Experiences of HPV self-collection among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix

Authors: Louise E Mitchell[1]*, Emily Phillips [1], Chloe J Jennett [2], Claire Bavor [3], Tessa Saunders [3], Claire Nightingale [3], Megan A Smith [2], Lisa J Whop [1], on behalf of Screen Your Way Investigator Team^

1. Yardhura Walani, National Centre for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Wellbeing Research, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia.
2. Sydney School of Public Health, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia.
3. Evaluation and Implementation Science Unit, Centre for Health Policy, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia.

*Corresponding author: louise.mitchell@anu.edu.au

^Membership of the Screen Your Way Investigator Team is provided in the Acknowledgements.

Abstract

Since July 2022, Australian guidelines have recommended that anyone eligible for cervical screening be offered a choice between using a self-collected vaginal sample or a clinician-collected cervical sample for Human Papillomavirus (HPV) testing. This study explored cervical screening among 555 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix, 261 who had screened since the policy change ('recently screened'). Participants were recruited for an online survey between December-2023 and April-2024. Over half of recently screened participants were offered a choice of collection methods (n=151, 58%). Of those offered the choice, 67% chose to screen using self-collection (n=101). In total, 46% (n=118) of recently screened participants used self-collection, either themselves at home (n=41, 35%) or the clinic (n=48, 41%) or assisted by a healthcare provider without a speculum (n=29, 24%). Among those who collected their own sample (n=89), the main reasons being it was less embarrassing, they felt in control of their body, and it was less scary. However, only 55% of these participants felt they had enough information to make an informed decision between collection methods. Over half of recently screened participants reported having a clinician-collected sample with a speculum (n=133, 51%). The majority were not offered a choice of collection method (61%, n=81), however 38% (n=50) were and chose a clinician-collected sample. The main reasons for choosing a clinician-collected sample included always having had it done by a healthcare provider, wanting the healthcare provider to have a look or believing the healthcare provider would collect a better sample. This study highlights a preference for HPV self-collection among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix, including those who already participate in cervical screening. It reinforces the importance of offering all eligible participants a choice of collection methods and supporting informed decision-making.

Introduction

Cervical cancer is preventable and can be effectively treated if detected early. [1, 2] Australia offers both primary and secondary prevention programs: a school-based human papillomavirus (HPV) immunisation program and primary HPV screening through the National Cervical Screening Program (NCSP). As a consequence of these programs, Australia will potentially become the first country to actively eliminate cervical cancer as a public health problem. [2, 3] However, inequities remain and without targeted efforts, elimination may not include Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix. [4] Cervical cancer burden among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix remains unacceptably high, with age-adjusted incidence rates 2.1 times higher (2016-2020) and mortality rates 2.8 times higher (2018-2022) compared to non-Indigenous individuals. [5]

In December 2017, the NCSP transitioned from cytology-based (Pap test) to HPV DNA-based screening, inviting women and people with a cervix aged 25-74 years to undertake a cervical screening test every five years. This transition also allowed for the introduction of HPV self-collection, which allows women and people with a cervix to collect a vaginal screening sample using a flocked swab to be tested for HPV. Initially, self-collection was thought to be less sensitive than clinician-collection, so it was limited to individuals aged over 30 years who were two or more years overdue or never-screened, and declined clinician testing. [6] These restrictions led to low uptake and poor awareness among both clinicians and those eligible for screening. [7] The number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander to have used self-collection is unknown.

In July 2022, based on strong evidence of the equivalent sensitivity between self-collection and clinician-collection, and modelling suggesting improved benefits from improved participation would outweigh any feasible loss in sensitivity [8], Australia updated its policy to expand eligibility for self-collection to include anyone eligible for cervical screening within the context of a practitioner-supported model of care (referred to as ‘universal access’). [9, 10] This change aimed to

improve access in practice to self-collection, and thereby remove barriers to cervical screening participation and reduce inequities in cervical cancer incidence and mortality. [11] However, it is unknown to what extent this choice is being offered as a result of the policy change. Research has demonstrated initially slow implementation with variable knowledge and adoption among the primary care workforce resulting in inconsistent promotion of self-collection. [12]

Universal access to self-collection provides an opportunity to address screening inequities among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix. While NCSP data is not yet available for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix who have used self-collection, research suggests self-collection is highly acceptable, as it increases privacy, comfort, convenience, power and control, which are integral to participation. [13-15] It remains uncertain whether Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander screening participants are adequately informed about self-collection as a choice for cervical screening, or what their experience has been in accessing self-collection since the implementation of universal access.

This study aimed to understand the screening practices of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix and explore the experiences of recently screened participants since the policy change to introduce universal access to HPV self-collection (i.e. since July 2022). Specifically, were participants offered a choice of collection methods at their most recent screen? If so, what method did they choose and why? If they chose self-collection, did they feel they had sufficient information to support their decision?

