on four
102 aspects is recommended—1) synchronous messaging, 2) provision for additional resources, 3)
103 providing a broader context to the data, and 4) directions for data usage. The emphasis on
104 synchronous messaging is to ensure a consistent message across different channels. For
105 example, the rates of new cancer cases presented on the tool should be consistent with cancer
106 statistics presented on other pages on the website (including pages beyond the web tool). The
107 provision for additional resources is to ensure users are provided or directed to resources
108 beyond the tool. For example, dashboards presenting data on screening-detectable cancers can
109 be accompanied by educational resources on cancer screening. Portraying information
110 accurately, clearly, and in a useful manner is critical to providing a broader context to the data.¹²
111 Emphasis on minimizing the cognitive burden, ensuring accessibility, and using audience-
112 tailored approaches will facilitate this aim. Finally, providing end-users guidance for correct
113 interpretation and usage is imperative. At a minimum, a description of how data points were
114 estimated and their inherent limitations can be specified.

115

116 **RESULTS**

117 *Organization, Planning, and Prototype Development*

118 The Working Group Members had recurring (bi-weekly) meetings to plan the process for
119 communicating catchment area data. Thematic areas, data elements, and the composition and
120 placement of the data visuals in the prototype were identified and finalized by the working group
121 and the stakeholders. The group members acknowledged that communication of such complex

122 data would require simplification through visuals and visual aids; therefore, a data visualization
123 tool would be the most appropriate channel for relaying catchment area data. All relevant data
124 elements were extracted from databases, transformed, and stored on a secured server. Data
125 were converted into a format readable in the visualization software (Tableau™). All visualizations
126 were developed and rendered in the *Tableau™* environment. The data visualization dashboards
127 are embedded on the HCC public-facing website. Interactivity is maintained using the *Tableau*
128 *Javascript* API. All interactive maps and graphics are color-blind friendly. All data visuals are
129 downloadable in commonly used formats (Image, PowerPoint, and Excel) to facilitate
130 dissemination. The working group recognized that sustainment of the tool beyond development
131 will require resources for maintenance and regular updates as new data become available. The
132 involvement of HCC leadership in the organization and planning process proved vital for gaining
133 support to sustain the tool.

134

135 The visualization dashboards describe state- and county-level cancer incidence, mortality rates,
136 calendar trends; burden (annual number of cases), the prevalence of risk factors, and social
137 determinants of health. Interactive catchment area maps are color-coded based on data
138 distribution to illustrate variation across geographic areas and to facilitate the identification of
139 underperforming areas (**Figure 2**). Data are presented at the most granular level available
140 (county or zip-code tabulation area), with area-specific data displayed as users hover over the
141 map. The dashboard also includes a search box where users can search for an area of interest.
142 Calendar-year trends spanning over 20 years (measured as annual percentage changes) are
143 illustrated using line graphs. Stratified data (race/ethnicity and sex-specific estimates) are
144 presented as bar graphs. Drop-down menus allow the selection of optional data visualizations.
145 For transparency regarding data sources, measures, and accuracy, an embedded document
146 describing these methodological details is incorporated in webpages. The publicly accessible

147 tool is available at [https://hollingscancercenter.musc.edu/outreach/sc-spot-south-carolina-](https://hollingscancercenter.musc.edu/outreach/sc-spot-south-carolina-cancer-data-statistics)
148 [cancer-data-statistics](https://hollingscancercenter.musc.edu/outreach/sc-spot-south-carolina-cancer-data-statistics).

149 *Testing*

150 Quantitative and qualitative assessments were conducted with 21 naïve stakeholders (7 CAB
151 members and other representatives, 10 clinicians and researchers, and 4 SC residents)
152 selected through purposive sampling, each given a 5–8-minute overview of the tool and an
153 opportunity to navigate the website. Data were collected using the modified *PEMAT* and open-
154 ended responses to questions regarding the overall appeal and areas for improvement.

155 Results of the quantitative assessments of SC-SPOT, including a detailed breakdown of the
156 modified *PEMAT* items and mean score, are presented in **Table 2**. The mean understandability
157 score was 14.75 (± 0.95 ; maximum possible 16 points). Mean actionability was 3.66 (± 0.50 ;
158 maximum possible 4 points).

