Socio-economic inequalities in breast and cervical cancer screening practices in Europe: influence of the type of screening program
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Background The aim of this study was to describe inequalities in the use of breast and cervical cancer screening services according to educational level in European countries in 2002, and to determine the influence of the type of screening program on the extent of inequality.

Methods A cross-sectional study was performed using individual-level data from the WHO World Health Survey (2002) and data regarding the implementation of cancer screening programmes. The study population consisted of women from 22 European countries, aged 25–69 years for cervical cancer screening (n = 11 770) and 50–69 years for breast cancer screening (n = 4784). Dependent variables were having had a PAP smear and having had a mammography during the previous 3 years. The main independent variables were socio-economic position (SEP) and the type of screening program in the country. For each country the prevalence of screening was calculated, overall and for each level of education, and indices of relative (RII) and absolute (SII) inequality were computed by educational level. Multilevel logistic regression models were fitted.

Results SEP inequalities in screening were found in countries with opportunistic screening [comparing highest with lowest educational level: RII = 1.28, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.12–1.48 for cervical cancer; and RII = 3.11, 95% CI 1.78–5.42 for breast cancer] but not in countries with nationwide population-based programmes. Inequalities were also observed in countries with regional screening programs (RII = 1.35, 95% CI 1.10–1.65 for cervical cancer; and RII = 1.58, 95% CI 1.26–1.98 for breast cancer).

Conclusions Inequalities in the use of cancer screening according to SEP are higher in countries without population-based cancer screening programmes. These results highlight the potential benefits of population-based screening programmes.
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Introduction

Breast and cervical cancer are the first and second most commonly diagnosed cancers among women worldwide, with cervical cancer being a relatively smaller problem in European countries. Breast cancer risk factors are not modifiable or are difficult to control at the population level, so early detection, along with appropriate treatment, is an important strategy for improving the disease prognosis. Mammography is the only screening test that has been shown to improve breast cancer survival. Human papilloma virus (HPV) infections have been causally linked to cervical cancer and the introduction of HPV vaccines may have an impact on cervical cancer control programs. To date, the most common strategy employed to reduce cervical cancer incidence and mortality has been cytological screening using the Papanicolaou (PAP) smear test. The Council of the European Union recommends mammography screening for breast cancer in women aged 50–69 years and the start of PAP smear screening between the ages of 20 and 30 years. The Advisory Committee on Cancer Prevention recommended a screening frequency of 3–5 years for cervical cancer screening and 2–3 years for mammography screening.

Screening strategies differ between countries. Some countries have population-based programmes, where in each round of screening women in the target population are individually identified and invited to attend screening. This type of programme can be implemented nationwide or only in specific regions of the country. In opportunistic screening, invitations depend on the individual's decision or on encounters with health-care providers. Population-based programmes have a greater potential ability to reduce cancer incidence and mortality due to their broader population coverage, follow-up and quality control. However, a number of issues regarding the nature of the screening test and the disease should be taken into account when planning to initiate a population-based cancer screening programme.

Socio-economic position (SEP) refers to social and economic factors, such as education level, income or wealth, which influence the position an individual or group holds within society. Inequalities in the use of breast and cervical cancer screening services due to SEP have been detected in some settings, with more deprived women less likely to be screened. A study comparing inequalities by educational level in the use of preventive services in Europe found that inequality is not a generalized phenomenon but that the level of inequality may vary between countries, and noted that the organization of health-care services may play an important role. Some studies highlight the fact that in opportunistic screening individual factors carry more weight, and differences in age, civil status and SEP may lead to inequalities in use. A recent review on the effectiveness of interventions that promote screening attendance in reducing socio-economic inequalities reported that, while population-based screening may increase attendance rates, it is not so effective in reducing inequalities in attendance. However, to our knowledge, there is no study that has used data from several countries to systematically analyse the association between the implementation of an organized program and the magnitude of inequality.

The aim of this study was to describe inequalities in the use of breast and cervical cancer screening services according to educational level in European countries in 2002, and to determine the influence of the type of screening program on the magnitude of these inequalities.

Methods

Design, study population and information sources

A cross-sectional study was performed using individual-level data regarding breast and cervical cancer screening practices and data regarding the type of screening program in the country. The study population consisted of women from 22 European countries, aged 25–69 years for cervical cancer screening (n = 11 770) and 50–69 years for breast cancer screening (n = 4784). Individual-level data were extracted from the WHO World Health Survey, a survey that was implemented worldwide (in countries willing to participate) in the year 2002/03. A choice of survey modes with distinct sampling strategies were available to participating countries. The sampling frame included non-institutionalized male and female adults >18 years of age and living in private households; all samples were selected from nationally representative sampling frames with known probabilities.