Materials and Methods

Positionality

This work is led by a research team with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander lived experience (LJW, EP), Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander leadership in public health (LJW, EP), epidemiology (LM, LJW, MAS), experience working in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health (LM, LJW, EP) and extensive experience in cervical cancer prevention (all authors).

Survey development

An electronic survey was designed containing questions about awareness and experience of, and future preferences for, self-collection cervical screening. The survey was designed to capture sociodemographic variables (including Indigenous status, age, sex, gender, sexuality, highest level of education, and postcode) and comprehensive feedback on cervical screening practices and preferences. For respondents who had recently screened (i.e. since July 2022), questions asked about their experience at their most recent screen, including if they were offered the choice of self-collection, how they chose to screen, and were they given sufficient information to support their choice. Questions were primarily multiple-choice questions to ensure ease of response and consistency in data collection; however, free text fields were included to capture any specific reasons or additional comments. Questions were informed by the COM-B system for behaviour change [16] and Theoretical Domains Framework. [17] The participant information and consent forms and survey were pilot tested by both non-Indigenous and Indigenous peoples, including a non-Indigenous consumer advisory group. The survey was hosted on Qualtrics and took approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Recruitment

Participants were recruited to the study through multiple channels, including a paid Meta campaign via the Cancer Council Australia Instagram and Facebook page, targeted promotion through peak Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Community Organisations, and through local stakeholder groups, social media, websites, newsletters, and hard-copy flyers. Recruitment was open between 14th December 2023 and 13th April 2024. Participants accessed the survey via an anonymous link. Upon entry, they were presented with a plain language statement that outlined the purpose of the study, contact details of the research team and additional supports, and that participation was entirely voluntary. The statement also explained participants could withdraw at any time by exiting the survey and included a link to a comprehensive Participant Information Sheet.

Before beginning the survey, participants were shown an embedded consent form within Qualtrics. Informed consent was obtained by asking participants the question: “Would you like to take part in this survey?” Only those who selected “I agree to take part in this survey” were able to proceed, thereby indicating their consent to participate. Participants were not renumerated for their time but at the completion of the survey, participants were invited to enter a draw to win a voucher valued at AUD$100.

Participants

In total, 11,311 people consented to the survey, of which 677 identified as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander. Of these, 2 people were aged <24 or >74, 19 whose sex was not recorded female at birth, and 21 who answered no/unsure to having a cervix were ineligible and therefore excluded. A review of data quality, informed by published studies [18, 19] and data available to the investigators from the Qualtrics platform, for identifying potentially fraudulent responses was undertaken. We excluded surveys less than 40% complete (i.e. did not reach key questions on outcome variables) or completed in <120 seconds. We then undertook manual review of surveys utilising Qualtrics fraud detection data; ReCaptca score of <0.5 and Fraud ID >30, and groups of >5 survey which were submitted within a 1-minute window, which identified 191 responses. The manual process involved review of key free text fields (where did you hear about this survey [asked twice], qualitative response questions, and email address), some of which were specifically included to help identify fraudulent responses. Two co-authors undertook the manual process, and 80 responses were excluded on consensus (EP and CJ). This analysis reports on the 555 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who were eligible for the study. Results for non-Indigenous participants will be reported separately. This process is outlined in Fig 1.

Fig 1. Flow chart for determining survey participants

Data analysis

Data analysis was conducted according to Indigenous data sovereignty principles [20] and directed by previously established Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Governance processes at Yardhura Walani. The analysis was grounded within Rigney's Indigenist research approach. [21] This means ensuring that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples lead, shape, and benefit from how data are collected, interpreted, and used. Data remains the property of participants, with the research team as its custodians.

Participants were categorised as recently screened if they responded "Within the last year (on or after July 2022)" (i.e. after the policy change) to the question "Do you remember when your last cervical screening test was?" (n=261); previously screened if they responded "More than a year ago (before July 2022)" (n=215), or never screened (n=79) if they had never had a screen (n=17), never heard of cervical screen (n=1) or could not remember participating in cervical screening (n=61). Postcode was used to classify the participant's place of residence by geographic remoteness using Australian Statistical Geography Standard Remoteness Structure derived from Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia Plus (ARIA+) [22], and area-level relative disadvantage using Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) Index of Relative Socioeconomic Disadvantage 2021 [23]. Summary data are provided as number of observations (n) and percentage (%). Data was analysed in STATA v18 (StataCorp, Texas, USA).

Ethics approval

Ethics approval was obtained from the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies Research Ethics Committee (REC-0209) and ACON (RERC 202404), and was ratified by The Australian National University (H/2023/1434) and the University of Melbourne (2023-28454-47328-1) Human Research Ethics Committees. Individual consent was obtained from all study participants.

