

Increasing Cancer Screening: Mass Media Targeting Clients - Colorectal Cancer

Summary Evidence Table

Study	Location Intervention Comparison	Study population description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Follow- up time																																					
<p>Author (year): Blumenthal 2005</p> <p>Study Period: 1994-1996</p> <p>Design Suitability: Greatest</p> <p>Study Design: Quasi-experimental</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair</p> <p>Outcome Measurement: Completed cervical, breast and colorectal cancer screening (based on a survey of screening test use)</p>	<p>Location: US, urban settings in Georgia and Tennessee</p> <p>Two intervention cities: one with higher intensity mass media (I₁) and one with lower intensity mass media (I₂). Both sites received common intervention components (kickoff event, educational sessions, newsletters and bulletins, health fairs). Also in I₁: Mass media (messages on city bus, newspaper ads and/or articles, radio and/or TV programs and PSA's) Also in I₂: campus newspapers, yard signs (not successful since few property</p>	<p>Study Population: African-American adults living in census tracts with a high proportion of African-American residents.</p> <p>Sample size:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="632 695 963 841"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Pre-intervention n</th> <th>Post-intervention n</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>I₁</td> <td>967</td> <td>971</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I₂</td> <td>987</td> <td>988</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Pre-intervention n	Post-intervention n	I ₁	967	971	I ₂	987	988	<p>Absolute change in cervical, breast and colorectal cancer screening.</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1119 440 1488 657"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>I₁</th> <th>I₂</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 ₁	I ₂	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 I₁ and I₂</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1488 537 1858 683"> <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 ₁	967	971																																									
I ₂	987	988																																									
	I ₁	I ₂																																									
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>owners allowed signs). Two additional comparison cities with no interventions.</p> <p>Here examined I₁ (multicomponent intervention with higher intensity mass media) vs. I₂ (multicomponent intervention with lower intensity mass media).</p>					