For the purposes of our study only European countries were considered. Two countries in which the survey was conducted did not collect data on screening practices (Norway and Turkey), two countries were removed because they had >15% of missing values in either of the two main outcomes (Slovakia and Ukraine), and four more were not considered because of lack of data regarding the type of screening program (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Kazakhstan and Russian Federation). Finally, 22 countries were included in the study (Table 2). Among these countries, five conducted postal surveys, ten face-to-face interviews, four used both modes and one used computer-assisted telephone interviews.

Information regarding survey mode was not available to participating countries. The sampling frame included non-institutionalized male and female adults >18 years of age and living in private households; all samples were selected from nationally representative sampling frames with known probabilities.

For the purposes of our study only European countries were considered. Two countries in which the survey was conducted did not collect data on screening practices (Norway and Turkey), two countries were removed because they had >15% of missing values in either of the two main outcomes (Slovakia and Ukraine), and four more were not considered because of lack of data regarding the type of screening program (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Kazakhstan and Russian Federation). Finally, 22 countries were included in the study (Table 2). Among these countries, five conducted postal surveys, ten face-to-face interviews, four used both modes and one used computer-assisted telephone interviews.

Information regarding survey mode was not available to participating countries. The sampling frame included non-institutionalized male and female adults >18 years of age and living in private households; all samples were selected from nationally representative sampling frames with known probabilities.

For the purposes of our study only European countries were considered. Two countries in which the survey was conducted did not collect data on screening practices (Norway and Turkey), two countries were removed because they had >15% of missing values in either of the two main outcomes (Slovakia and Ukraine), and four more were not considered because of lack of data regarding the type of screening program (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Kazakhstan and Russian Federation). Finally, 22 countries were included in the study (Table 2). Among these countries, five conducted postal surveys, ten face-to-face interviews, four used both modes and one used computer-assisted telephone interviews.

Information regarding survey mode was not available to participating countries. The sampling frame included non-institutionalized male and female adults >18 years of age and living in private households; all samples were selected from nationally representative sampling frames with known probabilities.
review of the literature. Health Ministries and screening specialists from the eight countries for which the information was not clear were contacted. Personal communications were obtained from Croatia, Estonia, Latvia and Slovenia.

Variables

Dependent variables

(1) Mammography use in the previous 3 years was assessed using the question, ‘When was the last time you had a mammography, if ever? (That is, an x-ray of your breasts taken to detect breast cancer at an early stage): within the last 3 years; 4–5 years ago; >5 years ago; never had an exam; or don’t know’. A dichotomous variable was created, where individuals were coded 1 if their answer was ‘within the last 3 years’ and 0 otherwise.

(2) PAP smear screening in the previous 3 years was assessed using two questions: ‘When was the last time you had a pelvic examination, if ever? (By pelvic examination, we mean when a doctor or nurse examined your vagina and uterus): within the last 3 years; 4–5 years ago; >5 years ago; never had an exam; don’t know’. Women who had had an examination within the last 3 years, were also asked ‘The last time you had a pelvic examination, did you have a PAP smear test? (By PAP smear test, we mean did a doctor or nurse use a swab or stick to wipe from inside your vagina, take a sample and send it to a laboratory?): yes; no; don’t know’. A dichotomous variable was created, where individuals were coded 1 if their responses were ‘in the last 3 years’ and ‘yes’, respectively, and 0 otherwise. A cut-off point of 3 years was chosen as this was the screening interval in most programmes.

Independent variables

The main independent variable was SEP, assessed as the maximum education level achieved using the question ‘What is the highest level of education that you have completed? 1. No formal schooling; 2. Less than primary school; 3. Primary school completed; 4. Secondary school completed; 5. High school (or equivalent) completed; 6. College/Pre-university/University completed; 7. Post-graduate degree completed’. Education levels were categorized as primary education or lower (1–3), secondary education (4), high school (5) and university studies (6–7).

Other covariates related to the adoption of preventive practices were used to control for their possible confounding effects on SEP: age, marital status, rural or urban setting, working situation and perceived health status.