Results

Participants

A total of 555 screen eligible Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix were included in the analysis. Participants predominantly identified as Aboriginal (87%), female (99%) and heterosexual (90%;

Table 1). Almost half of the participants were aged 25-34 years of age (n=239, 44%), had tertiary qualifications (n=254, 50%), and lived in a major city (n=224, 56%). The majority of survey participants had screened previously, either before (n=215, 39%) or after (n=261, 47%) the policy change to offer universal access to self-collection. A smaller proportion of participants (14%, n=79) had never screened. When asked to select from reasons for not screening, participants most commonly indicated being scared (n=9, 11%), feeling embarrassed or shame (n=7, 9%), or not wanting to be touched by a healthcare provider (n=7, 9%).

Table 1

Table 1. Participant characteristics

	Recently screened (after July 2022)	Previously screened (before July 2022)	Never screened	Total
Number (%)	**261 (47%)**	**215 (39%)**	**79 (14%)**	**555 (100%)**
Indigenous Status				
Aboriginal	240 (92%)	184 (86%)	57 (72%)	481 (87%)
Torres Strait Islander	10 (4%)	21 (10%)	15 (19%)	46 (8%)
Both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander	11 (4%)	10 (5%)	7 (9%)	28 (5%)
Gender				
Female	261 (100%)	211 (98%)	77 (97%)	549 (99%)
Non-Binary	0	<5	<5	6 (1%)
Intersex				
No	251 (97%)	204 (98%)	72 (94%)	527 (97%)
Yes	9 (3%)	<5	<5	18 (3%)
Sexuality				
Heterosexual	239 (92%)	190 (88%)	67 (87%)	496 (90%)
Gay/Lesbian	7 (3%)	8 (4%)	<5	16 (3%)
Bisexual/Pansexual	14 (5%)	16 (7%)	8 (10%)	38 (7%)
Other	<5	<5	<5	<5
Age (years)				

25-34	131 (51%)	80 (38%)	28 (36%)	239 (44%)
35-44	65 (25%)	62 (29%)	27 (35%)	154 (28%)
45-74	59 (23%)	70 (33%)	22 (29%)	151 (28%)
Highest Education				
School (Primary or High)	34 (14%)	36 (18%)	6 (9%)	76 (15%)
Tafe/Certificate	95 (39%)	57 (29%)	31 (44%)	183 (36%)
Tertiary	116 (47%)	105 (53%)	33 (47%)	254 (50%)
Language spoken at home				
English	229 (88%)	156 (73%)	66 (84%)	451 (81%)
Aboriginal languages	30 (11%)	47 (22%)	8 (10%)	85 (15%)
Torres Strait Islander languages	<5	10 (5%)	5 (6%)	17 (3%)
Other	0	<5	0	<5
Duration in Australia				
Born Australia	256 (98%)	213 (99%)	73 (92%)	542 (98%)
Born Overseas	<5	<5	6 (8%)	12 (2%)
Remoteness				
Major City	107 (55%)	90 (59%)	27 (52%)	224 (56%)
Regional/Remote	87 (45%)	63 (41%)	25 (48%)	175 (44%)
Socioeconomic Status				
1 Lowest SES quintile	28 (17%)	20 (15%)	12 (30%)	60 (18%)
2	63 (38%)	39 (30%)	11 (28%)	113 (34%)
3	37 (22%)	31 (24%)	9 (22%)	77 (23%)
4	28 (17%)	23 (18%)	6 (15%)	57 (17%)
5 Highest SES Quintile	11 (7%)	17 (13%)	<5	30 (9%)

SES: socioeconomic status as determined by Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas Disadvantage Index

Screening practices

Among participants who had previously participated in screening, 42% (n=201) indicated that they usually screened around the time they were due, approximately one-third (n=158, 33%) said sometimes left it a bit too long between screens, and 25% (n=115) reported having had one previous screen (Table 2). Of those who had only screened once, 28 were aged 25-29 years and therefore up to date. Participants most commonly accessed cervical screening at a doctor's clinic, or another clinic setting such as family planning or a women's clinic (Table 2). Around 13% of participants indicated usually screening at an Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation or Aboriginal Medical Service. When asked what prompted participants to get a cervical screening test, the most frequently identified reason was having gone to the healthcare provider for another

reason and being reminded (n=130, 27%), highlighting the importance of opportunistic screening. Other prompts included receiving a reminder (such as a letter or SMS) from their usual clinic (n=110, 23%), or remembering they were due for screening (n=109, 23%). Many also reported screening because they were worried about a symptom or health problem (n=95, 20%).

