

Title Page

Breast and Cervical Cancer Screening Rates in Student-Run Free Clinics: A Systematic Review

Sophia Ying Xiao, MS¹; Catherine Kendall Major, MD²; Katie A. O'Connell, MS³; David Lee, MD, MS⁴; Christine Lin⁵; Esther Sarino, MLIS⁶; Kevin Chen, MD, MHS^{7,8}

¹ Medical student, University of California San Diego School of Medicine, La Jolla, CA

² Resident physician, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

³ Medical student, Eastern Virginia Medical School, Norfolk, VA

⁴ Resident physician, Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Beaumont Health System and Oakland University William Beaumont School of Medicine, Royal Oak, MI

⁵ Medical student, Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine, Hershey, PA

⁶ Reference Services Coordinator, Brickell Medical Sciences Library, Eastern Virginia Medical School, Norfolk, VA

⁷ Senior Director of Design and Evaluation, Office of Ambulatory Care and Population Health, New York City Health + Hospitals, New York, NY

⁸ Clinical Assistant Professor, Department of Medicine, New York University, Grossman School of Medicine, New York, NY

PROSPERO registration # (date): CRD42021242361 (March 25, 2021)

Corresponding author:

Sophia Ying Xiao, 3869 Miramar Street #3431 La Jolla, CA

Cell phone: (408) 242-8872, email: sophxiao67@gmail.com

Abstract word count: 239, Main text word count: 2164

24 *Condensation:* Rates of breast and cervical cancer screening at student-run free clinics
25 can match those of insured and uninsured patients in other care settings nationally.

26 *Short title:* Cancer Screening in Student-Run Free Clinics

Abstract

Objective

To assess rates of breast and cervical cancer screening at student-run free clinics to better understand challenges and strategies for advancing quality and accessibility of women's health screening at student-run free clinics.

Data sources

We performed a systematic search of Ovid MEDLINE, PubMed, Web of Science, and Google Scholar databases from database inception to 2020 using keywords related to student-run clinics, breast cancer screening, and cervical cancer screening.

Study eligibility criteria

We included all English-language publications describing screening rates of breast and/or cervical cancer at student-run free clinics within the United States. Five authors screened abstracts and reviewed full texts for inclusion.

Study appraisal and synthesis methods

Two reviewers extracted data independently for each publication using a structured data extraction table. Disagreements were resolved by group consensus. Two reviewers then assessed for risk of bias for each text using a modified Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality checklist for cross-sectional and prevalence studies. Results were synthesized qualitatively due to study heterogeneity.

Results

Of 3634 references identified, 12 references met study inclusion criteria. The proportion of patients up-to-date on breast cancer screening per guidelines ranged from

45% to 94%. The proportion of patients up-to-date on cervical cancer screening per guidelines ranged from 40% to 88%.

Conclusion

Student-run free clinics can match breast and cervical cancer screening rates amongst uninsured populations nationally, though more work is required to bridge the gap in care that exists for the underinsured and uninsured.

Key words and phrases: breast cancer, cervical cancer, screening, student-run clinic, underserved population

Introduction

A National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) from 2020 revealed that 64% of insured women were up-to-date for breast cancer screening compared to 30% of uninsured women.¹ Similarly, a 2015 NHIS revealed that 82% of insured women were up-to-date with their cervical cancer screening compared to 78% of uninsured women.² Both cancers can be detected by screening tests, with early detection and intervention reducing morbidity and mortality. Yet, screening rates among racial and ethnic minorities, low-income, uninsured, and underinsured women in the United States (US) remain low.^{3,4}

One setting in which low-income, uninsured, and underinsured women may seek healthcare is in student-run free clinics (SRFCs), which are clinics led by students aiming to provide healthcare to underserved populations. For many of these patients, SRFCs may be their only source of care.^{5,6} As of 2014, SRFCs collectively provided over 37,000 annual patient visits. Quality of chronic disease management in SRFCs has been assessed, with evidence suggesting comparable care to other care settings.^{5,7–15} However, the efficacy of SFRCs at meeting national averages in women's cancer screenings has shown mixed results. One study found greater rates of mammography among their patients compared to national averages.¹⁶ This same clinic also found higher rates of cervical cancer screening compared to national rates, while other clinics did not.^{17,18}

Objective

The objective of this systematic review was to examine rates of breast and cervical cancer screenings at SRFCs. From this, we aim to better understand

challenges and strategies to effectively improve quality of women's health screening at SRFCs.

Methods

Information sources and search strategies

We performed a systematic search of Ovid MEDLINE, PubMed (National Library of Medicine), Web of Science (Clarivate), and Google Scholar (Google) databases from database inception to 2020 using key terms including: student-run clinic; human papillomavirus; women's health; gynecology; breast cancer; cervical cancer; mammography; Papanicolaou test; Pap smear; preventative medicine; screening. The search strategy (**Appendix 1**) was created in conjunction with a medical librarian.