159 Open-ended responses suggest that the tool effectively communicates cancer data and has the
160 potential for community education and advocacy. Additional areas of improvement that emerged
161 were the use of a warm color palette, the inclusion of details regarding data sources, and
162 providing benchmarks (i.e., presenting national-level data) for comparisons.

EXAMPLES OF STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK

Comments on Overall Appeal

“This tool will be **useful** to show what issues we face as a state.”
“I think the website is very **informative**, I would **share** it with my colleagues.”
“I guess that the visualization tool looks **appealing** in the sense that it is **professional**.”
“This can be a great tool for inter-programmatic **engagement and collaboration**”

Comments on Design

“I think that if they utilize a lot more **different colors** maybe instead of just dark blue, it will look better.”
“You do need some **better colors**.”
“I would like to see more **earth-tone colors** used on the website.”

Comments on Functionality

“I want to look at social determinants of health (risk factors) **interlaid** with cancer incidence (outcomes)”

“Having information by house and senate districts would be ideal for **advocacy.**”

“I would like to see how our state is doing **compared to others.**”

Areas for Improvement

“You should say where the data came from (**data source**)”

“I noticed there were **no percentage bars** for cervical cancer screening for American Indian and Hispanic women, does that mean no one underwent screening in those groups?”

163

164 *Integration*

165 Currently, in progress, the HCC working group plans to address the four recommended areas
166 for integration—synchronous messaging, provision for additional resources, providing a broader
167 context to the data, and directions for data usage—through an ad-hoc committee. The ad-hoc
168 committee is responsible for critically evaluating content on the website, including webpages
169 outside of the dashboard interface, to ensure that only high-quality evidence is cited and that
170 evidence-based strategies for cancer prevention, treatment, and survivorship are emphasized.
171 The committee is responsible for ensuring that information shared on these topics is consistent
172 across the web pages to maintain synchronicity in messaging. Additional resources will be
173 highlighted across the HCC’s web pages to navigate users beyond the visualization tool. These
174 will include 1) educational material on cancer screening, tobacco cessation, and cancer
175 survivorship, 2) options for scheduling mobile cancer screening and vaccinations, 3) identifying
176 oncologists, 4) resources for financial counseling, 5) genetic counseling information, and 6)
177 information for clinical trial participation. Additionally, two experts from the working group
178 responsible for demonstrating the tool will provide directions for data usage during presentations
179 to state agencies, non-profit organizations, and policymakers. Dissemination activities and
180 analytical data (as of June 2024) on users are summarized in **Table 3**.

181 **DISCUSSION**

182 With the increased importance of data-driven decision-making in medicine, community
183 engagement, and population health, there is a growing demand for tools that can efficiently and
184 effectively present complex data in an easy-to-digest format.⁶ Identification and characterization
185 of the cancer burden and contributing factors in catchment areas is a central goal across all NCI
186 Designated Cancer Centers.⁵ Remarkably, the need for catchment area data is intertwined with
187 the broader goal of improving the cancer center's community outreach and engagement. Thus,
188 catchment area data necessarily need to be accessible and useful to a wide audience
189 (communities, non-profit organizations, government agencies, researchers, clinical trial offices,
190 payers, policymakers, and other groups) with varying interests and expertise. Understanding
191 and incorporating the preferences and needs of these broad groups of end-users when
192 developing catchment area data resources is imperative.¹³ By actively engaging stakeholders
193 from its inception, we were able to generate an innovative catchment area data resource that
194 conforms with the needs of heterogeneous end-users. Furthermore, through validated tools and
195 qualitative data collection, we were also able to objectively quantify the understandability and
196 actionability of the tool and garner subjective feedback for improvisation.

