



May 6, 2025
House Insurance Committee

Dear Chair Lampton, Vice Chair Craig, Ranking Member Tims, and members of the House Insurance Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of bipartisan HB 33, a bill that aligns prostate cancer screening coverage with clinical guidelines and removes the cost barrier to screening for high-risk men.

In Ohio this year, the American Cancer Society estimates that there will be 10,820 new cases of prostate cancer and 1,160 men that will die from the disease.¹ Studies show that PSA testing reduces prostate cancer deaths,² but Ohio's PSA testing rate decreased from 54.4 percent in 2010 to 32 percent in 2020,³ and recent declines in screening rates have corresponded to a 42 percent increase in late stage prostate cancer.^{4,5}

According to researchers in Ohio, the men at highest risk for late-stage prostate cancer are economically disadvantaged men and Black men,⁶ who are less likely to be screened if they have higher deductibles,⁷ no coverage, or financial barriers to care.⁸ Cost has been cited as a barrier to access in surveys of high-risk men and in systematic reviews on factors influencing prostate cancer screening behavior.^{9,10} Cost sharing, even at modest levels, dissuades men from seeking preventive care if they can't afford it or assume screening is optional because the insurer doesn't fully cover the cost of it.¹¹ More than 75 percent of patients face out-of-pocket expenses for diagnostic testing for prostate cancer, and these costs are associated with costly delays in diagnosis and treatment.¹² Ninety-six percent of men don't discuss costs with their doctors,¹³ but doctors and patients make screening decisions based on cost assumptions.¹⁴

HB 33 will help combat the rise in late-stage cancer and detect cancer earlier in high risk men, containing costs, improving outcomes, and saving lives in the long run. Researchers have found that removing cost-sharing can increase screening rates by up to 25 percent,¹⁵ providing a rationale for insurers to cover the cost of prostate cancer screening to offset treatment costs. Treatment for late-stage cancer is, on average, \$309,000 more expensive compared to early-stage disease,¹⁶ and each prevented death would save \$125,200.¹⁷ Among men aged 55-69, research shows that screening 1000 men should detect 3 late-stage cases early,¹⁸ and screening 385 men should save one life.¹⁹ Based on these figures, we estimate that HB 33 could prevent 118 deaths, 404 late-stage cases, and over \$139 million in avoided late-stage treatment costs and lost earnings over 26 years.

HB 33 standardizes screening access for privately insured men, who are the largest pool of high-risk men, to contain costs through improved early detection. HB 33 aligns Ohio with the majority of states²⁰ that require private insurers to cover screening for high-risk men who need to be screened according to nationally recognized clinical practice guidelines from the American Cancer Society, American Urological Association, and National Comprehensive Cancer Network. In analyzing similar legislation, Kentucky,²¹ Maryland,²² Tennessee,²³ Texas,²⁴ and Virginia²⁵ found no significant impact on premiums or state budgets, with Kentucky anticipating long-term savings via improved screening access. For these reasons, 9 states have removed the cost barrier to screening,²⁶ and Alabama, Maine, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Texas are considering similar legislation this year.

We ask you to vote for HB 33 to reduce the number of Ohio families who lose precious time to this disease - and to ensure that every Ohioan has access to the care they need to stay healthy. Thank you, and please follow up with me with any questions.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Georgia Bates". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Georgia Bates
State Government Relations & Advocacy Manager, ZERO Prostate Cancer

1 Cancer Facts & Figures 2025, American Cancer Society.

2 Howrey, B. T., Kuo, Y. F., Lin, Y. L., & Goodwin, J. S. (2013). The impact of PSA screening on prostate cancer mortality and overdiagnosis of prostate cancer in the United States. *The journals of gerontology. Series A, Biological sciences and medical sciences*, 68(1), 56–61. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/gls135>

3 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Survey Data. Atlanta, Georgia: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, [2012, 2020]]

4 Plambeck, B. D., Wang, L. L., McGirr, S., Jiang, J., Van Leeuwen, B. J., Lagrange, C. A., & Boyle, S. L. (2022). Effects of the 2012 and 2018 US preventive services task force prostate cancer screening guidelines on pathologic outcomes after prostatectomy. *The Prostate*, 82(2), 216–220. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pros.24261>

5 Kelly, S. P., Anderson, W. F., Rosenberg, P. S., & Cook, M. B. (2018). Past, Current, and Future Incidence Rates and Burden of Metastatic Prostate Cancer in the United States. *European urology focus*, 4(1), 121–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2017.10.014>

6 Jennifer Cullen et al., Twenty-year patterns in area deprivation index and risk of metastatic prostate cancer at initial diagnosis among men in Ohio.. *JCO* 41, 10526-10526(2023).

