

Increasing Cancer Screening: Reducing Structural Barriers - Breast Cancer

Summary Evidence Table - Economic Review

Cost Studies

Study	Population	Method to Reduce Barrier	Comparison	Cost Components	Summary Measure										
Author (Year): Clarke (1998)	Location: New South Wales, Australia Study Population: Women 40-70 years of age	Mobile Mammography	N/A	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Component</th> <th>Included</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Staff Salary</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overhead</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Materials</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Equipment</td> <td>X</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component	Included	Staff Salary	X	Overhead		Materials	X	Equipment	X	Benefits of mobile screening outweigh costs when a rural town is located a distance greater than the breakeven point (29.04km) from a fixed screening unit
Component	Included														
Staff Salary	X														
Overhead															
Materials	X														
Equipment	X														
Author (Year): Fahs et al. (2003)*	Study Population: African American Women	Mobile Mammography	N/A	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Component</th> <th>Included</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Staff Salary</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overhead</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Materials</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Equipment</td> <td>X</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component	Included	Staff Salary	X	Overhead	X	Materials	X	Equipment	X	1st year: \$83.29-86.81 Ongoing annual costs: \$81.73-85.27
Component	Included														
Staff Salary	X														
Overhead	X														
Materials	X														
Equipment	X														
Author (Year): Schweitzer et al. (1998)	Location: Florida Study Population: Indigent women in South Florida	Mobile Mammography	N/A	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Component</th> <th>Included</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Staff Salary</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overhead</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Materials</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Equipment</td> <td>X</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component	Included	Staff Salary	X	Overhead	X	Materials	X	Equipment	X	\$97.48 per woman (n=10,000); \$131 (n=3,600)
Component	Included														
Staff Salary	X														
Overhead	X														
Materials	X														
Equipment	X														

Study	Population	Method to Reduce Barrier	Comparison	Cost Components		Summary Measure
Author (Year): Wolk (1992)	Location: Wellesley, MA	Mobile Mammography	N/A	<u>Component</u>	<u>Included</u>	1st year: \$150 per woman screened (n=3,522 women) 2nd year: \$135 per woman screened (n=4,232 women) 3rd year: \$113 per woman screened (n=5,005 women)
				Staff Salary	X	
				Overhead	X	
				Materials	X	
				Equipment	X	
Author (Year): Zavertrnik et al. (1991)	Location: Florida Study Population: Indigent women in South Florida	Mobile Mammography	N/A	<u>Component</u>	<u>Included</u>	\$63.09 (n=11,871)
				Staff Salary	X	
				Overhead	X	
				Materials	X	
				Equipment	X	

Cost-Effectiveness (Partially Modeled)

Study	Population	Method to Reduce Barrier	Comparison	Cost Components		Summary Measure
Author (Year): Naeim et al. (2009)	Location: Los Angeles, CA Study Population: Mean age 74.3 +/- 6.4	Mobile Mammography + Group education	Group Education (Stationary Unit)	<u>Component</u>	<u>Included</u>	Mobile film mammogram: \$208 per additional woman screened Mobile digital mammogram: \$267 per additional woman screened
				Staff Salary	X	
				Overhead		
				Materials	X	
				Equipment	X	