197
198 Collaboration between population health researchers, basic scientists, clinicians, information
199 technology experts, and stakeholders is foundational for developing catchment area data
200 resources. For instance, the expertise of population health researchers and clinicians was
201 necessary to gather credible sources of data and identify metrics that accurately capture burden
202 and risk factors, and to create a blueprint of the data visualization dashboard. Identifying and
203 procuring cutting-edge information technology infrastructure (including storage, data
204 architecture, web design, and interactivity between the back end and public-facing components)
205 was essential for the efficient execution of the dashboards and ensuring a seamless end-user

206 experience. Achieving the delicate balance between information load and comprehension
207 integral to human-computer interaction would have been impossible to achieve without input
208 from key stakeholders. Each group brought unique strengths and perspectives which led to a
209 robust, easily accessible, and shareable user-centered catchment area data resource. Each
210 end-user can leverage the information to further strengthen their mission and/or to make
211 collective data-driven decisions.¹⁴

212

213 Based on spatial patterns observed in the data, community outreach, and engagement staff can
214 target geographic areas in need of intervention.⁵ Such activities could be tailored further by
215 understanding the sociodemographic composition of the target communities. Towards these
216 efforts, the catchment area data visualization tool could be used as a ‘primer’ for educating
217 members of these communities about cancer in their communities and to build trust and
218 confidence for engagement activities. Overall, within the context of community outreach,
219 catchment area data tools could substitute ‘needs assessment’ reports,¹⁵ a priori often
220 mandatory to justify effort allocation and guide the development of community action plans.
221 From the research standpoint, basic and population health scientists could leverage information
222 from the tool to describe the cancer burden and risk factor contribution to create a case for
223 research investments in understanding the basic biology and mechanisms, development of new
224 therapeutics, translational science, and developing, testing, and implementing medical
225 innovations and evidence-based interventions.

226

227 Recent federal mandates to capture and address social determinants of health emphasize the
228 need for healthcare providers and clinical staff to be aware and knowledgeable on relevant
229 metrics such as the built environment, healthcare access, socioeconomic standing, education,

230 and social factors (segregation, isolation, discrimination, and lack of social support) of their
231 catchment areas.¹⁶ Furthermore, at the health system level, catchment area data tools can also
232 be critical for executive leadership in creating a business case for expansion in medically
233 underserved areas or for planning and strategizing new programs and/or initiatives across the
234 healthcare enterprise.

235

236 Finally, the prospect of catchment area data visualization tools contributing to the development
237 and implementation of data-driven policies is promising. However, to achieve this end goal, it
238 may be necessary to first identify and define an issue and then present it to policymakers in a
239 compelling manner backed with data. Next, it will also be critical to invigorate advocacy at the
240 grassroots level to build and strengthen coalitions between stakeholders. Through
241 visualizations, catchment area data tools can also present compelling data stories which can be
242 useful for educating and communicating key takeaways to both policymakers and key
243 stakeholders such as non-profit organizations, coalitions, patient advocacy groups, and
244 community members.

245

246 Limitations of the data visualization tool should also be carefully considered. The data presented
247 on the visualization dashboard were collected by multiple federal- or state-level agencies,
248 employing specific data collection techniques (surveillance systems, telephone surveys, home
249 interviews, etc.). Each database has varying degrees of sensitivity, specificity, and limitations
250 inherent to the data collection process. For example, data from surveys are prone to recall bias
251 and social desirability bias. Mortality ascertainment is not possible for all cancer cases in cancer
252 registries. Strict patient confidentiality laws relevant to patient identifiers (including area of
253 residence) may limit the granularity of data visualization. Due to the disintegrated nature of

254 healthcare in the US and the lack of linkages across databases, having complete information on
255 individuals is not always possible. For instance, information on HIV/AIDS status, a major clinical
256 risk factor for certain cancers, is not available in cancer registries. Despite their limitations,
257 these data sources provide valid and reliable estimates relevant to the US population with
258 opportunities for data cross-linkage (e.g., HIV/AIDS registry linkage with cancer registry) when
259 necessary.

260

261 In conclusion, cancer centers in the US are key infrastructures for preventing, treating, and
262 eliminating cancers from US communities. In addition to providing cancer care, cancer centers
263 also shoulder the responsibility of community education, outreach, and engagement, advancing
264 research, and workforce training. The SC-SPOT tool created by the Hollings Cancer Center
265 exemplifies the importance of stakeholder engagement for creating catchment area data
266 resources. Taking this approach ensures that the end-users will have a seamless interactivity
267 experience, the cancer information is relayed effectively, and stakeholders gain actionable
268 insights. Generating a catchment area data resource, such as the SC-SPOT, is a necessary first
269 step. Making a measurable impact will require time, resources, and a long-term plan for
270 continuous outreach and advocacy by cancer centers.

