A systematic review of barriers that prevent, and interventions that increase, participation in cervical screening programs for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Women

Kate E. Mazey, MD The Royal Women's Hospital – Melbourne, Victoria

ABORIGINAL & TORRES INTRODUCTION RESULTS STRAIT ISLANDER Twenty studies were included for data extraction. The studies reported **WOMEN IN AUSTRALIA** Cervical cancer is a largely preventable disease in either interventions only (n = 10), barriers only (n = 8) or both (n = 1). Australia. Low incidence rates are attributable to INCIDENCE the success of the current screening and vaccination programs¹. 2x THAT OF ALL OTHER Barriers **AUSTRALIAN WOMEN** Despite such success, women among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations remain at A total of 9 studies reported barriers preventing participation in cervical significant risk². **MORTALITY RATE** screening programs for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women. 4x THAT OF ALL OTHER **AUSTRALIAN WOMEN** WHAT IS MISSING? Interventions National cervical screening participation rates cannot be measured A total of 11 studies reported interventions demonstrating improved for Indigenous women, yet they experience a higher burden from participation rates in cervical cancer screening programs for Aboriginal cervical cancer compared with non-indigenous women². and Torres Strait Islander women. Increased risk of cervical cancer in this vulnerable group suggests Intervention sites represented a group of very heterogeneous that Aboriginal and Torres Islander women are under-screened³. communities (urban, rural, remote/desert) No intervention reported was the same among all (9) locations All interventions reported an increase in cervical screening rates in **OBJECTIVES Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women** Provide evidence of barriers to cervical screening in Successful interventions included: **Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women specifically** Provide evidence of existing intervention strategies, if any, that increase participation of Aboriginal and Torres **Screening programs** Culturally appropriate, Recruitment of female, Strait Islander women in the NCSP developed by Aboriginal **Aboriginal Community-Aboriginal elders to guide Healthcare workers Controlled Women's Clinics** and teach young women **METHODS** A systematic search was performed using Ovid and EBSCO Hunt & Straton (1998) Dasgupta et al (2021) Darwin, NT - Urban⁸ North QLD - Regional¹³ platforms. Medline, CINAHL, PsycINFO and Informit databases Mak & Straton (1997) were used to form a combined search. Binns & Condon (2006) NT - Urban, Rural, Remote⁴ Couzos et al (1998) Broome, WA - Regional⁵ Records identified through database searching Panaretto et al (2006) (n = 448)Townsville, QLD - Urban¹ Records excluded Gilles et al (1995) (n = 390)Yuendumu, NT - Remote⁷ Ivers et al (2023) Wollongong, NSW – Urban¹⁴ Records screened by abstract (n = 58)Read & Bateson (2009) Dubbo, NSW - Rural¹¹ Full-text articles assessed for eligibility Wilson (1999) Nyirripi, NT - Remote¹² (n = 58)Full-text articles excluded, with Dorrington et al (2015) reasons

(n = 38)

Total studies for systematic

review

(n = 20)

Lack of education about screening and prevention, poor priority of cancer **PROVIDER** screening **KNOWLEDGE LOGISTIC** Lack of culturally Poor access to health appropriate services & transport, resources, lack of not enough female identification of healthcare providers **Aboriginal or Torres** Straight status **BARRIERS CULTURAL ECONOMIC** Inherited distrust of western medicine, Cost of travel & language barriers, lack accommodation for of Aboriginal & Torres patient and family Strait Islander **EMOTIONAL** healthcare providers Feelings of fear, shame, embarrassment of screening, fear 'of pain', fear 'of cancer

PATIENT KNOWLEDGE

DISCUSSION

Nurrabundah, ACT - Urban⁶

REFERENCES: [1] Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2018). Cervical screening in Australia 2018 (No. CAN 111). Retrieved from <a href="https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/cancer-screening/cervical-screening-in-australia-2018/contents/table-of-contents/table-of-contents/table-of-contents/table-of-contents/table-of-contents/table-of-contents/table-of-contents/table-of-contents. [2] Cancer Council Australia 2018 (No. CAN 111). Retrieved from <a href="https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/cancer-screening/cervical-screening-in-australia-2018/contents/table-of-contents/

Health, 19(5), 477-481. [8] Hunt, J., Gless, G. W. and Straton, J. (1998). Pap smear screening at an urban Aboriginal health service: report of a practice audit and an evaluation of recruitment strategies, Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 22(6), 720-725. [9] Mak, D. and Straton, J. (1997). Effects and sustainability of a cervical screening program in remote Aboriginal Australia, Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 22(6), 720-725.

clinical practice and cervical screening in Australian Aboriginal women in western New South Wales, Australia, Rural and Remote Health, 9(1117). [12] Wilson, N. (1999). The Nyirripi grandmother's women's health program, Aboriginal community-controlled primary health organizations can explain some of the higher pap test participation among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women in primary care – randomised controlled trial of letter vs. phone/SMS reminders, International Journal of

A great disparity exists in data availability for indigenous vs nonindigenous participation in the National Cervical Screening Program².

- Existing partnership between government, states and territories doesn't account for Indigenous status reporting³.
- Interventions targeting specific communities are not likely to provide the same benefit in other, heterogeneous, locations. Heterogeneity, combined with moderate opportunity for bias across studies limits the generalisability of these results.
- All interventions captured report improved screening rates. Absence of interventions showing failure to improve participation highlights potential areas where unpublished data is lost.
- Lack of available data meeting inclusion criteria limits the potential of this review to establish why significant progress is still not being made to reduce incidence and mortality of cervical cancer in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women.

CONCLUSIONS & FUTURE DIRECTION

- National population-based screening is not reaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women.
- Future interventions need to address barriers specific to each community.
- Intervention design must be carried out in direct consultation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, Aboriginal healthcare workers and government, state and territory health services in order to increase participation in the NCSP.