

# Increasing Cancer Screening: Group Education - Colorectal 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><b>Author (year):</b> Larkey (2006)*</p> <p><b>Study Period:</b> NR 12 weeks</p> <p><b>Design Suitability:</b> Least</p> <p><b>Study Design:</b> Pre-post</p> <p><b>Quality of execution:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Outcome Measurement:</b> Completed Screening: Mammography; Self report</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> US, Phoenix AZ</p> <p><b>Intervention:</b> 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><b>Comparison:</b> Pre- intervention period</p>	<p><b>Study population:</b> Women 18 years and older, residing in the Phoenix metropolitan area.</p> <p><u>Sample Size:</u></p> <p><b>Overall</b> n = 366</p> <p><b>FOBT</b> n =186</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis: No</p>	Proportion of completed FOBT determined by returned FOBT kits	9.1%	12.9%	+3.8 pct pts 95% CI: -2.5, 10.1	3 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><b>Author (year):</b> Weinrich et al. (1993)</p> <p><b>Study Period:</b> Fall 1990 – Spr 1991</p> <p><b>Design Suitability:</b> Greatest</p> <p><b>Study Design:</b> Group randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Quality of execution:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Outcome Measurement:</b> Completed Screening: FOBT; Lab test</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> US, South Carolina</p> <p><b>3 intervention arms</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elderly health educator led didactic training using “traditional method” (EE)</li> <li>2. Didactic training, which used techniques to modify the ACS presentation to accommodate for normal aging process (AAC)</li> <li>3. EE + AAC</li> </ol> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Standard ACS presentation &amp; handout about colorectal cancer</p>	<p><b>Study population:</b> Participants at South Carolina’s Council on Aging’s Congregate meal sites who could consent for an interview.</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> n = 171 (not reported by group)</p> <p>Intent to Treat Analysis: No</p>	Proportion of completed FOBT determined by returned FOBT kits 6 days after interview, relative to the comparison site.	NR	<p>EE: 61%</p> <p>AAC: 43%</p> <p>EE + AAC: 93%</p> <p>Comparison: 56%</p>	<p>EE: +5 pct pts (p&lt;0.01)</p> <p>95% CI: (-14.6, 24.6)</p> <p>AAC: -13 pct pts (p&lt;0.05)</p> <p>95% CI: (-34.3, 8.3)</p> <p>EE + AAC: +37 pct pts (p&lt;0.01)</p> <p>95% CI: (19.2, 54.8)</p>	~6 days

\*From the updated search period.