271

272

273

274

275

276 **Funding/Support:** Research reported in this publication was supported by the US National
277 Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities under award number K01MD016440.
278 Additional support came from Hollings Cancer Center Cancer Control Seed Funds and the
279 National Cancer Institute under award number P30CA138313.

280 **Role of the Funders/Support:** The funders did not participate in the design and conduct of the
281 study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or
282 approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

283 **Acknowledgments:** We sincerely thank all stakeholders for their engagement and participation.
284 We would also like to thank Dan Rinder and William Morgenweck for providing development
285 support and Alexis Nuzzo, MPH for her help with proofreading the content.

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297 **REFERENCES**

- 298 1. Which cancer center was first? The answer depends on what you mean by “cancer
299 center”. Available from: https://cancerletter.com/in-the-archives/20210709_6/.
- 300 2. Vanderpool R, editor. Evolution of the Geographic Catchment Area Requirement in the
301 NCI Cancer Center Support Grant. 1st Annual Catchment Area Data Conference: Beyond
302 Definition; 2023; Richmond, VA, US.
- 303 3. National Cancer Institute: NCI-Designated Cancer Centers. Available from:
304 <https://www.cancer.gov/research/infrastructure/cancer-centers>.
- 305 4. National Cancer Institute: GIS Portal for Cancer Research. Available from:
306 <https://gis.cancer.gov/ncicatchment/>.
- 307 5. Paskett ED, Hiatt RA. Catchment Areas and Community Outreach and Engagement:
308 The New Mandate for NCI-Designated Cancer Centers. *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers &*
309 *Prevention*. 2018;27(5):517-9. doi: 10.1158/1055-9965.Epi-17-1050.
- 310 6. Chishtie J, Bielska IA, Barrera A, Marchand J-S, Imran M, Tirmizi SFA, Turcotte LA,
311 Munce S, Shepherd J, Senthinathan A, Cepoiu-Martin M, Irvine M, Babineau J, Abudiab S,
312 Bjelica M, Collins C, Craven BC, Guilcher S, Jeji T, Naraei P, Jaglal S. Interactive Visualization
313 Applications in Population Health and Health Services Research: Systematic Scoping Review. *J*
314 *Med Internet Res*. 2022;24(2):e27534. Epub 18.2.2022. doi: 10.2196/27534. PubMed PMID:
315 35179499.
- 316 7. Qaurooni D, Herr BW, 2nd, Zappone SR, Wojciechowska K, Börner K, Schleyer T. Visual
317 Analytics for Data-Driven Understanding of the Substance Use Disorder Epidemic. *Inquiry*.
318 2024;61:469580241227020. doi: 10.1177/00469580241227020. PubMed PMID: 38281107;
319 PMCID: PMC10823843.

- 320 8. Park S, Bekemeier B, Flaxman A, Schultz M. Impact of data visualization on decision-
321 making and its implications for public health practice: a systematic literature review. Informatics
322 for Health and Social Care. 2022;47(2):175-93. doi: 10.1080/17538157.2021.1982949.
- 323 9. National Cancer Institute: Making Data Talk: A Workbook.
- 324 10. Shoemaker SJ, Wolf MS, Brach C. Development of the Patient Education Materials
325 Assessment Tool (PEMAT): a new measure of understandability and actionability for print and
326 audiovisual patient information. Patient Educ Couns. 2014;96(3):395-403. Epub 20140612. doi:
327 10.1016/j.pec.2014.05.027. PubMed PMID: 24973195; PMCID: PMC5085258.
- 328 11. The Patient Education Materials Assessment Tool (PEMAT) and User's Guide. Available
329 from: <https://www.ahrq.gov/health-literacy/patient-education/pemat.html>.
- 330 12. Nelson DE, Spieker MR, Hesse BW. Communicating health data. PUBLIC HEALTH
331 YEARBOOK 2011. 2011:161.
- 332 13. Laplume AO, Sonpar K, Litz RA. Stakeholder Theory: Reviewing a Theory That Moves
333 Us. Journal of Management. 2008;34(6):1152-89. doi: 10.1177/0149206308324322.
- 334 14. Bispo JAB, Balise RR, Kobetz EK. Cancer Data Visualization: Developing Tools to Serve
335 the Needs of Diverse Stakeholders. Current Epidemiology Reports. 2023;10(3):125-31. doi:
336 10.1007/s40471-022-00285-w.
- 337 15. Neuber KA. Needs assessment: A model for community planning: Sage; 1980.
- 338 16. CMS Issues New Roadmap for States to Address the Social Determinants of Health to
339 Improve Outcomes, Lower Costs, Support State Value-Based Care Strategies [cited 2024
340 February]. Available from: [https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/press-releases/cms-issues-new-
341 roadmap-states-address-social-determinants-health-improve-outcomes-lower-costs](https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/press-releases/cms-issues-new-roadmap-states-address-social-determinants-health-improve-outcomes-lower-costs).