Eligibility criteria and study selection

We included English-language studies describing screening rates of breast cancer and/or cervical cancer in adult women at SRFCs in the United States as primary or secondary outcomes. We included original observational and interventional studies published as peer-reviewed journal articles, abstracts, and theses.

We excluded studies if they did not report on the proportion of eligible women for receiving screening.

Five authors independently screened study titles and abstracts for inclusion, with each piece being reviewed by two authors. Conflicts were resolved by group consensus. Then, five authors reviewed complete texts of potentially eligible pieces, again with each piece reviewed by two authors and conflicts resolved by discussion. The reference list of each included text was also reviewed to identify potentially eligible pieces not identified in the database searches.

Data extraction and synthesis

For each included study, two authors independently used a structured data extraction form to collect information regarding the study characteristics, findings, and limitations. Disagreements were resolved in the same manner as described for study inclusion.

We organized studies related to breast cancer screening and cervical cancer screening separately. If a study related to both types of preventive care, the relevant data were included under their respective categories.

Due to heterogeneity of study designs, we synthesized results descriptively.

Assessment of risk of bias

Additionally, two authors independently assessed for risk of bias for each study using the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) methodology checklist for cross-sectional and prevalence studies.¹⁹ This tool was chosen because all studies incorporated were primarily of cross-sectional design. Risk of bias was determined by the number of items on the checklist fulfilled by each study; the fewer the items fulfilled, the higher the risk of bias. Final quality assessment was based on consensus, and disagreements were resolved in the same manner as discussed for study inclusion.

Results

Study selection

Our search identified 3634 references. Of these, 3614 were excluded as either duplicates or because they did not meet our inclusion criteria based on title and abstract (n=3125). For the remaining 20 studies, we undertook full-text review and eliminated 8 studies because they did not specify the proportion of eligible women who had

screening and as a result, we were not able to obtain rate of screening information from those studies.^{20–27} This left 12 references which ultimately met our inclusion criteria and were synthesized in the systematic review. **Figure 1** details the study selection process. Studies referred to breast and cervical cancer screening guidelines from either the United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) or the American Cancer Society (ACS).

Figure 1. Flow diagram of study selection for inclusion in systematic review.

Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

Breast cancer screening

Study characteristics

Eight studies reported on rates of breast cancer screening at SRFCs (**Table 1**). Breast cancer screening was performed via mammography for all studies. A total of 1408 patients were included in these studies. Two studies were cross-sectional questionnaires, two were cross-sectional chart reviews, and four were interventional studies.

144 **Table 1.** Details of studies that identified breast cancer screening rates in SRFs via mammography

Author (year)	Study type	Guideline referenced	Study location	Study period	Number of participants	Inclusion/exclusion criteria	Age in years, % or mean \pm SD	Race/ethnicity, %	Primary outcome	Results	Limitations (as stated per authors)
Buntrock et al. (2020)	Cross-sectional questionnaire	USPSTF – year not specified	Coyote clinic, Sioux Falls, South Dakota	June 2019 - February 2020	8 patients eligible for mammography	Inclusion: female patients ages 18-65 years Exclusion: none explicitly stated	18-26: 7.0%* 27-49: 60%* 50-74: 33%*	Black: 15%* Hispanic: 26%* Middle Eastern: 7.0%* White: 52%*	Proportion of patients up-to-date with mammogram per USPSTF guidelines	6/9 (67%)	- Small sample size - <1 year of data collection - Poor recall from patient population of screening results and year completed
Burger et al. (2020)	Interventional	USPSTF 2019	Orlando, Florida	Not stated	334 patients eligible for mammography	Inclusion: female patients ages 41-69 years Exclusion: none explicitly stated	54 \pm 7	Black: 32% White: 55% Other: 13%	Proportion of patients having received a mammogram in the last year	Pre-intervention: 93% Post-intervention: 94%	- Four interventions implemented simultaneously; unable to draw conclusions about efficacy of each - Some patients included in post-intervention just joined clinic and didn't receive the intervention - Half of visits are provided by volunteer nurses or providers; may influence rate of consistent implementation of interventions
Hu et al. (2016)	Cross-sectional questionnaire	USPSTF 2014	Stony Brook Heath Outreach and Medical Education Clinic; Stony	Fall 2012 - Spring 2013	165 patients surveyed	Inclusion: all patients presenting to clinic Exclusion: none explicitly stated	19-24: 3.8%* 25-34: 21%* 35-44: 31%* 45-54: 31%* 55-64: 11%* 65-74: 1.3%* >75: 0.6%*	Asian: 1.2%* Black: 5.6%* Hispanic: 80%* White: 9.4%* Other: 4.3%*	Proportion of patients having received a mammogram in the last 2 years	45/56 (80%) of women >40 years reported ever having had a mammogram. 23/56 (41%) of women >40 years	- Single center - Small sample size - Did not determine citizenship status for insurance eligibility