The contextual variable used in this study was the country’s situation regarding population-based screening programmes in 2000, which allowed a 2-year time span for all women in the target population to be invited. The programme was considered to be national if in the year 2000 an organized screening programme inviting all the women in the target group in an active way was fully implemented throughout the country. The programme was considered to be regional if a population-based programme was being piloted or present only in some regions of the country. The percentage of regions covered by regional cervical cancer screening programmes varied from 4% in Austria to 60% in Belgium. In breast cancer screening, these percentages varied from 2 to 50%. Countries with opportunistic screening or no formal program were considered together in the last category.

Data analysis

For each country, the prevalence of breast and cervical cancer screening in the previous 3 years was calculated, overall and for each educational level. Age-adjusted robust Poisson regression models were fitted to examine the association between screening and education level in each country. In these models, education level was introduced as a continuous variable, with four values from 0 to 1, which reflect the educational-level distribution in each country. As a result, we obtained the Relative Index of Inequality (RII) and the Slope Index of Inequality, which can be interpreted as the prevalence ratio and the absolute difference in the prevalence at the two extremes of the educational spectrum (highest compared with lowest), respectively.

To determine whether the magnitude of inequality was related to the type of screening program in the country, a multilevel logistic regression analysis was carried out. For each of the two dependent variables the same process was followed. First, a model with all the individual variables was fitted, assuming that both the prevalence (intercept) and the inequalities due to SEP (coefficient of educational level) had a random component. Secondly, we fitted a model to determine whether the type of screening programme was associated with screening prevalence and with the magnitude of SEP inequalities in screening, taking individual variables into account. The percentage change in the variance (PCV), that is, the percentage of variance explained by the type of program, was also calculated. The odds ratios provided were transformed into prevalence ratios and their confidence intervals were calculated using a derived formula of the variance of the log PR.

The results of the multilevel analyses were plotted to aid interpretation. The prevalence ratios of screening between countries with regional or national screening programmes compared with those with opportunistic screening programmes (reference group) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were represented. To assess the effect of the type of programme on the extent of inequality we derived the RII and 95% CI for each type of programme.
Results

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of the individual variables under study in each of the two study populations. Subjects were generally educated to secondary level or less, married or cohabiting, and living in an urban setting and in paid employment.

Prevalence of cancer screening and SEP inequalities by country

Tables 2 and 3 show the prevalence of screening overall and by educational level in each of the countries studied. Relative and absolute indices of inequality are reported after adjustment for age group.

In the five countries with a nationwide population-based cervical screening programme, the prevalence of individuals who had undergone PAP smear screening varied from 48% in The Netherlands to 65.6% in Finland. Inequalities were only found in Finland, with an RII of 1.54 (95% CI 1.15–2.07), comparing the groups with the highest and lowest education level. Countries with regional population-based cervical screening services had screening prevalences from 37.8% in Ireland to 83.6% in Austria. Four of the seven countries had SEP inequalities, with the highest in Greece (RII = 2.29, 95% CI 1.36–3.84; SII = 36.8%, 95% CI 15.7–58). Among the nine countries with no organized cervical screening program, screening prevalence ranged from 54.2 to 82%, and inequalities were observed in four of these countries, with the highest relative inequalities in Estonia (RII = 1.86, 95% CI 1.31–2.63) and absolute inequalities in Croatia (SII = 44%, 95% CI 20.6–67.4).

In countries with a nationwide population-based breast screening programme, the prevalence of screening varied from 69.8% in the UK to 87.9% in Finland. None of the countries with national programmes showed inequalities in breast cancer screening. Screening prevalences in countries with regional programs ranged from 22% in Denmark to 79.4% in France. Inequalities were found in four of twelve countries, with the greatest inequalities being observed in Greece (RII = 2.96, 95% CI 1.44–6.11; SII = 46.4, 95% CI 16.9–75.4). Among the four countries with no organized breast cancer screening programme, screening prevalences ranged from 38.1% (Latvia) to 50.5% (Czech Republic). Two of these four countries, Croatia and the Czech Republic, had screening inequalities with RIIIs of 5.38 (95% CI 2.57–11.25) and 4.91 (95% CI 2.1–11.44) and SIIIs of 47.9% (95% CI 18.4–77.3) and 82.8% (95% CI 36.3–129.3), respectively.