342

343

344

345 **TABLE 1:** Data elements, description of elements, and their sources.

DASHBOARD	DATA ELEMENT	DESCRIPTION	DATA SOURCE
Cancer Incidence	Incidence	Number of new cancer cases (overall and site-specific)	United States National Cancer Registries
	Cancer Mortality	Mortality	
Risk Factors	Colorectal Cancer screening	Percentage of eligible population up to date on screening	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, National Health Interview Survey
	Cervical Cancer Screening	Percentage of eligible population up to date on screening	
	Breast Cancer Screening	Percentage of eligible population up to date on screening	
	Alcohol Consumption	Proportion of adults who binge drink	
	Smoking Prevalence	Proportion of adults who are current smokers	
	Obesity Prevalence	Percentage of population with BMI ≥ 30	
	Physical Inactivity	Percentage of the adult population aged ≥ 18 years who are not doing any leisure time physical activity.	
	Sleep Deprivation	Percentage of adult population aged ≥ 18 years who are getting less than 7 hours of sleep	
	UV Irradiance	The Annual Average Daily Dose of UV Irradiance (J/m^2) quantifies the yearly accumulation of ultraviolet radiation per unit area, indicating the level of sun exposure.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Environmental Public Health Tracking Network
Social Determinants of Health	Social Vulnerability Index	Index quantifying the extent to which a community is socially vulnerable to disasters or disease outbreaks.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
	Index of Concentration at Extremes	An index that quantifies the extent to which wealth or poverty is concentrated within a given area, highlighting the distribution of economic advantage or disadvantage among the population.	National Cancer Institute
	Local Isolation Index	An index that assesses how much minority individuals primarily interact with others from	

		the same minority group, is calculated as the weighted average of the minority proportion in each area.	
	SES Measurement using YOST	YOST quintile evaluates socioeconomic status by placing individuals into quintiles based on their income, education, and occupation.	
Demographics	Age	Percentage of child, adult, and older adult population	US Census Bureau-Quick Facts, Population Estimates Program, American Community Survey
	Gender	Percentage of female population	US Census Bureau: Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates Program Data
	Race/Ethnicity	Percentage of population by race/ethnicity	
	Income and Poverty	Median Household income and percentage of population living in poverty	
	Chronic Health Conditions	Age-adjusted prevalence of leading chronic health conditions- Arthritis, Asthma, Hypertension	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey
	Any Disability	Percentage population with one or more disability	
	Currently Uninsured	Percentage of uninsured individuals	
	Health Status	The percentage of the population who reported fair or poor health status and experienced poor mental health for 14 days or more.	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion
	Housing Situation	Distribution of median gross rent and percentage of owner-occupied housing units.	US Census Bureau-Quick Facts*, American Community Survey

346 **Abbreviations:** BMI, Body Mass Index; UV, Ultraviolet; SES, Socioeconomic status
 347 *CDC-QuickFacts data are derived from: Population Estimates, American Community Survey, Census of Population and Housing,
 348 Current Population Survey, Small Area Health Insurance Estimates, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, State and County
 349 Housing Unit Estimates, County Business Patterns, Unemployment Statistics, Economic Census, Survey of Business Owners,
 350 Building Permits.
 351

352

353

354

355

TABLE 2: Understandability and actionability items adopted from the *PEMAT* and item-specific mean scores.