			Brook, New York							reported having a mammogram in the past 2 years	
Khalil et al. (2020)	Retrospective chart review	ACS 2015	BRIDGE Healthcare Clinic; Tampa, Florida	January 2012 - March 2018	194 patients eligible for mammography	Inclusion: female patients ages 40-75 years at most recent visit, at least two medical visits during study interval Exclusion: <40 years at most recent visit	Mean: 53; 40-44: 19% 45-54: 40% 55-75: 41%	Hispanic: 79% Non-Hispanic: 9.8% Did not specify: 11%	Proportion of patients having received an annual mammogram if ages 45-54 years or biennial mammogram if ages ≥55 years	Total: 70.6% 40–44 years: 49% 45-54: 67% ≥55 years: 85%	- Retrospective - Small sample size - Large Hispanic population may not be generalizable to other free clinics - No evaluation of patient education level (may be related to decision making about preventative health screenings)
Menning et al. (2016)	Interventional	USPSTF 2014	Student Health Alliance Reaching Indigent Needy Groups (SHARING) Clinic; Omaha, Nebraska	January 2012 - December 2014	26 patients eligible for mammography	Inclusion: all patients ≥19 years during study interval Exclusion: none explicitly stated	Pre-intervention: 53±12* Post-intervention: 50±13*	<u>Pre-intervention:</u> Hispanic: 49%* Non-Hispanic: 48%* Not documented: 1.2%* <u>Post-intervention:</u> Hispanic: 40%* Non-Hispanic: 57%*	Proportion of patients ≥50 years having received a mammogram in the last 1 or 2 years	Pre-Intervention: 29/36 (81%) Post-intervention: 22/26 (85%).	- Small sample size

								Not documented: 4.2%*			
Russi et al. (2018)	Interventional	USPSTF 2012	Community Health Chicago (CHC); Chicago, Illinois	November 2014 - May 2016	126 patients eligible for mammography	Inclusion: female patients ages 50-74 years Exclusion: none explicitly stated	Intervention group: 46±11* Control group: 46±11*	Not stated	Proportion of patients having received a mammogram in the last 2 years	156/212 (74%)	- Short time period at one study site
Slaughter et al. (2018)	Interventional	USPSTF 2016	St. Vincent de Paul (SVdP) Medical Clinic; Phoenix, Arizona	September 2017 - December 2017	508 patients eligible for mammography	None listed	Up-to-date: 55±4.7 Not up-to-date: 58±5.7	<u>Up-to-date</u> Black: 17% Hispanic: 65% White: 17% <u>Not up-to-date</u> Black: 14% Hispanic: 71% White: 14%	Proportion up-to-date with mammogram per USPSTF guidelines	23/51 (45%)	None explicitly stated
Zucker et al. (2013)	Retrospective chart review	USPSTF 2009	Student Family Health Care Center (SFHCC); Newark, New Jersey	June 2008 – June 2009	47 patients eligible for mammography	Inclusion: all patients seen during study interval Exclusion: none explicitly stated	<18: 3.0%* 18-64: 91%* ≥65: 6.0%*	Black: 60%* Hispanic: 29%*	Proportion of patients having received a mammogram in the last 2 years	21/47 (45%)	None explicitly stated

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

145

146

USPSTF = United States Preventive Services Task Force; ACS = American Cancer Society

147

* Demographics listed refer to all participants in the study, not just breast cancer screening specific patients

The percentage of White participants ranged from 9.4% to 55%. The percentage of Hispanic/Latino participants ranged from 26% to 79.5%. The percentage of Black participants ranged from 5.6% to 60%. One study had a 7% Middle-Eastern population.²⁸ Another study had a 1.2% Asian population.²⁹ For studies that listed participant ages specific to the sample of patients who were eligible for breast cancer screening, the majority fell between the ages of 40 and 50 years.^{16,30,31}

Primary outcomes included a) date of last mammogram (n=1), b) rate of mammogram completion (n=5), c) percentage of patients up-to-date as per screening guidelines (n=2). Sample sizes ranged from 8-508 participants evaluated in each study.³¹

Of these eight studies, six (75%) used USPSTF guidelines to determine whether patients were up-to-date on their screenings, one used ACS guidelines, and one did not specify the guideline used.

Synthesis of results

For studies measuring the percentage of patients who are up-to-date on their screening as per guidelines, the proportion of patients who were screened appropriately amongst the studies ranged from 45% to 94%.

