International Journal of
Cancer Care and Delivery

Conference Abstracts
Vol. 6, Issue Supplement 2, 2026

Hematologists Accept Regional Oncology Faculty Invitations at Almost Half the Rate of Other Cancer Specialists: An Analysis of 518 Invitations

Jin Mou, MD, MPH, MSc, PhD[1,a]; Angira Shah[1]; Divyanshu Kumar[2]; Weixuan Tang[3]; Daniel Su[4]; Elizabeth Damitio, BS[1]; Hemanta Neupane, MPH[1]; Bhawana Srivastava, BS, MBA[1]

[1] Binaytara, Bellevue, WA, USA
[2] University of Washington Bothell, Bothell, WA, USA
[3] Nanjing Foreign Language School, NanJing, Jiangsu, China
[4] University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

Corresponding author
[a] Jin Mou, MD, MPH, MSc, PhD, Binaytara, Bellevue, WA, USA
Email: jin.m@binaytara.org

Keywords: hematology workforce, faculty recruitment, continuing medical education, speaker invitation acceptance, geographic proximity

Submission received: 2026-08-15 / Accepted: 2026-08-25 / Published: 2026-09-18

https://doi.org/10.53876/001a.129842

Abstract

Background

Regional continuing medical education meetings depend on expert faculty availability. A documented national shortage of hematology specialists may constrain the recruitable pool differently than in solid tumor oncology.

Methods

We analyzed all 518 faculty invitations issued for eight regional meetings in 2025. Invitations were classified as hematology or non-hematology and characterized by gender, career stage, practice setting, and geographic proximity. Acceptance was compared using univariate and multivariate regression across the full cohort and within hematology.

Results

Of 518 invited, 105 (20.3%) were hematologists. Hematologists' acceptance was lower (29.5% vs 51.8%, p<0.001) than other cancer specialists, a deficit that persisted after adjustment for confounders (aOR 0.35, 95% CI 0.21-0.56). The deficit was consistent across every stratum examined, spanning 17.7 to 29.0 percentage points: women (27.5% vs 55.9%, p=0.001), men (30.8% vs 48.4%, p=0.012), early (38.2% vs 67.2%, p=0.002), mid (26.7% vs 48.3%, p=0.038) and established faculty (24.4% vs 44.7%, p=0.016), and both in-state (38.3% vs 59.7%, p=0.003) and out-of-state invitees (17.8% vs 36.4%, p=0.020). Cohort-wide, acceptance varied by career stage (60.7% early, 42.9% mid, 41.4% established; p<0.001) but not gender (χ^2=1.85, p=0.174). Within hematology, only in-state practice was associated with acceptance (38.3% vs 17.8%; aOR 3.09, 95% CI 1.19-7.99, p=0.020).

Conclusion

Hematologists accept regional faculty invitations at approximately half the rate of other cancer specialists, independent of measured covariates. Because proximity shows the strongest association with acceptance, hematology programming warrants geographically targeted selection, earlier outreach, deeper invitation lists, and hybrid participation options.

© 2021–2026 Binaytara. Website design and layout all rights reserved. Articles published in the International Journal of Cancer Care and Delivery are open access. Authors retain copyright. All articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0) license, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and derivative works are shared under the same license.