UNDERSTANDABILITY <i>Total Questions= 16 (Scoring: Agree=1; Disagree=0)</i>		SCORE <i>Mean±SD</i>
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This website is useful for understanding cancer data. The website does not include information or content that is distracting 	2±0
Word Choice & Style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The website uses common, everyday language. When used, medical terms were easy to interpret 	1.75±0.50
Use of Numbers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Numbers appearing on the website are clear and easy to understand. The website expects the user to perform calculations.* 	2±0
Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The website breaks or "chunks" data into short sections. The website sections have informative headers. The data presented on the website is confusing or not easy to understand.* The website provides a summary of cancer data 	3.5±0.58
Layout & Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The website uses visuals like arrows, boxes, bullets, bold, larger font, and colors 	1±0
Use of Visual Aids	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The material uses graphs, so data is easily understood (e.g., maps, bar graphs). The graphs make data interesting and reduce confusion. The graphs have clear titles or captions. The graphs are clear and uncluttered. The website design is appealing (color, fonts, shapes) 	4.5±0.58
ACTIONABILITY <i>Total Questions= 4 (Scoring: Agree=1; Disagree=0)</i>		
Information Seeking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I will use this website when I need cancer data 	1±0
Information Sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am likely to share this website with my family or friends if they need cancer data 	0.75±0.50
Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharing data with the public and community is important. The website will be useful to me and my community to advocate for better health or health care 	2±0

Abbreviations: PEMAT, Patient Education Material Assessment Tool; SD, Standard deviation

*Responses were reverse coded Agree=0; Disagree=1

TABLE 3: SC-SPOT dissemination activities and user analytics (as of June 2024).

DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES						
<i>Invited Presentations (including external and internal)</i>						
South Carolina Cancer Alliance Office of Senator Lindsay Graham BlueCross BlueShield of South Carolina South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control Office of Cancer Control American Medical Informatics Association Catchment Area Data Conference MUSC Social Determinants Of Health working group MUSC Enterprise Chief Digital Transformation Office MUSC Population Health Leadership Committee Hollings Cancer Center Executive Advisory Board Hollings Cancer Center Cancer Control Program Hollings Cancer Center Clinical Trials Office						
<i>News outlets/ Newsletters</i>						
WSBC News Fox News 24 Post and Courier Health IT Analytics AMIA Informatics Smartbrief						
USER ANALYTICS <i>(Data is for the period of 3/15/24-6/11/24)</i>						
PAGE	VIEWS	ACTIVE USERS	SESSIONS	ENGAGED SESSIONS	ENGAGEMENT RATE*	AVERAGE SESSION DURATION
Landing Page	779	439	633	348	54.91%	1:32
New Cancer Cases	278	167	225	192	85.33%	1:52
Social determinants	196	139	177	148	83.62%	1:39
Cancer-Related Deaths	118	92	113	99	87.61%	1:48
Cancer Risk Factors	107	78	97	86	88.66%	2:42
Demographics	73	56	75	64	85.33%	1:27
Health Care Access	57	44	51	44	86.27%	1:54
TOTAL	1608	541	834	448	86.14%	1:51

*Total engagement rate reflects engagement with dashboards (i.e., excludes landing page).

FIGURE LEGENDS


FIGURE 1: Framework for catchment area data visualization tool development.

The figure illustrates the OPT-In framework and outlines key activities during each phase.

FIGURE 2: The Hollings Cancer Center catchment area data dashboard.

The figure showcases key data visualization dashboards illustrating catchment area (i.e., the entire state of South Carolina) data for the Hollings Cancer Center: (A) Dashboard presents area-level variation, trends, and sociodemographic breakdown of cancer burden (i.e., incidence and mortality), (B) Dashboard illustrates the prevalence of risk factors and breakdown of prevalence by race and sex, (C) Dashboard captures key sociodemographic attributes of the catchment area population, and (D) Dashboard illustrates social determinants of health captured as composite measure illustrating vulnerability, segregation, isolation, and socioeconomic status.


OPT-In Framework*




Abbreviations: PEMAT, Patient Education Material Assessment Tool

*Adapted from: Nelson DE, Hesse BW, Croyle RT. Making Data Talk: Communicating Public Health Data to the Public, Policy Makers, and the Press. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 2009.


(A) Cancer Burden



(B) Risk Factors



(C) Sociodemographic Data



(D) Social Determinants of Health