Table 2. Screening practices of participants that have previously screened to the policy change offering universal access to self-collection (i.e. before or after July 2022)

	When was last cervical screen?	
	After July 22	Before July 22
Number (%)	**261 (55%)**	**215 (45%)**
How often do you screen?		
Around when due	135 (52%)	66 (31%)
Leave it a bit long	81 (31%)	77 (36%)
Only had one*	44 (17%)	71 (33%)
Usual screening location		
Doctors clinic	115 (44%)	93 (43%)
Women's/Sexual Health clinic	92 (35%)	84 (39%)
ACCHO/AMS	36 (14%)	24 (11%)
Gynaecologist	17 (7%)	11 (5%)
Other	0	<5
What prompted you to get a CST?		
I went to the HCP for another reason and they reminded me	81 (31%)	49 (23%)
A reminder letter, email, SMS (or similar) from my usual clinic	56 (21%)	54 (25%)
I remembered I was due for a screening test	66 (25%)	43 (20%)
I was worried about a symptom or health problem	40 (15%)	55 (26%)
A reminder letter from the National Cancer Screening Register	50 (19%)	37 (17%)
The health worker told me I was due	36 (14%)	37 (17%)
I wanted to follow-up after a previous abnormal cervical screen	34 (13%)	25 (12%)
I saw something in the media (television, radio, social media)	14 (5%)	6 (3%)
Other	22 (8%)	9 (4%)

CST: cervical screening test. HCP: healthcare provider, ACCHO/AMS: Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation (ACCHO) or Aboriginal Medical Service (AMS) * 28 respondents screened only once were aged 25-29 years and therefore up to date.

Experiences of recently screened participants

Participants who reported screening since the policy change recommending universal access to the option of self-collection were asked additional questions about their most recent experience.

Over half of respondents (n=151, 58%) recalled being offered the choice of self-collection (Table 3). Of those offered the choice, 67% chose to screen using self-collection (n=101). Additionally, 17 participants who were not or could not recall being offered a choice in collection method, screened using self-collection. In total, 46% (n=118) of participants who recently screened, used HPV self-collection, either doing it themselves at home (n=41, 35%) or at the clinic (n=48, 41%), or assisted by a healthcare provider without a speculum) (n=29, 24%). Among the 89 participants who collected their own sample, the most commonly reported reasons for so were because it was less embarrassing (n=49, 55%), they felt in control of their body (n=34, 38%), and it was less scary (n=27, 30%). Those who chose self-collection assisted by a healthcare provider most commonly reported doing so as they wanted the health professional to have a look without a speculum and ensure everything was OK (n=19, 66%) or they believed the provider would collect a better sample (n=14, 48%).

Over half of recently screened participants reported having a clinician collected their sample with a speculum (n=133, 51%). The majority of these participants (61%, n=81) were not offered a choice of collection method, however 38% (n=50) were offered a choice and elected to have a clinician-collected sample, and an additional two couldn't remember. In addition to not being told about self-collection (n=41, 31%), the main reasons for choosing a clinician-collected sample include always having had it done by a healthcare provider (n=66, 50%), wanting the healthcare provider to have a look (n=25, 19%), or believing the healthcare provider would collect a better sample (n=17; 13%; Table 3).

Table 3. Experience of recently screened participants since the policy change offering universal access to self-collection (i.e. after July 2022)

	Number (%)
Recently screened participants (after July 2022)	**261**
Offered choice at last CST (n=259)	
Yes, offered choice	*151 (58%)*

Screened using self-collection^	101 (67%)*
Screened by HCP using speculum (clinician-collection)	50 (33%)
No, not offered choice	*100 (39%)*
Screened using self-collection^	15 (15%)*
Screened by HCP using speculum (clinician-collection)	81 (81%)
Can't remember	*8 (3%)*
Screened using self-collection^	<5
Screened by HCP using speculum (clinician-collection)	<5
How did you do your last CST? (n=259)	
Self-collection in clinic	48 (19%)
Self-collection at home/elsewhere	41 (16%)
HCP helped without speculum (assisted self-collection)	29 (11%)
HCP with speculum (clinician-collection)	133 (51%)
Unsure	8 (3%)
Reasons for choosing self-collection (n=89 respondents who collected their own sample)	
It is less embarrassing	49 (55%)
It helps me feel in control of my body	34 (38%)
It is not as scary	27 (30%)
It is more convenient	24 (27%)
It is less painful	23 (26%)
My HCP suggested it as an option	16 (18%)
A friend/family member had a good experience with self-collection	14 (16%)
It is just as accurate as a sample collected by a HCP	14 (16%)
I had a bad experience in the past when a sample was collected by a HCP using a speculum	11 (12%)
The information I received at my appointment made it look like a good option	8 (9%)
Other	8 (9%)
Reasons for choosing HCP assisted self-collection (i.e. no speculum) (n=29)	
I want my HCP to have a look, even without a speculum, and make sure everything is OK	19 (66%)
I thought that the HCP could collect a better sample than I could	14 (48%)
It's less embarrassing	<5
I cannot reach, or it is not comfortable for me to reach	<5
I do not like to touch myself there	<5
Reasons for choosing a clinician-collected sample (i.e. with a speculum) (n=133)	
I have always had it done by a HCP	66 (50%)
I was not told about the option to use self-collection	41 (31%)
I wanted my HCP to have a look	25 (19%)
I did not think I would take the self-collected sample properly	17 (13%)
I did not think self-collection was accurate	10 (8%)
I am not eligible for self-collection	8 (6%)
I thought I would need to return for another test anyway if I used self-collection	5 (4%)
I do not know why	5 (4%)
I needed more information about self-collection	<5
My HCP told me they did not offer self-collection	<5

