

Increasing Cancer Screening: Group Education - Breast Cancer

Summary Evidence Table

| Study | Location Intervention Comparison | Study population description Sample size | Effect measure | Reported baseline | Reported effect | Value used in summary [95%CI] | Follow- up time |
|---|---|--|--|----------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------|
| <p>Author (year): Aiken et al. (1994)</p> <p>Study Period: 1987-1989</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Study Design: Other design w.comparison group</p> <p>Quality of execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Screening: Mammography; Self report</p> | <p>Location: US, Phoenix AZ</p> <p>2 Intervention Arms:</p> <p>1. Education program alone aimed to increase perceived severity & decrease perceived barriers</p> <p>2. Interactive program included education program along with psychological program with 5 compliance exercises</p> <p>3. Comparison: No intervention</p> | <p>Study population: Women ages 35 and 74 years who had never been diagnosed with breast cancer. In addition participants were members of women’s community groups in the Phoenix metropolitan area, which were identified through lists of community organizations.</p> <p>Sample size: Education only: n= 81 Interactive: 101 Comparison: 113</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis? Yes</p> | <p>Proportion of women reporting completion of mammography screening</p> | <p>16.7%</p> | <p>41.1%</p> | <p>+24.4 pct pts 95% CI: (11, 38)</p> | <p>6 months</p> |

| Study | Location Intervention Comparison | Study population description Sample size | Effect measure | Reported baseline | Reported effect | Value used in summary [95%CI] | Follow- up time |
|--|--|---|--|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| <p>Author (year): Agho et al. (2007)*</p> <p>Study Period: Pre: 1995, Post 1997</p> <p>Design Suitability: Least</p> <p>Study Design: Pre-post</p> <p>Quality of execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Screening: Mammography</p> <p>Record Review: County level mammography rates</p> | <p>Location: US, Florida</p> <p>Intervention: Group Education (lessons on SBE techniques, video presentation, discussion)</p> <p>Comparison: Pre- intervention period</p> | <p>Study population: African American women ages 65 and older residing in Florida counties (Bay, Gadsen, Jackson, and Leon), who had received at least one mammogram during the time period</p> <p>Sample size: Not reported</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis? Yes</p> | County level mammography rates (Took median for all counties) | 76.2 | 76 | -0.2 pct pts | 24 months |
| <p>Author (year): Bowen et al. (2006)*</p> <p>Study Period: NR</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Study Design: iRCT</p> <p>Quality of execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Screening: Mammography; Self report</p> | <p>Location: US, Seattle, WA</p> <p>Intervention: Group Education (four weekly sessions that covered one of four themes, including: risk assessment & education; breast cancer screening; stress management; and social support)</p> <p>Comparison: Delayed intervention (received the intervention after 24 month follow up)</p> | <p>Study Population: Self identified lesbian or bi- sexual women between the ages of 18 and 74, healthy, and had no personal history of breast or ovarian cancer. They also had to reside within 60 miles of Seattle, Washington</p> <p>Sample Size: n=150</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis? Yes</p> | Proportion of women reporting receipt of a mammogram | I: 75% C: 75% | I: 87% C: 75% | + 12 pct pts 95%CI: (-1, 25) | 24 months |

| Study | Location Intervention Comparison | Study population description Sample size | Effect measure | Reported baseline | Reported effect | Value used in summary [95%CI] | Follow- up time |
|--|---|--|---|----------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------|
| <p>Author (year): Erwin et al. (1996)</p> <p>Study Period: 1993-1994</p> <p>Design Suitability: Least</p> <p>Study Design: Pre-post</p> <p>Quality of execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Sreening: Mammography; Self report</p> | <p>Location: US, Arkansas</p> <p>Intervention: Interactive education program, which relied on witness role models (African American survivors of breast or cervical cancer)</p> <p>Comparison: Pre intervention period</p> | <p>Study population:</p> <p>Sample size: n= 152</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis? Yes</p> | <p>Proportion of women reporting receipt of a mammogram</p> | <p>52.7%</p> | <p>63.6%</p> | <p>+10.9 pct pts 95% CI: (-0.1, 22)</p> | <p>6 months</p> |