Risk of bias of included studies

The average number of checklist items fulfilled by each study reporting breast cancer screening data on the AHRQ methodology checklist was 4.0 (SD = 1.1) (**Table 2**). No studies explained patient exclusions from analysis or described how confounding was assessed or controlled. Only one study described assessments undertaken for quality assurance purposes.¹⁷ Only one study summarized patient response rates and

171 completeness of data collection.²⁸ Only two studies explain how missing data were
172 handled in the analysis.^{17,28}

173 **Table 2.** Risk of bias analysis
174

<i>Author</i> (Year)	<i>Define</i> source of information	<i>List inclusion and</i> exclusion criteria for exposed and unexposed subjects (cases and controls) or refer to previous publications	<i>Indicate</i> time period used for identifying patients	<i>Indicate</i> whether subjects were consecutive if not population- based	<i>Indicate if</i> evaluators of subjective components of study were masked to other aspects of the status of the participants	<i>Describe any</i> assessments undertaken for quality assurance purposes (e.g., test/retest of primary outcome measurements)	<i>Explain any</i> patient exclusions from analysis	<i>Describe</i> how confounding was assessed and/or controlled	<i>If applicable,</i> explain how missing data was handled in the analysis	<i>Summarize</i> patient response rates and completeness of data collection	<i>Clarify what</i> follow-up, if any, was expected and the percentage of patients for which incomplete data or follow-up was obtained
<i>Khalil et al.</i> (2020)	+	+	+	+	NA	-	NA	-	NA	-	NA
<i>Menning et al.</i> (2016)	+	+	+	+	NA	-	NA	-	NA	-	NA
<i>Price et al.</i> (2019)	+	+	+	+	NA	-	NA	-	NA	-	NA
<i>Russi et al.</i> (2018)	+	+	+	+	NA	-	NA	-	NA	-	NA
<i>Slaughter</i> (2018)	+	-	+	+	NA	-	NA	-	NA	-	NA
<i>Buntrock et al.</i> (2020)	+	+	+	+	NA	-	-	-	+	+	NA
<i>Burger et al.</i> (2020)	+	+	-	+	NA	-	-	-	-	-	NA
<i>Butala et al.</i> (2012)	+	+	+	+	NA	-	+	+	+	-	NA
<i>Butala et al.</i> (2013)	+	+	+	+	NA	-	+	-	+	+	NA

<i>Hu et al.</i> (2016)	+	-	+	+	NA	-	-	-	-	-	NA
<i>Veras et al.</i> (2019)	+	-	+	+	NA	-	-	-	-	-	NA
<i>Zucker et al.</i> (2013)	+	-	+	+	NA	+	-	-	+	-	NA

+ = present; - = absent; N/A = not applicable

178 Cervical Cancer Screening

179 *Study characteristics*

180 Ten studies reported on rates of cervical cancer screening at SRFCs (**Table 3**).
 181 Cervical cancer screening was performed via Papanicolaou (Pap) smear with cytology
 182 alone (without co-testing) for all studies. A total of 2198 patients were included in these
 183 studies. Two studies were cross-sectional questionnaires, four were cross-sectional
 184 chart reviews, and four were interventional studies. Of these ten studies, eight (80%)
 185 used USPSTF guidelines to determine whether or not patients were up-to-date on their
 186 screenings, one used ACS guidelines, and one did not specify the guideline used.

187 **Table 3.** Details of studies that identified cervical cancer screening rates in SRFCs via Pap smear.

Author (year)	Study type	Guidelines referenced	Study location	Study period	# of participants	Inclusion/exclusion criteria	Age in years (mean \pm SD)	Race/ethnicity	Primary outcome	Results	Limitations
Buntrock et al. (2020)	Cross-sectional questionnaire	USPSTF – year not specified	Coyote clinic, Sioux Falls, South Dakota	June 2019-February 2020	27 patients eligible for Pap smear	Inclusion: female patients ages 18-65 years Exclusion: none explicitly stated	18-26: 7.0%* 27-39: 60%* 50-74: 33%*	Black: 15%* Middle Eastern: 7.0%* Hispanic: 26%* White: 52%*	Proportion of patients up-to-date with Pap smear per USPSTF guidelines	21/27 (78%)	- Small sample size - <1 year of data collection - Poor recall from patient population of screening results and year completed.
Butala et al. (2012)	Retrospective chart review	USPSTF 2010-2011	HAVEN Clinic; New Haven, Connecticut	October 2008-October 2009	55 patients eligible for Pap smear	Inclusion: female patients that kept at least one clinical visit during study period Exclusion: no gender listed in patient chart, participants with missing patient charts (e.g., due to being under clinical use at the time of data abstraction)	35 \pm 10*	Black: 90%* Latino: 90%* Non-Latino White: 1.0%* Other: 1.9%*	Proportion of patients up-to-date with Pap smear per USPSTF guidelines	30/55 (55%)	- Missing charts - Preventative services delivered at the clinic may not have been documented fully in the charts - Nationwide comparisons may not be strictly comparable since BRFSS is a survey and this study was done via chart review - HAVEN patients all have access to free care which may not be the case for all BRFSS patients.
Butala et al. (2013)	Interventional	USPSTF 2009	HAVEN Clinic; New Haven, Connecticut	Pre-intervention: 2008-2009	166 patients eligible for Pap smear pre-intervention and 58 eligible	Inclusion: determined according to USPSTF guidelines on the	Pre-intervention: 36*	<u>Pre-intervention</u> Latino: 87%* Other: 10%* <u>Post-intervention</u>	Proportion of patients up-to-date with Pap smear as	Pre-intervention: 68/116 (59%) Post-intervention: 34/58 (59%)	- Observational pre/post design cannot establish a causal relationship between the implementation of the intervention and the increase