7 Peña VN, Obiora D, Kypriotis C, et al. High-Deductible Health Plan Enrollment and Prostate Cancer Screening Rates. *JAMA Health Forum*. 2025;6(3):e250180. doi:10.1001/jamahealthforum.2025.0180

8 Zhao, G., Okoro, C. A., Li, J., & Town, M. (2018). Health Insurance Status and Clinical Cancer Screenings Among U.S. Adults. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 54(1), e11–e19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2017.08.024>

9 Vapiwala, N., Miller, D., Laventure, B., Woodhouse, K., Kelly, S., Avelis, J., Baffic, C., Goldston, R., & Glanz, K. (2021). Stigma, beliefs and perceptions regarding prostate cancer among Black and Latino men and women. *BMC public health*, 21(1), 758. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10793-x>

10 Kim KM, Kim JH. Individual and Socioeconomic Affecting Factors for Prostate Cancer Screening Behavior. *World J Mens Health*. 2024 Sep;42:e85. <https://doi.org/10.5534/wjmh.240110>

11 Farabi, H., Moradi, N., Ahmadzadeh, A., Agamir, S. M. K., Mohammadi, A., & Rezapour, A. (2023). Factor associated with willingness to pay for prevention of cancer: a study of prostate cancer screening. *Cost effectiveness and resource allocation : C/E*, 21(1), 89. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12962-023-00494-0>

12 Srivastava, A., Tilea, A., Kim, D. D., Dalton, V. K., & Fendrick, A. M. (2024). Out-of-pocket costs for diagnostic testing following abnormal prostate cancer screening among privately insured men. *Cancer*, 130(19), 3305–3310. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cnrc.35392>

13 Benedetti, Nancy J.; Fung, Vicki PhD; Reed, Mary DrPH; Price, Mary MA; Brand, Richard PhD; Newhouse, Joseph P. PhD; Hsu, John MD, MBA, MSCE*. Office Visit Copayments: Patient Knowledge, Response, and Communication With Providers. *Medical Care* 46(4):p 403-409, April 2008. | DOI: 10.1097/MLR.0b013e31815c3192

14 Gunn CM, Li EX, Gignac GA, et al. Delivering Genetic Testing for Patients with Prostate Cancer: Moving Beyond Provider Knowledge as a Barrier to Care. *Cancer Control*. 2023;30. doi:10.1177/10732748221143884

15 Bitler, Marianne P., and Christopher S. Carpenter. 2016. "Health Insurance Mandates, Mammography, and Breast Cancer Diagnoses." *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 8 (3): 39-68.

16 McGarvey, N., Gitlin, M., Fadli, E., & Chung, K. C. (2022). Increased healthcare costs by later stage cancer diagnosis. *BMC health services research*, 22(1), 1155. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-08457-6>

17 Islami F, Miller KD, Siegel RL, et al. National and State Estimates of Lost Earnings From Cancer Deaths in the United States. *JAMA Oncol*. 2019;5(9):e191460. doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2019.1460

18 US Preventive Services Task Force, Grossman DC, Curry SJ, et al. Screening for Prostate Cancer: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. *JAMA* 2018; 319(18):1901–1913.

19 Shoag, J. E., Nyame, Y. A., Gulati, R., Etzioni, R., & Hu, J. C. (2020). Reconsidering the Trade-offs of Prostate Cancer Screening. In *New England Journal of Medicine* (Vol. 382, Issue 25, pp. 2465–2468). Massachusetts Medical Society. <https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmsb2000250>

20 AL, AK, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, DC, GA, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MN, MO, NV, NJ, NY, NC, ND, OK, OR, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, VT, VA, WA, WV

21 Kentucky Department of Insurance. (2024, February 9). Financial Impact Statement on HB 52. <https://apps.legislature.ky.gov/recoxddocuments/note/24RS/hb52/HCS1HM.pdf>

22 Steffen, B. (2020, January 28). Request for Cost Estimate to Eliminate Cost Sharing for Prostate Cancer Screening. [https://www.scstatehouse.gov/CommitteeInfo/ProstateCancerStudyCommittee/MHCC%20Transmittal%20Letter%20PSA%20screening%20\(2\).pdf](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/CommitteeInfo/ProstateCancerStudyCommittee/MHCC%20Transmittal%20Letter%20PSA%20screening%20(2).pdf)

23 Carsner, K. L. (2024). Fiscal Note HB 2954 - SB 2883. <https://www.capitol.tn.gov/Bills/113/Fiscal/HB2954.pdf>

24 Legislative Budget Board, Cortez, & McGinty, J. (2025). Fiscal Note, 89th Legislative Regular Session. In J. Dean, House Committee on Insurance. <https://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/89R/fiscalnotes/pdf/HB00712I.pdf#navpanes=0>

25 Bureau of Insurance [Bradley Marsh]. (2024, August 12). Step Two Assessments [Slide show]. Virginia Assembly Interim Studies & Commission Listings. https://studiesVirginiaGeneralAssembly.s3.amazonaws.com/meeting_docs/documents/000/002/095/original/24.08.12_-_HIRC_Presentation_-_Step_Two.pptx?1723484782

26 VA, TN, KY, DE, DC, OR, IL, RI, MD, NY