| Study | Location Intervention Comparison | Study population description Sample size | Effect measure | Reported baseline | Reported effect | Value used in summary [95%CI] | Follow- up time |
|---|--|---|--|----------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------|
| <p>Author (year): Hurdle (2007)*</p> <p>Study Period: Not reported</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Study Design: Other design with concurrent comparison</p> <p>Quality of execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Screening: Mammography; Self report</p> | <p>Location: US, Northwest</p> <p>Intervention: An educational intervention that promote the health of older women, particularly breast health. Participants attended two one-hour educational sessions(1 wk apart), which included mini-lectures, brainstorming about positive health practices, developing a personal wellness plan, and performing a breast exam on a model. Also emphasized social support using a "buddies" system.</p> <p>Comparison: No intervention</p> | <p>Study population: Women living in a northwestern city who attended community- based organizations for seniors or lived in senior residence facilities.</p> <p>Sample size: Completed the pre-test: n = 158 (not reported by study arm)</p> <p>Completed the post test: Intervention: n = 70 Comparison: n=20</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis? Yes</p> | Proportion of women reporting receipt of a mammogram | NR | I: 90% C: 46.9% | +43.1 pct pts 95% CI: (25.4, 60.6) | 6 months |

| Study | Location Intervention Comparison | Study population description Sample size | Effect measure | Reported baseline | Reported effect | Value used in summary [95%CI] | Follow- up time |
|---|---|---|---|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| <p>Author (year): King et al. (1998)</p> <p>Study Period: 9/1993 – 2/1995</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Study Design: gRCT</p> <p>Quality of execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Screening: Mammography; Self Report</p> | <p>Location: US, Pennsylvania, North Carolina</p> <p>Intervention: Interactive education program designed to overcome misconceptions about mammography and breast cancer + video and Q & A project</p> <p>Comparison: Usual care</p> | <p>Study population: Senior citizens’ housing facilities in Philadelphia and North Carolina, which housed at least 40 women ages 65 – 84 years in independent living housing. They had to provide contact information, and they could not have had an education program or mobile mammography during the preceding 2 years.</p> <p>Sample size: Facilities: n=40 Intervention: n=115</p> <p>Comparison: n=122</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis? Yes</p> | <p>Proportion of women reporting receipt of a mammogram</p> | <p>NR</p> | <p>I: 18% C: 13%</p> | <p>+5 pct pts (-4, 14)</p> | <p>6 months</p> |

| Study | Location Intervention Comparison | Study population description Sample size | Effect measure | Reported baseline | Reported effect | Value used in summary [95%CI] | Follow- up time |
|--|--|--|--|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|
| <p>Author (year): Larkey (2006)*</p> <p>Study Period: NR 12 weeks</p> <p>Design Suitability: Least</p> <p>Study Design: Pre-post</p> <p>Quality of execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Screening: Mammography; Self report</p> | <p>Location: US, Phoenix, AZ</p> <p>Intervention: A standard Promotora led classroom formatted education session which addressed five cancer screening objectives such as: increasing fruits and vegetable intake, physical activity, and achieving compliance with mammography, pap test, and FOBT.</p> <p>Comparison: Pre-intervention period</p> | <p>Study population: Women 18 years and older, residing in the Phoenix metropolitan area.</p> <p>Sample Size: Overall n = 366 Mammogram n = 234</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis? No</p> | <p>Proportion of women reporting receipt of a mammogram</p> | <p>58.1%</p> | <p>70.9%</p> | <p>+12.8 pct pts 95% CI: 4.2, 21.4</p> | <p>3 months</p> |
| <p>Author (year): Lopez et al. (2006)*</p> <p>Study Period: NR 12 months</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Study Design: gRCT</p> <p>Quality of execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Screening: Mammography; Self Report</p> | <p>Location: US, Phoenix, AZ</p> <p>Intervention: Interactive education sessions delivered by Promotoras who were members of the selected churches and who had recruited participants</p> <p>Comparison: Family mental health education sessions, also delivered by Promotoras</p> | <p>Study population: Low acculturated, low income Hispanic women 18 years and older, residing in the Phoenix metropolitan area.</p> <p>Sample Size: Churches: n =14</p> <p>Participants: Intervention n = 283 Comparison n = 164</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis? Yes</p> | <p>Odds ratio of women reporting receipt of a mammogram relative to the comparison group</p> | <p>NR</p> | <p>Group Level: OR: 0.82 (95% CI: 0.44, 1.56)</p> <p>Participant s: OR: 1.31 (95% CI: 0.99, 1.74)</p> | <p>0.82 95% CI: 0.44, 1.56</p> <p>1.31 95% CI: 0.99, 1.74</p> | <p>12 months</p> |