Other	18 (14%)

CST: cervical screening test. HCP: healthcare provider. ^ includes self-collection at clinic, at home and healthcare assisted self-collection (i.e. without a speculum).* percent within response category for offered choice at last CST. Note: Participants could choose multiple reasons for their chosen collection method therefore percentages will not add up to 100%

Information to support the choice of self-collection

Participants who recently screened and collected their own sample at home or in the clinic (n=89) were asked if they were given information to support their choice. Over half recalled being provided the specific pieces of information needed to make an informed decision around self-collection (ranging from 52-69% for different pieces of information), such as needing to return for a clinician-collected sample if HPV was found or how they would receive test results (Fig 2). Only 55% of participants felt they had enough information to choose between self-collection and clinician-collection methods. When asked about their agreement with statements regarding self-collection, most participants agreed that they understood how to collect their sample (70% agreement), that the test was accurate (69% agreement) and that self-collection was easy to do (66% agreement). Participants were less confident in their ability to correctly collect the sample (55% agreement), and 33% were worried having to return for a follow-up test (Fig 2).

Fig 2. Information to support informed decision making among those who recently who recently screened using self-collection (n=89)

SC: self-collection, CC: clinician collection, HCP: healthcare provider, HPV: Human Papillomavirus

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the experience of cervical screening among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix since the introduction of universal access to self-collection in July 2022. This change means that anyone who is eligible for cervical screening should be offered the choice of HPV testing on clinician-collected cervical sample

or on a self-collected vaginal sample. [24] Our survey was conducted between December 2023 and April 2024, almost 18 months after the policy shift. Among survey participants screened in this approximately 18-month period, 39% of participants reported they were not offered a choice. This is consistent with reports of implementation challenges experienced prior to universal access, including limited promotion, and lack of confidence in test accuracy, leading to low self-collection uptake. [7, 25] The policy change to universal access, alongside improved provider education on updated clinical guidelines and more accredited pathology services had already driven a steady increase in use of self-collected tests prior to this study, from 1.2% of all tests immediately prior to universal access to 23.9% in Q3 2023. [26] This has continued to increase since then, reaching 40.4% of all tests in Q4 2024, shortly after the commencement of a major national campaign in September 2024 that promoted awareness of the option to use self-collection and which was preceded by a range of promotion activities encouraging providers to be ready to offer self-collection. [26, 27]

Our findings indicate a higher proportion of self-collected samples than national population-wide statistics with 46% of recently screened participants reporting using self-collection either in the clinic, at home, or assisted by a healthcare provider. However, our findings also show that when offered a choice, 67% of participants chose self-collection. Participants selected this option as it was less embarrassing, scary and painful, let them feel in control of their body, and was more convenient. These findings are consistent with existing literature where self-collection is shown to promote privacy, bodily autonomy and control among Indigenous women and people with a cervix, in particular among those who would not normally participate in screening. [13, 15, 28, 29] Interestingly, the majority of this had previously screened and over 40% indicated they typically screened on time. Our results confirm that having a more positive screening experience by avoiding trauma, pain, discomfort and embarrassment are important factors for women and people with a cervix, even among those who typically screen. This is particularly important to consider for under- or never screened participants who indicated they chose not to screen because they were scared, felt embarrassed or shame, didn’t want to be touched by a healthcare provider. Research shows that

cervical screening should be conducted in a way that empowers Indigenous women to feel in control of their bodies, health, and health decision-making [30] and that the choice of self-collection for under- and never-screened Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix is integral to participation. [13-15, 28] Ensuring a positive first screening experience is a key factor in supporting ongoing participation in cervical screening programs. [28]

When asked about the information provided to support their decision to screen using self-collection, only 55% felt they had enough information to choose between collection methods. It is important to note that these responses occurred in a group of participants where almost half had tertiary qualifications and almost all were English-speaking. This highlights the role of healthcare providers in not only providing information but supporting clients to make an informed decision, and more broadly to the need to embed health literacy into systems and environments to support screening participants to access, understand and act upon health-related information. [31] This is particularly important to consider in the case of cervical screening to support decision making around any follow-up tests that may be required. For example, almost half of our survey participants were aged 25-35 years of age and national statistics show relatively high rates of oncogenic HPV (not 16/18) detected in these age groups, particularly among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix. [5] Guidelines reinforce that to support informed choice, any conversation with these participants should involve discussing the likelihood of follow-up tests, including explaining that those who test positive for non-16/18 HPV types may need to return for a clinician-collected sample for cytology. [24] This information is important to ensure informed decision making around the collection method.