				Post intervention: 2010-2011	post-intervention	basis of age and gender Exclusion: observations with missing age or gender; patients who were screening in a previous year within the guideline-recommended window	Post-intervention: 35*	Latino: 90%* Other: 9.0%*	per USPSTF guidelines		in prevention, because data were combined from multiple years - Patients may have repeated observations
Hu et al. (2016)	Cross-sectional questionnaire	Not stated explicitly	Stony Brook Health Outreach and Medical Education Clinic; Stony Brooke, New York	September 2012- May 2013	165 patients surveyed	Inclusion: all patients presenting to clinic Exclusion: none explicitly stated	19-24: 3.8%* 25-34: 21%* 35-44: 31%* 45-54: 31%* 55-64: 11%* 65-74: 1.3%* >75: 0.6%*	Asian: 1.2%* Black: 5.6%* Hispanic: 80%* White: 9.4%* Other: 4.3%*	Proportion of patients having received a Pap smear in the past 3 years	51/79 (65%) women >18 reported having a Pap smear in the past 3 years	- Single center - Small sample - No determined citizenship status
Menning et al. (2016)	Interventional	USPSTF 2014	Student Health Alliance Reaching Indigent Needy Groups (SHARING)	January 2012- December 2014	33 patients eligible for Pap smear	Inclusion: all patients ≥19 years during study interval Exclusion: none explicitly stated	Pre-intervention: 53 ± 12* Post-intervention: 50 ± 13*	<u>Pre-intervention:</u> Hispanic: 49%* Non-Hispanic: 48%* Not documented: 1.2%*	Proportion of patients up-to-date with Pap smear as per USPSTF guidelines	Pre-intervention: 25/38 (66%) Post-intervention: 22/33 (67%)	- Small sample size

) clinic; Omaha, Nebraska					<u>Post-intervention:</u> Hispanic: 40%* Non-Hispanic: 57%* Not documented: 4.2%*	pre-intervention versus post-intervention		
Price et al. (2020)	Cross-sectional chart review	ACS – Cervical 2019	Building Relationships and Initiatives Dedicated to Gaining Equality Healthcare Clinic (BRIDGE); Tampa, Florida	January 2012-March 2018	239 patients eligible for Pap smear	Inclusion: all female patients aged 21 - 64 at their most recent clinic visit with 2+ medical visits during the study interval. Exclusion: history of total hysterectomy	Mean 45; 21-29: 11% 30-64: 89%	Hispanic: 85% Non-Hispanic: 7.1% Did not specify: 7.9%	Proportion of patients up-to-date with Pap smear as per ACS guidelines	210/239 (88%)	- Retrospective nature - Small sample size - Demographics not necessarily generalizable
Russi et al. (2018)	Interventional	USPSTF 2012	Community Health Chicago (CHC); Chicago, Illinois	November 2014-May 2016	212 patients eligible for Pap smear	Inclusion: for breast cancer screening, female patients between 50 - 74, for cervical cancer screening, female patients between 30 – 64. Exclusion: none explicitly stated	Intervention group: 46 ± 11* Control group: 46 ± 11*	Not stated	Proportion of patients up-to-date with Pap smear as per USPSTF guidelines	156/212 (74%)	- Short time period at one study site.

Slaughter et al. (2018)	Interventional	USPSTF cervical 2012	St. Vincent de Paul (SVdP) Medical Clinic; Phoenix, Arizona	September 2017-December 2017	1164 patients eligible for Pap smear	None explicitly stated	Up to date: 43 ± 9.6 Not up to date: 51 ± 10	<u>Up-to-date</u> Black: 5.4% Hispanic: 88% White: 6.9% <u>Not up-to-date</u> Black: 5.2% Hispanic: 83% White: 12%	Proportion of patients up-to-date with Pap smear as per USPSTF guidelines	130/188 (69%)	None explicitly stated
Veras et al. (2019)	Retrospective chart review	USPSTF (no year stated)	Clinica Esperanza/ Hope Clinic (CEHC); Providence, Rhode Island	2015-2017	75 patients eligible for Pap smear	Inclusion: patients presenting to clinic for non-gynecologic visits. Exclusion: none explicitly stated	21-65	Hispanic (no % listed)	Proportion of patients up-to-date with Pap smear as per USPSTF guidelines	40-62%	None explicitly stated
Zucker et al. (2013)	Retrospective chart review	USPSTF cervical 2003	Student Family Health Care Center (SFHCC); Newark, New Jersey	June 2008-June 2009	62 patients eligible for Pap smear	Inclusion: all patients seen during study interval Exclusion: none explicitly stated	< 18: 3.0%* 18-64: 91%* ≥ 65 y: 6.0%*	Black: 60%* Hispanic: 29%*	Proportion of patients having received a Pap smear in the last 2 years	32/62 (52%)	None explicitly stated

