

European Commission Initiative on Breast Cancer (ECIBC):  
European guidelines on breast cancer screening and diagnosis  
Evidence profile

<b>Healthcare question</b>	Should a letter plus a phone call to remind vs. a letter alone be used for inviting women for further diagnostic assessment?
<b>Date</b>	November 2017
<b>Authors</b>	ECIBC Guidelines Development Group (GDG): Mariangela Autelitano, Bettina Borisch, Mireille Broeders, Xavier Castells, Edoardo Colzani, Jan Daneš, Stephen Duffy, Patricia Fitzpatrick, Markus Follmann, Livia Giordano, Paolo Giorgi Rossi, Axel Gräwingholt, Solveig Hofvind, Lydia Ioannidou-Mouzaka, Susan Knox, Miranda Langendam, Annette Lebeau, Helen McGarrigle, Lennarth Nyström, Elsa Pérez Gómez, Cecily Quinn, Holger Schünemann, Alberto Torresin, Ruben Van Engen, Cary Van Landsveld-Verhoeven, Sue Warman, Kenneth Young. Systematic Review team: Claudia Valli, Pablo Alonso-Coello, Ignacio Ricci Cabello. JRC Healthcare Quality team: Elena Parmelli, Zuleika Saz-Parkinson.
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>CI:</b> Confidence interval <b>RR:</b> Risk ratio

[illegible]

Certainty assessment							Nº of patients		Effect		Certainty	Importance
Nº of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	A letter plus a phone call to remind	A letter alone	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)		
Anxiety - not measured												
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	CRITICAL
Satisfaction - not measured												
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	CRITICAL

## Explanations

- Two trials (Page 2006 and Hegenscheid 2011) were at high risk of selection bias and two trials (Mayer 1994 and Vernon 1992) were at high risk of attrition bias. However, a sensitivity analysis excluding these trials from the analysis still showed a significant effect (RR= 1,62 [1,31, 2,01]), therefore evidence was not downgraded for risk of bias.
- High statistical heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup>=82%). The majority of studies show a consistent direction of effect, with overlapping 95% confidence intervals, therefore evidence was not downgraded for inconsistency.
- Downgraded for indirectness because the majority of included studies were conducted outside Europe, the included population is not specific to women invited for further assessment and as the outcome is about participation in screening and not specific for further assessment.

## References

- Bodiya A, Vorias D, Dickson HA. Does telephone contact with a physician's office staff improve mammogram screening rates? . Family Medicine; 1999.
- Chambers JA, Gracie K, Millar R, Cavanagh J, Archibald D, Cook A, et al.. A pilot randomized controlled trial of telephone intervention to increase Breast Cancer Screening uptake in socially deprived areas in Scotland (TELBRECS).. Journal of medical screening; 2015.
- Champion V, Skinner CS, Hui S, Monahan P, Juliar B, Daggy J, et al.. The effect of telephone versus print tailoring for mammography adherence. Patient Education and Counseling; 2007.
- Goelen G, De Clercq G, Hanssens S.. A community peer-volunteer telephone reminder call to increase breast cancer-screening attendance. Oncology nursing forum.; 2010.
- Hegenscheid K, Hoffmann W, Fochler S, Domin M, Weiss S, Hartmann B, et al.. Telephone counseling and attendance in a national mammography-screening program: A randomized controlled trial. American Journal of Preventive Medicine; 2011.
- Lantz PM, Stencil D, Lippert MT, Beversdorf S, Jaros L, Remington PL.. Breast and cervical cancer screening in a low-income managed care sample: The efficacy of physician letters and phone calls.. American Journal of Public Health; 1995.
- Mayer JA, Clapp EJ, Bartholomew S, Elder J. Facility-based inreach strategies to promote annual mammograms.. American Journal of Preventive Medicine; 1994.
- Page A, Morrell S, Chiu C, Taylor R, Tewson R. Recruitment to mammography screening: a randomised trial and meta-analysis of invitation letters and telephone calls. Aust N Z J Public Health. ; 2006.

9. Phillips L, Hendren S, Humiston S, Winters P, Fiscella K.. Improving breast and colon cancer screening rates: a comparison of letters, automated phone calls, or both. *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine : JABFM*; 2015.
10. Puschel K, Coronado G, Soto G, Gonzalez K, Martinez J, Holte S, et al. Strategies for increasing mammography screening in primary care in Chile: Results of a randomized clinical trial.. *Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention*; 2010.
11. Richardson A, Williams S, Elwood M, Bahr M, Medicott T.. Participation in breast cancer screening: randomised controlled trials of doctors' letters and of telephone reminders. *Australian journal of public health*; 1994.
12. Valanis B, Whitlock EE, Mullooly J, Vogt T, Smith S, Chen C, et al. Screening rarely screened women: time-to-service and 24-month outcomes of tailored interventions. *Preventive medicine*; 2003.
13. Vernon SW, Gilstrap EL, Jackson GL, Hughes JI.. An intervention to increase participation in a work site cancer screening program. . *Health Values: The Journal of Health Behavior, Education & Promotion*; 1992.
14. Vogt TM, Glass A, Galsgow RE, La Chance PA, Lichtenstein E.. The safety net: a cost-effective approach to improving Breast and cervical cancer screening. 2003; *J Womens Health*.