To our knowledge this is the first insight into the preferences, use and experiences of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix in relation to self-collection assisted by a healthcare provider (i.e. without a speculum). The most common reasons for doing so wanting an examination and a perception that the healthcare provider would take a better sample. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women have raised concerns in previous research that a

clinician-collected test was more accurate and professional, and had expressed concerns around self-sampling incorrectly or hurting themselves. [15] This reinforces the need to educate clients about the accuracy of self-collection and the need for only a low to mid vaginal swab. [9, 10] Self-collection with the help of a trusted healthcare provider also offers an alternative for those who struggle with self-collection. While less than five participants in our sample indicated being unable to collect their sample as a reason for choosing this method, this possibly reflects the younger cohort with potentially fewer physical limitations. However, for women and people with a cervix who have physical limitations that may hinder their ability to self-collect, it is important that their healthcare provider offers them this choice and supports them in making the best decision for their individual needs.

In Australia, self-collection is offered via a practitioner-supported model of care. Our survey results support the role of the healthcare provider in the delivery of cervical screening, with most participants screening opportunistically due to being reminded by their healthcare provider, or in response to a reminder from their clinic. Maintaining the role of the healthcare provider, rather than mail-out models seen in other high-income countries, also helps address any perceived barriers to self-collection, such as concerns about collecting the sample correctly or its accuracy. Additionally, it ensures that follow-up care is appropriately managed if the test results are positive for HPV. This model maintains the critical role of healthcare providers in delivering comprehensive care and supports informed decision-making. [32]

Just over half of recently screened participants reported having a clinician-collected sample (i.e. with a speculum) at their most recent cervical screening test. For some people under surveillance or those exhibiting symptoms a co-test is indicated, necessitating a clinician-collected sample. This fits with a small proportion (6%) being told they were not eligible for self-collection. While the majority of participants who were screened using clinician-collected samples were not offered a choice of collection method (61%), some who were offered a choice elected to have a clinician-collected sample. This highlights the importance of offering screening participants a choice

of collection methods, ensuring they are fully informed and supported in making the decision that best suits their needs. When asked why, participants indicated they chose a clinician-collected sample because they had always had it done by a healthcare provider, they wanted the healthcare provider to have a look, or they thought their healthcare provider would be able to collect a better sample. Providers can reassure their clients that genital inspection is not necessary in the absence of vulvovaginal symptoms or risk factors for vulvar disease. [24] This reinforces the importance of empowering eligible clients to make an informed decision around collection methods. In doing so, this also honours the sovereign rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to govern health decisions.

Strengths and Limitations

This survey successfully reached potential participants through a targeted social media recruitment campaign alongside traditional recruitment methods. A total of 555 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix eligible for cervical screening completed the survey. Our sample represents women who have previously screened and was typically young, had tertiary qualifications and were more likely to live in a major. While the results may not be generalisable to the broader Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population, especially to those who are under- and never-screened, our findings – that is, that screening participants value the choice of collection methods and require support to make an informed decision - are potentially even more important for these groups who likely need greater information and support. These findings also provide an important benchmark for a planned future survey using similar methodologies, that will be able to explore whether there have been changes as self-collection becomes more established practice and following the major national campaign. The 'Own it!' campaign was developed in partnership with the National Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation (NACCHO) and features Aboriginal and Torres Strait people who are a primary audience for the campaign.

Online surveys are inherently at risk of fraudulent responses by bots or individuals aiming to complete multiple survey responses to receive prize incentives. Our recruitment method aimed to minimise the risk of attracting bots using a paid meta campaign which specifically targeted Instagram and Facebook users based on age and geographical location and not mentioning the prize draw in the caption text of any social media posts. In our study, we implemented multiple layers of protection in our survey, including captchas and honeypot questions (imbedded in the survey using JavaScript, and only visible to bot responses), and undertook a method of data review to ensure data quality. Based on our experience of recruiting a large-scale online survey, a multi-pronged approach is required to control for fraudulent survey responses and maintain data integrity.

Conclusions

This study indicates a preference for self-collection among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and people with a cervix when offered a choice between clinician collected and self-collection and highlights the vital role of healthcare providers in the delivery of cervical screening, in particular supporting clients to confidently choose and complete self-collection. There is a significant opportunity to ensure all screen-eligible participants are aware of self-collection, are offered this option and can make an informed decision to participate in cervical screening, due to the national promotional campaign running during 2024-2025.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank those who participated in the study. We acknowledge the assistance and guidance of the Screen Your Way Investigators, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Caucus as well as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander reference group Thiitu Tharrmay. Membership of the Screen Your Way Investigator Team includes Chief Investigators: Associate Professor Julia Brotherton, Professor Gail Garvey, Dr Tamara Butler, Associate Professor Mark Wenitong, Associate Professor Megan Smith, Associate Professor Claire Nightingale, Professor Marion Saville, Professor Rebecca

Guy, and Professor Joan Cunningham; and Associate Investigators: Claudette “Sissy” Tyson, Sonya Egert, Kristine Falzon, Professor Bev Lawton, Professor Karen Canfell, Associate Professor Natalie Taylor and Dr Hamish McManus. We also thank Josephine Mondino, Cancer Council Australia, for providing support and advice for the Meta recruitment campaign. Ownership of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges and cultural heritage is retained by the informants.