| Study | Location Intervention Comparison | Study population description Sample size | Effect measure | Reported baseline | Reported effect | Value used in summary [95%CI] | Follow- up time |
|--|--|---|--|---------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| <p>Author (year): Maxwell et al. (2003)</p> <p>Study Period: 2/1998 – 2/2000</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Study Design: gRCT</p> <p>Quality of execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Screening: Mammography; Self-report</p> | <p>Location: US, California</p> <p>Intervention: Small group education about breast and cervical cancer screening; culturally Filipino American women and facilitated by Filipino American female healthcare workers</p> <p>Comparison: Same program with content focus on physical activity</p> | <p>Study population: Filipino women over the age of 40, recruited by community based organizations in Los Angeles County, California</p> <p>Sample size: Intervention: n= 213 Comparison: n=234</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis? Yes</p> | Proportion of women reporting receipt of a mammogram | Mammo: I: 47% C:48% | Mammogra phy: I: 59 C: 57 | Mammograph y: +3 pct pts 95% CI: (-6, 12) | 12 months |
| <p>Author (year): Mishra et al. (2007)*</p> <p>Study Period: 7/1998 – 6/2001</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Study Design: gRCT</p> <p>Quality of execution: Good</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Screening: Mammography; Self report</p> | <p>Location: US, Southern California</p> <p>1 intervention arm</p> <p>Intervention: Specially developed English and Samoan language breast cancer education booklets; skill building and behavioral exercises; and interactive group discussion sessions</p> <p>Comparison: Provided with breast cancer educational materials after the posttest surveys (usual care)</p> | <p>Study Population: Women of Samoan ancestry attending Samoan-speaking churches in two contiguous southern CA counties (Los Angeles and Orange), who were 42 years or older, and had no mammogram within the past 2 years</p> <p>Sample size: Intervention: Churches: n = 32 Participants: n = 391 Comparison: Churches: n = 29 Participants: 385</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis? Yes</p> | Absolute difference in proportion of women reporting the receipt of a mammogram relative to the comparison | NR | I: 47% C: 39% | +8 pct pts (0.8, 15.2) | 35 months |

| Study | Location Intervention Comparison | Study population description Sample size | Effect measure | Reported baseline | Reported effect | Value used in summary [95%CI] | Follow- up time |
|--|--|--|--|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| <p>Author (year): Mishra et al. (1998)</p> <p>Study Period: NR ~ 10 weeks</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Study Design: iRCT</p> <p>Quality of execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Screening: Mammography; Self report</p> | <p>Location: US, Orange County, CA</p> <p>1 intervention arm</p> <p>Intervention: Four interactive sessions addressing different aspects of breast cancer prevention. Women received \$25 for each session they attended.</p> <p>Comparison: No intervention</p> | <p>Study population: Women of Latino/Hispanic heritage ages 37 years and older who had not obtained a mammogram in the past 2 years, had never been taught BSE, and who had never experienced breast cancer</p> <p>Sample size: I: n=51 C: n=37</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis? Yes</p> | Absolute difference in proportion of women reporting receipt of a mammogram relative to comparison | NR | I: 10% C: 11% | -1 pct pts 95% CI: (-14, 12) | ~8 weeks |
| <p>Author (year): Navarro et al. (1998)</p> <p>Study Period: NR ~ 12 weeks</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Study Design: gRCT</p> <p>Quality of execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Screening: Mammography; Self report</p> | <p>Location: US, San Diego CA</p> <p>1 intervention arm</p> <p>Intervention: 12 weekly small group education sessions about breast cancer screening (sessions conducted by Consejeras or Latina women recruited to receive health education training) in their natural social networks</p> <p>Comparison: Received generic community living skills education</p> | <p>Study population: Women ages 18 to 72 years were recruited by the Consejeras to participate in the program, and were randomly assigned to the intervention or comparison group.</p> <p>Sample size: I: 199 C: 162</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis? Yes</p> | Absolute difference in proportion of women who reported receiving a mammogram relative to the comparison | I: 30.4 C: 24.6 | I: 56.4 C: 43.6 | +7 pct pts 95%CI: (-3, 18) | ~ 12 weeks |

| Study | Location Intervention Comparison | Study population description Sample size | Effect measure | Reported baseline | Reported effect | Value used in summary [95%CI] | Follow- up time |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| <p>Author (year): Skinner et al. (2000)</p> <p>Study Period: 2/1995 – 3/1997</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Study Design: Other design</p> <p>Quality of execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed Screening: Mammography; Self report</p> | <p>Location: US, St. Louis MO</p> <p>1 intervention arm</p> <p>Intervention: Group education sessions led by healthcare professionals (Learn, Share, and Live) designed to promote understanding about breast cancer and screening</p> <p>Comparison: Usual care</p> | <p>Study population: Elderly women affiliated with the System to Assure Elder Services program at one of two sites</p> <p>Sample size: I: n = 69 C: n = 83</p> <p>Intent to treat Analysis? Yes</p> | Absolute difference in proportion of women reporting receipt of a mammogram relative to the comparison group. | I: 49% C: 57% | I: 68% C: 52% | +24 pct pts | 24 months |

*From the updated search period.

Abbreviations

C, Control
gRCT, group randomized controlled trial
iRCT, individual randomized controlled trial
I, Intervention
NR, not reported