Influence of the type of screening programme on the prevalence of cancer screening and on SEP inequalities

As shown in Figure 1, no differences in the prevalence of cervical cancer screening were found between countries with different types of screening

| Table 1 Distribution of study variables among women 25–69 years and women 50–69 years |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------|
| **Age group** | **25–69** | **50–69** |
| | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
| Cervical cancer screening | | | | |
| Yes | 7097 | 60.3 | 3141 | 65.7 |
| No | 4094 | 34.8 | 1599 | 33.4 |
| Missing | 579 | 4.9 | 45 | 0.9 |
| Breast cancer screening | | | | |
| Yes | 2938 | 61.4 | | |
| No | 1635 | 34.2 | | |
| Missing | 211 | 4.4 | | |
| Educational level | | | | |
| Primary level or lower | 2249 | 19.1 | 1518 | 31.7 |
| Secondary | 3837 | 32.6 | 1558 | 32.6 |
| High School | 3334 | 28.3 | 1045 | 21.8 |
| College/University/Post graduate | 2345 | 19.9 | 661 | 13.8 |
| Missing | 5 | 0.1 | 2 | 0.1 |
| Age group | | | | |
| 25–39 | 4087 | 34.7 | | |
| 40–49 | 2899 | 24.6 | | |
| 50–59 | 2598 | 22.1 | 2598 | 54.3 |
| 60–69 | 2187 | 18.6 | 2187 | 45.7 |
| Missing | 5 | 0.1 | 2 | 0.1 |
| Marital status | | | | |
| Married or cohabiting | 7980 | 67.8 | 3141 | 65.7 |
| Not cohabiting | 3679 | 31.3 | 1599 | 33.4 |
| Missing | 111 | 0.9 | 45 | 0.9 |
| Settings | | | | |
| Urban | 8151 | 69.2 | 3244 | 67.8 |
| Rural | 2847 | 24.2 | 1159 | 24.2 |
| Missing | 772 | 6.6 | 382 | 8.0 |
| Working situation | | | | |
| Working | 5850 | 49.7 | 1434 | 30.0 |
| Homemaker | 2884 | 24.5 | 1263 | 26.4 |
| Unemployed | 521 | 4.5 | 109 | 2.3 |
| Retired | 1615 | 13.7 | 1585 | 33.1 |
| Others | 744 | 6.3 | 313 | 6.5 |
| Missing | 155 | 1.3 | 81 | 1.7 |
| Perceived health | | | | |
| Good | 7449 | 63.3 | 2331 | 48.7 |
| Less than good | 4196 | 35.6 | 2414 | 50.5 |
| Missing | 125 | 1.1 | 40 | 0.8 |
| Total | 11770 | 100.0 | 4785 | 100.0 |
programme. Moreover, the between-country variability in screening prevalence could not be explained by differences in the type of screening programme. Screening inequalities were observed in countries with regional (RII=1.35, 95% CI 1.10–1.65) and opportunistic (RII=1.28, 95% CI 1.12–1.48) screening programmes, but not in those with a nationwide programme (RII=1.13, 95% CI 0.92–1.40). The type of screening programme in the country explained 13.6% of the variability in screening inequalities.

In breast cancer screening, the type of screening programme affected both the prevalence of screening and the presence of inequality. Women in countries with regional programmes had a 2.23-fold (95% CI 1.25–4.00) higher probability of having had a mammography during the previous 3 years than women in countries with opportunistic screening. The probability of having had a mammography in a country with a nationwide screening programme was 3.85 (95% CI 2.19–6.74) times higher than that in countries with opportunistic screening programmes. Socio-economic inequalities among women who had undergone mammographies were observed in countries with regional (RII=1.58, 95% CI 1.26–1.98) and opportunistic (RII=3.11, 95% CI 1.78–5.42) screening programmes, but not in those with national screening programmes. The type of program explained 74.4% of the between-country variability in prevalence of breast cancer screening and 24.3% of inequality in SEP.

Table 2  Number of cases and prevalences (%) (total and by educational level) of cervical cancer screening in the previous 3 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of program and country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>By educational level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>RII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot/Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2430</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative (RII) and absolute (SII) associations between educational level (highest compared with lowest) and cervical cancer screening in women of 25–69 years of age by country of residence and type of screening program. RII and SII are age adjusted.
The main finding of this study is that SEP inequalities in the use of breast and cervical cancer screening services exist in some countries of Europe. When the type of screening program is taken into account, inequalities are found only in countries without a population-based cancer screening programme. Women were more likely to have undergone screening in countries with nationwide breast cancer screening programmes than in those with opportunistic screening. This pattern was not observed for cervical cancer screening.

### Strengths and weaknesses of this study

This study has important strengths. It includes many countries from different parts of Europe, is representative of the state of cancer screening in Europe, and there is enough variability to apply the multilevel approach. It provides information on screening for two different cancers from representative samples of European countries.