Abbreviations

CST: cervical screening test

HCP: healthcare provider

HPV: Human Papillomavirus

NCSP: National Cervical Screening Program

References

1. NHMRC Centre of Research Excellence in Cervical Cancer Control. 2022 Cervical Cancer Elimination Progress Report: Australia’s progress towards the elimination of cervical cancer as a public health problem. Melbourne, Australia 2022.
2. World Health Organization. Global strategy to accelerate the elimination of cervical cancer as a public health problem. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2020.
3. Hall MT, Simms KT, Lew JB, Smith MA, Brotherton JM, Saville M, et al. The projected timeframe until cervical cancer elimination in Australia: a modelling study. Lancet Public Health. 2019;4(1):e19-e27. Epub 20181002. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/s2468-2667(18)30183-x. PubMed PMID: 30291040.
4. Whop LJ, Smith MA, Butler TL, Adcock A, Bartholomew K, Goodman MT, et al. Achieving cervical cancer elimination among Indigenous women. Prev Med. 2021;144:106314. Epub 20210304. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2020.106314. PubMed PMID: 33678228.
5. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. National Cervical Screening Program monitoring report 2024. Canberra: AIHW, 2024.
6. Arbyn M, Verdoodt F, Snijders PJ, Verhoef VM, Suonio E, Dillner L, et al. Accuracy of human papillomavirus testing on self-collected versus clinician-collected samples: a meta-analysis. Lancet Oncol. 2014;15(2):172-83. Epub 20140114. doi: 10.1016/s1470-2045(13)70570-9. PubMed PMID: 24433684.
7. Zammit CM, Creagh NS, McDermott T, Smith MA, Machalek DA, Jennett CJ, et al. "So, if she wasn't aware of it, then how would everybody else out there be aware of it?"-Key Stakeholder Perspectives on the Initial Implementation of Self-Collection in Australia's Cervical Screening Program: A Qualitative Study. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(23). Epub 20221127. doi:

10.3390/ijerph192315776. PubMed PMID: 36497850; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9739016.

8. Smith MA, Hall MT, Saville M, Brotherton JML, Simms KT, Lew JB, et al. Could HPV Testing on Self-collected Samples Be Routinely Used in an Organized Cervical Screening Program? A Modeled Analysis. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2021;30(2):268-77. Epub 20201120. doi: 10.1158/1055-9965.Epi-20-0998. PubMed PMID: 33219163.
9. Arbyn M, Smith SB, Temin S, Sultana F, Castle P. Detecting cervical precancer and reaching underscreened women by using HPV testing on self samples: updated meta-analyses. Bmj. 2018;363:k4823. Epub 20181205. doi: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.k4823. PubMed PMID: 30518635; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6278587.
10. Medical Services Advisory Committee. Application No. 1664 – Improvements to the National Cervical Screening Program Self-Collection Policy. 2021.
11. Department of Health. Public Summary Document: Application No. 1664 – Improvements to the National Cervical Screening Program Self-Collection Policy. 2021.
12. Creagh NS, Saunders T, Brotherton J, Hocking J, Karahalios A, Saville M, et al. Practitioners support and intention to adopt universal access to self-collection in Australia's National Cervical Screening Program. Cancer Med. 2024;13(10):e7254. doi: 10.1002/cam4.7254. PubMed PMID: 38785177; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC11117194.
13. Meiselbach K, Nightingale C, Anderson S, Ryan A, O'Reilly C, Saville M, et al. Do it for yourself: Australia's first experience of universal eligibility for self-collection cervical screening increases access for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women. First Nations Health and Wellbeing - The Lowitja Journal. 2023;1:100002. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fnhli.2023.100002.
14. Saville M, Hawkes D, McLachlan E, Anderson S, Arabena K. Self-collection for under-screened women in a National Cervical Screening Program: pilot study. Curr Oncol. 2018;25(1):e27-e32. Epub 20180228. doi: https://doi.org/10.3747/co.25.3915. PubMed PMID: 29507492; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5832287.
15. Whop LJ, Butler TL, Lee N, Cunningham J, Garvey G, Anderson K, et al. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women's views of cervical screening by self-collection: a qualitative study. Aust N Z J Public Health. 2022;46(2):161-9. Epub 20220203. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/1753-6405.13201. PubMed PMID: 35112767.
16. Michie S, van Stralen MM, West R. The behaviour change wheel: A new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. Implementation Science. 2011;6(1):42. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-6-42.
17. Cane J, O'Connor D, Michie S. Validation of the theoretical domains framework for use in behaviour change and implementation research. Implementation Science. 2012;7(1):37. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-7-37.
18. Bonett S, Lin W, Sexton Topper P, Wolfe J, Golinkoff J, Deshpande A, et al. Assessing and Improving Data Integrity in Web-Based Surveys: Comparison of Fraud Detection Systems in a COVID-19 Study. JMIR Form Res. 2024;8:e47091. doi: 10.2196/47091.
19. Storozuk A, Ashley M, Delage V, Maloney EA. Got Bots? Practical Recommendations to Protect Online Survey Data from Bot Attacks. TQMP. 2020;16(5):472-81. doi: 10.20982/tqmp.16.5.p472.