USPSTF = United States Preventive Services Task Force; ACS = American Cancer Society

* Demographics listed refer to all participants in the study, not just cervical cancer screening specific patients

The percentage of White participants ranged from 1.0% to 52%. The percentage of Hispanic/Latino participants ranged from 26% to 90%. The percentage of Black participants ranged from 5.2% to 89.5%. One study had participants with 7% Middle-Eastern population, and another reported a 1.2% Asian population.^{28,29} For studies that listed participant ages specific to the sample of patients who were eligible for cervical cancer screening, the majority fell between the ages of 30 and 50 years.^{31–33}

Primary outcomes included a) date of last Pap smear (n = 1), b) Pap smear rate (n=3), c) percentage of patients up-to-date as per screening guidelines (n=6). Sample sizes ranged from 27-1164 participants evaluated in each study.³¹

Synthesis of results

For studies measuring the percentage of patients who are up-to-date on their screening as per guidelines, the proportion of patients who had been screened appropriately amongst the studies ranged from 40% to 88%.

Risk of bias of included studies

The average number of checklist items fulfilled by each study reporting cervical cancer screening data on the AHRQ methodology checklist was 4.6 (SD = 1.5) (**Table 2**). Only one of the 10 studies discussed assessments undertaken for quality assurance purposes.¹⁷ Only one study described how confounding was assessed or control.¹⁸ Only two studies summarized patient response rates and completeness of data collection.^{28,34} Only two studies explained patient exclusions from analysis.^{21,24}

Discussion

Main findings

In this systematic review of breast and cervical cancer screening at SRFCs, we found that: (1) SRFCs largely use mammography and Pap smears with cytology alone for screening; (2) SRFCs may vary in the guidelines followed for screening interval recommendations but largely reference USPSTF and ACS; (3) adherence to guideline-recommended screening for breast and cervical cancer at SRFCs range from 45-94% and 40-88%, respectively, and; (4) most studies on this subject are at high risk of bias.

Comparison with existing literature

In 2018, the national average of all eligible persons up-to-date with screening was 72.4% (95% CI 70.8–73.9) for breast cancer and 82.9% (95% CI 81.6–84.0) for cervical cancer.³⁵ Within the uninsured population in the US, screening rates were 39.5% (95% CI 32.8–46.5) for breast cancer and 65.0% (95% CI 60.6–69.1) for cervical cancer.³⁵ In our review, we found that approximately half of the studies included on breast cancer screening and one in ten of studies included on cervical cancer screening reported screening rates at or above the overall national average.^{16,29,30,32,36} If comparing with national screening rates for the uninsured only, all studies on breast cancer screening and five in ten studies on cervical cancer screening met or surpassed the national average.^{28,31,32,36,37} This suggests that, while there is substantial variation, people receiving care at SRFCs can achieve similar rates of breast and cervical cancer screening when compared with insured and uninsured populations receiving care at established settings, but further work is needed to close gaps in preventative care.

There may be several contributing factors to the difference between adherence to breast and cervical cancer screening recommendations at SRFCs. SRFCs rely on mostly volunteer faculty to oversee trainees, and not all faculty may have the same level

of comfort with performing Pap smears versus referring patients for mammography. Another potential barrier to adherence to cervical cancer screening guidelines is ensuring that each clinic session has supplies to administer Pap smears and a pathology service available to interpret them. With breast cancer screening, where women are referred to an imaging facility that has a radiologist already available to interpret results, this may be less of an obstacle. Similarly, patients at SRFCs may not be as comfortable with trainees performing an invasive examination or test. The screening intervals for cervical cancer are also more infrequent than that for breast cancer screening, thus patients who have limited access to regular care may be more likely to be captured as adherent to cervical cancer screening than breast cancer screening if they receive intermittent screening for both. Other barriers to screening at SRFCs are broader. SRFCs usually need to partner with different diagnostic facilities to process laboratory and radiographic tests, and these tests may be of limited availability and cost. Furthermore, for patients who may have had intermittent access to care via SRFCs, addressing acute medical concerns or chronic disease management may displace focus on preventive services.

Limitations

The studies synthesized in this review had several limitations. Many studies had small sample sizes. Most studies only fulfilled approximately 3 of 11 items on the AHRQ methodology checklist, suggesting a high risk of bias. Few studies summarized patient response rates and completeness of data collection or discussed assessments undertaken for quality assurance purposes or control/assessment of confounding. In addition, few studies provided demographic information specific to patients being

evaluated for breast or cervical cancer screening rates. This may make it difficult to draw conclusions between national averages and SRFC averages. Future studies can benefit from increasing study size, discussing confounding, and improving discussion of patient demographics.

Our systematic review also has its limitations. Because SRFCs are organized by individual institutions in response to local community needs and student and supervising clinician interests, SRFCs tend to be heterogeneous in terms of scope of services, frequency of operation, and consistency of services provided. As a result, SRFCs often serve a diverse patient demographic with varying availability of services provided and less predictability of resources. Thus, findings from this systematic review may not be generalizable of SRFCs. Similarly, due to heterogeneity in study design, we were unable to perform a meta-analysis of breast and cervical cancer screening rates. In addition, some relevant studies may have eluded our search due to research remaining unpublished, being published in uncatalogued sources, or publication bias.