This study, however, also has some limitations. For example, response rates are particularly low in some countries. Some studies suggest that non-respondents tend more often to have lower socio-economic status and less favourable health behaviours. Thus, the prevalence of screening may be overestimated in countries with low response rates, and inequalities would be underestimated. However, since these countries have different types of screening programs, we would argue that this would not strongly affect the global results.
Information on the type of screening programme was very difficult to obtain, and four countries could not be considered because of a lack of reliable sources. Moreover, regional and pilot programs were collapsed into a single category although the percentage of the population covered by these programmes varies between countries. In Ireland, Finland and The Netherlands, cervical screening programmes offer testing every 5 years, although the screening variables have a 3-year frequency due to the phrasing of the question regarding PAP smear testing frequency. This may hide the potential effect an organized program can have on participation rates and on the extent of inequality. We could not consider having had a PAP smear in the last 5 years but we could compare our results with those of having had a pelvic examination in the last 3 years and having had a pelvic examination in the last 5 years. Inequalities diminished in magnitude and prevalences increased when we considered a wider interval. However, these changes occurred in all categories, so the global results remained the same when modifying the practice queried and when changing the interval (results not shown).

Prevalence of cancer screening and type of screening program

We have observed that countries with population-based breast cancer screening programmes achieve higher rates of attendance than those with opportunistic screening. This is in agreement with two Cochrane reviews, which found that interventions encouraging the uptake of breast and cervical cancer screening appeared to be effective in increasing screening attendance.

However, our study does not support a similar assertion for cervical cancer screening. This is partly because Eastern European countries have high cervical cancer screening rates even though they do not have organized screening programs. Cervical smear tests were previously included in annual medical examinations in many institutions and factories during the Soviet era, and the health-care system emphasized the responsibility of the medical
profession for the timely detection and treatment of
diseases. For this reason, both women and physi-
cians may be more conscious of the problem and
may request screening more frequently. Compared
with mammography, cervical cancer screening is
also cheaper and easier to carry out by health profes-
sionals during visits. In fact, several variables related
to access to health services and to gynaecology visits
have been found to be strong predictors of screening
attendance. In Luxembourg, for example, which
only has opportunistic screening for cervical cancer,
the prevalence of PAP smear testing is ~80%. In
fact, this country does not have a program that invites
women for screening, but one that is based on the
cooperation of physicians and on contributions to
physicians who carry out the smears tests. For
these reasons, we believe that cervical cancer screen-
ing behaviour may be more sensitive to other aspects
of health care, such as access or visits to the
gynaecologist.

In The Netherlands, a country with a nationwide
population-based programme, only half of women
had had a PAP smear test during the previous
3 years. This could be due to the fact that within
the program, the screening interval following a nega-
tive result is 5 years.

SEP inequalities in cancer screening and
type of screening programme
Overall we have not found substantial socio-economic
inequalities in countries with nation wide population-
based screening programmes, but have observed
inequality in countries with regional or opportunistic
screening. SEP inequalities in cervical cancer screen-
ing were observed in Finland. However, as mentioned
above, Finland’s screening interval is 5 years, so more
socio-economically privileged women may undergo
opportunistic screening more frequently and this
could be reflected in the presence of inequalities.

In the approach based on personal invitations,
equality of access ensures that screening is available
to everyone and that no subgroup is excluded due to
individual characteristics. In contrast, opportunistic
screening depends on an individual requesting screen-
ing or on health advisors recommending it, and
women in a higher SEP may have more information
about preventive practices and more contact with the
physician. In Europe, two studies on the impact of
implementation of an organized programme on the
magnitude of inequality have been performed. In
one, the level of inequality did not change after
implementation of the programme; in the other,
with organized screening the gradient in education
level was less steep, although inequality persisted as
socio-economically advantaged women also took ben-
efit from the programme. These studies were carried
out very shortly after the implementation of the
screening programmes and a longer time may be nec-
essary to observe the effects on the magnitude of
inequality.

Conclusions
This study has found socio-economic inequalities in
breast and cervical cancer screening practices in
some European countries. It also highlights the fact
that these inequalities are higher in countries without
population-based cancer screening programmes.
These results highlight the potential benefits of popu-
lation-based screening programmes, although their
implementation should be preceded by careful consider-
ation of the principles of early disease detection.
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KEY MESSAGES
- This study has found socio-economic inequalities in breast and cervical cancer screening practices in some
  European countries.
- Inequalities are more pronounced in countries that do not have population-based cancer screening
  programs.
- These results highlight the potential benefits of population-based screening programs, although
  their implementation should be preceded by careful consideration of the principles of early disease
detection.
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