20. Maiam nayri Wingara. Indigenous Data Sovereignty Communique Indigenous Data Sovereignty Summit 20th June 2018. Canberra, ACT2018.
21. Rigney L-I. Internationalization of an Indigenous Anticolonial Cultural Critique of Research Methodologies: A Guide to Indigenist Research Methodology and Its Principles. Wicazo Sa Review. 1999;14(2).
22. University of Adelaide, Australian Centre for Housing Research. Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA+). 2023.
23. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Socio-economic indexes for areas (SEIFA). Australia2021.
24. Cancer Council Australia. National Cervical Screening Program Guidelines 2025. Available from: https://app.magicapp.org/#/guideline/Eez2Kj.
25. Sultana F, Roeske L, Malloy MJ, McDermott TL, Saville M, Brotherton JML. Implementation of Australia's renewed cervical screening program: Preparedness of general practitioners and nurses. PLoS One. 2020;15(1):e0228042. Epub 20200129. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0228042. PubMed PMID: 31995585; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6988932.
26. Australian Government. Cervical Screening Test self-collection uptake report as of 21 January 2025 Canberra2025. Available from: https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/update-on-cervical-screening-self-collection-uptake?language=en.
27. Australian Government Department of Health and Aged Care. Getting everyone on board to eliminate cervical cancer by 2035. 2024, September 3. Available from: https://www.health.gov.au/ministers/the-hon-ged-kearney-mp/media/getting-everyone-on-board-to-eliminate-cervical-cancer-by-2035.
28. Butler TL, Lee N, Anderson K, Brotherton JML, Cunningham J, Condon JR, et al. Under-screened Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women's perspectives on cervical screening. PLoS One. 2022;17(8):e0271658. Epub 20220831. doi: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0271658. PubMed PMID: 36044466; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9432770.
29. Adcock A, Cram F, Lawton B, Geller S, Hibma M, Sykes P, et al. Acceptability of self-taken vaginal HPV sample for cervical screening among an under-screened Indigenous population. Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol. 2019;59(2):301-7. Epub 20190107. doi: https://10.1111/ajo.12933. PubMed PMID: 30614524.
30. Butler TL, Anderson K, Condon JR, Garvey G, Brotherton JML, Cunningham J, et al. Indigenous Australian women's experiences of participation in cervical screening. PLoS One. 2020;15(6):e0234536. Epub 20200615. doi: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234536. PubMed PMID: 32542004; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7295213.
31. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. Health literacy: Taking action to improve safety and quality. Sydney: 2014.
32. Zammit C, Creagh N, Nightingale C, McDermott T, Saville M, Brotherton J. 'I'm a bit of a champion for it actually': Qualitative insights into practitioner-supported self-collection cervical screening among early adopting Victorian practitioners in Australia. Primary Health Care Research and Development. 2023;24. doi: 10.1017/S1463423623000191. PubMed Central PMCID: PMC37185205.


Total Sample: 11,311 consented responses
10,634 responses identified as not Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander
Identified as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander: 677 responses
42 excluded as not eligible for cervical screening:
• 2 aged <24 years or >74 years
• 19 sex not female at birth
• 21 Unsure/No cervix
Met inclusion criteria: 635 responses
191 flagged as potentially fraudulent based on pre-determined criteria.
80 excluded based on review of free-text fields to identify fraudulent responses.
555 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people eligible for study

Figure 1


Given the following information regarding self-collection
I had enough information to decide between SC and CC
49
26
14
That SC as accurate as sample collected by HCP
61
18
10
That I could ask for help to collect sample
52
24
13
Might need to come back for another test if HPV found
57
19
13
Might need a HCP collected sample for follow-up test
58
25
6
How I would get test results
56
22
11
Could take the swab away and do somewhere else
46
30
13
Agree/Disagree regarding the following statements
Worried about having to return for a follow-up test
29
32
27
Understood how to collect own sample
60
18
8
It was easy for me to collect the sample
57
23
6
Information given was easy to understand
56
22
10
Confident the test was accurate
61
19
8
Confident could do the test correctly
47
27
12
0%
25%
50%
75%
100%
Yes
No
Unsure/can't remember
Agree
Neither disagree/agree
Disagree

Figure 2