Conclusions and implications

SRFCs are an important point of access for preventive care for the underserved. Our review suggests that SRFCs can match the rate of breast and cervical cancer screening in populations nationally. However, there is still a clear discrepancy between the rate of SRFC screening compared to the national insured population. Additional work is needed to capture data from SRFCs and improve screening in this setting.

279 **Acknowledgements**

280 No acknowledgements to disclose.

281

References

1. Street W. Breast Cancer Facts & Figures 2019-2020. :44.
2. Hall IJ. Patterns and Trends in Cancer Screening in the United States. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2018;15. doi:10.5888/pcd15.170465
3. Hoerger TJ, Ekwueme DU, Miller JW, et al. Estimated Effects of the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program on Breast Cancer Mortality. *Am J Prev Med*. 2011;40(4):397-404. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2010.12.017
4. Tangka FKL, O'Hara B, Gardner JG, et al. Meeting the cervical cancer screening needs of underserved women: The National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program, 2004–2006. *Cancer Causes Control*. 2010;21(7):1081-1090. doi:10.1007/s10552-010-9536-3
5. Palma ML, Arthofer A, Halstead KM, Wahba JM, Martinez DA. Service Learning in Health Care for Underserved Communities: University of Iowa Mobile Clinic, 2019. *Am J Public Health*. 2020;110(9):1304-1307. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2020.305755
6. Schweitzer PJ, Rice TR. The student-run clinic: a new opportunity for psychiatric education. *Acad Psychiatry J Am Assoc Dir Psychiatr Resid Train Assoc Acad Psychiatry*. 2012;36(3):233-236. doi:10.1176/appi.ap.10110163
7. Taylor J, Thomas D, Tornheim J, Meah Y. Hypertension Outcomes at a Student-Run Clinic for the Uninsured. *J Stud-Run Clin*. 2015;1(1). Accessed October 24, 2021. <https://journalsrc.org/index.php/jsrc/article/view/4>
8. Wahle B, Meyer K, Faller M, Kochhar K, Sevilla J. Assessment of Hypertension Management and Outcomes at an Indianapolis Student-Run Free Clinic. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 2017;28(2):694-706. doi:10.1353/hpu.2017.0068

9. Zucker J, Gillen J, Ackrivo J, Schroeder R, Keller S. Hypertension management in a student-run free clinic: meeting national standards? *Acad Med J Assoc Am Med Coll.* 2011;86(2):239-245. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e31820465e0
10. Rojas SM, Smith SD, Rojas S, Vaida F. Longitudinal hyperlipidemia outcomes at three student-run free clinic sites. *Fam Med.* 2015;47(4):309-314.
11. Ryskina KL, Meah YS, Thomas DC. Quality of diabetes care at a student-run free clinic. *J Health Care Poor Underserved.* 2009;20(4):969-981. doi:10.1353/hpu.0.0231
12. Mehta PP, Santiago-Torres JE, Wisely CE, et al. Primary Care Continuity Improves Diabetic Health Outcomes: From Free Clinics to Federally Qualified Health Centers. *J Am Board Fam Med JABFM.* 2016;29(3):318-324. doi:10.3122/jabfm.2016.03.150256
13. Smith SD, Marrone L, Gomez A, Johnson ML, Edland SD, Beck E. Clinical outcomes of diabetic patients at a student-run free clinic project. *Fam Med.* 2014;46(3):198-203.
14. Liberman KM, Meah YS, Chow A, Tornheim J, Rolon O, Thomas DC. Quality of mental health care at a student-run clinic: care for the uninsured exceeds that of publicly and privately insured populations. *J Community Health.* 2011;36(5):733-740. doi:10.1007/s10900-011-9367-5
15. Suen J, Attrill S, Thomas JM, Smale M, Delaney CL, Miller MD. Effect of student-led health interventions on patient outcomes for those with cardiovascular disease or cardiovascular disease risk factors: a systematic review. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord.* 2020;20(1):332. doi:10.1186/s12872-020-01602-1

