# Increasing Cancer Screening: Mass Media Targeting Clients – Cervical Cancer

## Summary Evidence Table

| Study | Location<br>Intervention<br>Comparison | Study population description<br>Sample size | Effect measure | Reported baseline | Reported effect | Follow-up time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Author (year):**<br>Blumenthal 2005*<br><br>**Study Period:**<br>1994-1996<br><br>**Design Suitability:**<br>Greatest<br><br>**Study Design:**<br>Quasi-experimental<br><br>**Quality of Execution:**<br>Fair<br><br>**Outcome Measurement:**<br>Completed cervical, breast and colorectal cancer screening (based on a survey of screening test use) | **Location:** US, urban settings in Georgia and Tennessee<br><br>Two intervention cities: one with higher intensity mass media ($I_1$) and one with lower intensity mass media ($I_2$).<br>Both sites received common intervention components (kickoff event, educational sessions, newsletters and bulletins, health fairs).<br>Also in $I_1$: Mass media (messages on city bus, newspaper ads and/or articles, radio and/or TV programs and PSA's)<br>Also in $I_2$: campus newspapers, yard signs (not successful since few property | **Study Population:**<br>African-American adults living in census tracts with a high proportion of African-American residents.<br><br>**Sample size:**<br>Pre-intervention n / Post-intervention n<br>$I_1$ 967 / 971<br>$I_2$ 987 / 988 | Absolute change in cervical, breast and colorectal cancer screening. | $I_1$ / $I_2$<br>Pap w/in 2 y 79.0% / 83.8%<br>CBE w/in 2 y 82.9% / 88.2%<br>MAM w/in 2 y 68.5% / 65.9%<br>FOBT ever 54.3% / 54.3%<br>Proct ever 27.8% / 28.4% | Diff in Differences between $I_1$ and $I_2$<br>Pap 4.7 pct pts<br>CBE 4.2 pct pts<br>MAM -2.4 pct pts<br>FOBT -4.7 pct pts<br>Proct -8.0 pct pts | Not reported |

| Study | Location<br>Intervention<br>Comparison | Study population description<br>Sample size | Effect measure | Reported baseline | Reported effect | Follow-up time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | owners allowed signs).<br>Two additional comparison cities with no interventions.<br>Here examined $I_1$ (multicomponent intervention with higher intensity mass media) vs. $I_2$ (multicomponent intervention with lower intensity mass media). | | | | | |
| **Author (year):**<br>Byles (1994)<br><br>**Study Period:**<br>1989<br><br>**Design Suitability:**<br>Greatest<br><br>**Study Design:**<br>Group non-randomized trial<br><br>**Quality of Execution:**<br>Fair<br><br>**Outcome Measurement:**<br>Completed cervical cancer screening (based on Health | **Location:** New South Wales, Australia;<br><br>1. TV campaign only (30 second ad 12 times over 3 days at peak viewing time) *versus*<br><br>2. Usual care | **Study Population:**<br>Women aged 18-70 residing in postal regions in rural locality, country town, major rural center.<br><br>Here reported effect in women who reported not having had a Pap test in the past 3 years.<br><br>**Sample size:**<br>intervention n / comparison n<br>Country town 1542 / 1004<br>Rural center 2292 / 2780 | Relative change for 1 vs. 2 (for women with no record of Pap in 3 yrs) | Country towns / Rural centers<br>Intervention 46.9% / 72.7%<br>Comparison 66.9% / 75.8% | Relative change 1 vs. 2<br>Country towns: 20.4% (p>.05)<br>Rural Center: 47.6% (p<.05) | 3 mos |

| Study | Location<br>Intervention<br>Comparison | Study population description<br>Sample size | Effect measure | Reported baseline | Reported effect | Follow-up time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Insurance Commission claims) | | | | | | |
| **Author (year):** Howe (2002)<br><br>**Study Period:** 2001<br><br>**Design Suitability:** Least<br><br>**Study Design:** Before/After<br><br>**Quality of Execution:** Fair<br><br>**Outcome Measurement:** Number of Pap tests done (based on data from cervical screening registry databases) | **Location:** Lancashire and Greater Manchester zones, UK<br><br>1. TV soap opera story line about a woman diagnosed with cervical cancer (aired 25 April – 17 June 2001) *versus*<br><br>2. Pre-intervention records for comparison | **Study Population:** Women age >25 whose previous Pap test was performed in a community setting and was normal, and who were eligible for cervical cancer screening in one of nine Health Authorities.<br><br>**Sample size:** not reported (show has ~ 13 million viewers) | Relative change in number of Pap tests performed | NA | Relative Change: 1 vs. 2 = 21.3% (NR) | 2 mos |

* Study from the updated search period