

# Increasing Cancer Screening: Mass Media Targeting Clients - Breast Cancer

## Summary Evidence Table

Study	Location Intervention Comparison	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Follow-up time																																					
<p><b>Author (year):</b> Blumenthal 2005</p> <p><b>Study Period:</b> 1994-1996</p> <p><b>Design Suitability:</b> Greatest</p> <p><b>Study Design:</b> Quasi-experimental</p> <p><b>Quality of Execution:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Outcome Measurement:</b> Completed cervical, breast and colorectal cancer screening (based on a survey of screening test use)</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> US, urban settings in Georgia and Tennessee</p> <p>Two intervention cities: one with higher intensity mass media (I<sub>1</sub>) and one with lower intensity mass media (I<sub>2</sub>). Both sites received common intervention components (kickoff event, educational sessions, newsletters and bulletins, health fairs). Also in I<sub>1</sub>: Mass media (messages on city bus, newspaper ads and/or articles, radio and/or TV programs and PSA's) Also in I<sub>2</sub>: campus newspapers, yard signs (not successful since few property owners allowed signs). Two additional</p>	<p><b>Study Population:</b> African-American adults living in census tracts with a high proportion of African-American residents.</p> <p><b>Sample size:</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="630 649 963 812"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Pre-intervention n</th> <th>Post-intervention n</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>I<sub>1</sub></td> <td>967</td> <td>971</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I<sub>2</sub></td> <td>987</td> <td>988</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Pre-intervention n	Post-intervention n	I <sub>1</sub>	967	971	I <sub>2</sub>	987	988	<p>Absolute change in cervical, breast and colorectal cancer screening.</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1119 406 1488 617"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>I<sub>1</sub></th> <th>I<sub>2</sub></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pap w/in 2 y</td> <td>79.0%</td> <td>83.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CBE w/in 2 y</td> <td>82.9%</td> <td>88.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAM w/in 2 y</td> <td>68.5%</td> <td>65.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FOBT ever</td> <td>54.3%</td> <td>54.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proct ever</td> <td>27.8%</td> <td>28.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		I <sub>1</sub>	I <sub>2</sub>	Pap w/in 2 y	79.0%	83.8%	CBE w/in 2 y	82.9%	88.2%	MAM w/in 2 y	68.5%	65.9%	FOBT ever	54.3%	54.3%	Proct ever	27.8%	28.4%	<p>Diff in Differences between I<sub>1</sub> and I<sub>2</sub></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1488 487 1858 649"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pap</td> <td>4.7 pct pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CBE</td> <td>4.2 pct pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAM</td> <td>-2.4 pct pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FOBT</td> <td>-4.7 pct pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proct</td> <td>-8.0 pct pts</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Pap	4.7 pct pts	CBE	4.2 pct pts	MAM	-2.4 pct pts	FOBT	-4.7 pct pts	Proct	-8.0 pct pts	<p>Not reported</p>
	Pre-intervention n	Post-intervention n																																									
I <sub>1</sub>	967	971																																									
I <sub>2</sub>	987	988																																									
	I <sub>1</sub>	I <sub>2</sub>																																									
Pap w/in 2 y	79.0%	83.8%																																									
CBE w/in 2 y	82.9%	88.2%																																									
MAM w/in 2 y	68.5%	65.9%																																									
FOBT ever	54.3%	54.3%																																									
Proct ever	27.8%	28.4%																																									
Pap	4.7 pct pts																																										
CBE	4.2 pct pts																																										
MAM	-2.4 pct pts																																										
FOBT	-4.7 pct pts																																										
Proct	-8.0 pct pts																																										

Study	Location Intervention Comparison	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Follow- up time
	<p>comparison cities with no interventions.</p> <p>Here examined I<sub>1</sub> (multicomponent intervention with higher intensity mass media) vs. I<sub>2</sub> (multicomponent intervention with lower intensity mass media).</p>					
<p><b>Author (year):</b> Page (2005)</p> <p><b>Study Period:</b> 2003</p> <p><b>Design Suitability:</b> Moderate</p> <p><b>Study Design:</b> Time series</p> <p><b>Quality of Execution:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Outcome Measurement:</b> Number of mammograms done per month (based on screening program mammography records).</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> New South Wales, Australia</p> <p>1. Radio ads (4 different ads aired on a rotational basis in various timeslots during a 4 wk period) and newspaper ads (5 different ads published during the same 4 wk period)</p> <p>2. Usual recruitment activities to the screening program.</p>	<p><b>Study Population:</b> Italian-speaking women aged 50-69 years residing in 1 of 23 Local Government Areas in New South Wales, Australia</p> <p><b>Sample size:</b> not reported</p>	<p>Relative percent change in number of mammograms done per month.</p>	<p>Not reported</p>	<p>Relative percent change:</p> <p>Initial screen</p> <p>50-59 yrs -16.1% (p&gt;.05)</p> <p>60-69 yrs -10.8% (p&gt;.05)</p> <p>Subsequent screen</p> <p>50-59 yrs -4.2% (p&gt;.05)</p> <p>60-69 yrs 9.0% (p&gt;.05)</p>	<p>12 wks</p>