16. Khalil S, Hatch L, Price CR, et al. Addressing Breast Cancer Screening Disparities Among Uninsured and Insured Patients: A Student-Run Free Clinic Initiative. *J Community Health*. 2020;45(3):501-505. doi:10.1007/s10900-019-00767-x
17. Zucker J, Lee J, Khokhar M, Schroeder R, Keller S. Measuring and assessing preventive medicine services in a student-run free clinic. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 2013;24(1):344-358. doi:10.1353/hpu.2013.0009
18. Butala NM, Murk W, Horwitz LI, Graber LK, Bridger L, Ellis P. What is the quality of preventive care provided in a student-run free clinic? *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 2012;23(1):414-424. doi:10.1353/hpu.2012.0034
19. Rostom A, Dubé C, Cranney A, et al. *Appendix D. Quality Assessment Forms*. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2004. Accessed November 2, 2021. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK35156/>
20. Hunter D, Brustrom J, Garrett K. Encouraging Breast and Prostate Cancer Screening at a Student-run Clinic through Free Comprehensive Vision Testing. *Fuel Energy Abstr*. 2010;78. doi:10.1016/j.ijrobp.2010.07.1335
21. Kamimura A, Chernenko A, Nourian MM, Aguilera G, Assasnik N, Ashby J. The Role of Health Literacy in Reducing Negative Perceptions of Breast Health and Treatment Among Uninsured Primary Care Patients. *J Community Health*. 2016;41(4):858-863. doi:10.1007/s10900-016-0164-z
22. Kamimura A, Myers K, Ashby J, Trinh HN, Nourian MM, Reel JJ. Women in Free Clinics: An Assessment of Health-Related Quality of Life for Prevention and Health Education. *J Community Health*. 2015;40(4):793-801. doi:10.1007/s10900-015-0002-8

23. Kumar NR, DuVernois G, Almeida-Monroe V, Siegert N, De Groot AS. Evaluating the Impact of a Student-Run Women's Clinic on Access to Gynecologic Care for Uninsured Women in Rhode Island. *R I Med J* 2013. 2019;102(10):52-56.
24. Mootz A, Santiago ABD, Gutierrez J, Steffen K, Swinney I, Francis M. Providing Women's Cancer Screening and Education in an Underserved Border Population. *J Stud-Run Clin*. 2018;4(1). Accessed October 26, 2021. <https://journalsrc.org/index.php/jsrc/article/view/62>
25. Tran C, Ngo L, Crowley M, Tran S, Robinson WR. Impact of a Student-Run Clinic in a Non-Profit Substance Abuse Rehabilitation Facility for Women [32B]. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2019;133:29S. doi:10.1097/01.AOG.0000559415.87312.23
26. Weston C, Page R, Jones-Schubart K, Akinlotan M. Improving Cancer Screening for Underserved Women Through an FNP Student-Led Clinic. *J Nurse Pract*. 2018;14(5):e101-e104. doi:10.1016/j.nurpra.2018.01.013
27. Chau J, Kibria F, Landi M, et al. HPV Knowledge and Vaccine Acceptance in an Uninsured Hispanic Population in Providence, RI. *R I Med J*. 2014;96.
28. Buntrock A, Bormann J, Kazi S, Waligoske K, Wallum M, Beard M. Incorporation of Women's Health Maintenance Screening in the USD Coyote Clinic. *S D Med J S D State Med Assoc*. 2020;73(10):470-472.
29. Hu ZI, Smith DM. Cancer Screening Rates in a Student-Run Free Clinic. *Ochsner J*. 2016;16(1):37-40.
30. Burger M, Taddeo MS, Hushla D, Pasarica M. Interventions for Increasing the Quality of Preventive Care at a Free Clinic. *Cureus*. 2020;12(1):e6562. doi:10.7759/cureus.6562

31. Slaughter G. Beyond Disease-Oriented Care for the Uninsured: Increasing Access to Prevention. Published online February 28, 2018. Accessed October 26, 2021. <https://repository.arizona.edu/handle/10150/626889>
32. Price CR, Hatch LA, Radisic A, et al. Enhancing Adherence to Cervical Cancer Screening Guidelines at a Student-Run Free Clinic. *J Community Health*. 2020;45(1):128-132. doi:10.1007/s10900-019-00724-8
33. Veras Y, Medina S, Almeida-Monroe, RN V, Rosales D, De Groot A. Cervical Cancer Screening Trends at a Free Clinic for the Uninsured in Providence, Rhode Island. In: ; 2019. Accessed October 26, 2021. https://apha.confex.com/apha/2019/meetingapi.cgi/Paper/450898?filename=2019_Abstract450898.pdf&template=Word
34. Butala NM, Chang H, Horwitz LI, Bartlett M, Ellis P. Improving Quality of Preventive Care at a Student-Run Free Clinic. *PLoS ONE*. 2013;8(11):e81441. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0081441
35. Sabatino SA. Cancer Screening Test Receipt — United States, 2018. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7002a1
36. Menning M, Nabower A, Medder J, Geske J, Margalit R. The Impact of a Multifaceted Intervention on the Rate of Preventive Services Offered in a Student-Run Clinic. *J Stud-Run Clin*. 2016;2(2). Accessed October 26, 2021. <https://studentrunfreeclinics.org/journalsrc.org/index.php/jsr/article/view/14>
37. Russi AE, Bhaumik S, Herzog JJ, Tschoe M, Baumgartner AC. Impact of an education-centered medical home on quality at a student-volunteer free clinic. *Med Educ Online*. 2018;23(1):1505401. doi:10.1080/10872981.2018.1505




Figure 1. Flow diagram of study selection for inclusion in systematic review.

Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71