

1 **Title Page**

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

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

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

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

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

10 ⁴ Resident physician, Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Beaumont Health

11 System and Oakland University William Beaumont School of Medicine, Royal Oak, MI

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

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

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

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

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

20 *Corresponding author:*

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

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

23 *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

27 **Abstract**

28 *Objective*

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

32 *Data sources*

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

36 *Study eligibility criteria*

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

40 *Study appraisal and synthesis methods*

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

46 *Results*

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

49 45% to 94%. The proportion of patients up-to-date on cervical cancer screening per
50 guidelines ranged from 40% to 88%.

51 *Conclusion*

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

55

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

58 **Introduction**

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

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

78 **Objective**

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

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

83 **Methods**

84 Information sources and search strategies

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

91 Eligibility criteria and study selection

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

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

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

104 Data extraction and synthesis

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

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

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

113 Assessment of risk of bias

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

121 **Results**

122 Study selection

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

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

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

134 *Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The*
135 *PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ*
136 *2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71*

137 Breast cancer screening

138 *Study characteristics*

139 Eight studies reported on rates of breast cancer screening at SRFCs (**Table 1**).
140 Breast cancer screening was performed via mammography for all studies. A total of
141 1408 patients were included in these studies. Two studies were cross-sectional
142 questionnaires, two were cross-sectional chart reviews, and four were interventional
143 studies.

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

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

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

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

161 *Synthesis of results*

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

165 *Risk of bias of included studies*

166 The average number of checklist items fulfilled by each study reporting breast
167 cancer screening data on the AHRQ methodology checklist was 4.0 (SD = 1.1) (**Table**
168 **2**). No studies explained patient exclusions from analysis or described how confounding
169 was assessed or controlled. Only one study described assessments undertaken for
170 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 (Year)</i>	<i>Define source of information</i>	<i>List inclusion and exclusion criteria for exposed and unexposed subjects (cases and controls) or refer to previous publications</i>	<i>Indicate time period used for identifying patients</i>	<i>Indicate whether subjects were consecutive if not population- based</i>	<i>Indicate if evaluators of subjective components of study were masked to other aspects of the status of the participants</i>	<i>Describe any assessments undertaken for quality assurance purposes (e.g., test/retest of primary outcome measurements)</i>	<i>Explain any patient exclusions from analysis</i>	<i>Describe how confounding was assessed and/or controlled</i>	<i>If applicable, explain how missing data was handled in the analysis</i>	<i>Summarize patient response rates and completeness of data collection</i>	<i>Clarify what follow-up, if any, was expected and the percentage of patients for which incomplete data or follow-up was obtained</i>
<i>Khalil et al. (2020)</i>	+	+	+	+	NA	-	NA	-	NA	-	NA
<i>Menning et al. (2016)</i>	+	+	+	+	NA	-	NA	-	NA	-	NA
<i>Price et al. (2019)</i>	+	+	+	+	NA	-	NA	-	NA	-	NA
<i>Russi et al. (2018)</i>	+	+	+	+	NA	-	NA	-	NA	-	NA
<i>Slaughter (2018)</i>	+	-	+	+	NA	-	NA	-	NA	-	NA
<i>Buntrock et al. (2020)</i>	+	+	+	+	NA	-	-	-	+	+	NA
<i>Burger et al. (2020)</i>	+	+	-	+	NA	-	-	-	-	-	NA
<i>Butala et al. (2012)</i>	+	+	+	+	NA	-	+	+	+	-	NA
<i>Butala et al. (2013)</i>	+	+	+	+	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

175
176
177

+ = 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 ± 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	USPSPTF 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 ± 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 Relationshi ps 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)	Intervention al	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

188

189

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

190

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

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

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

200 *Synthesis of results*

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

204 *Risk of bias of included studies*

205 The average number of checklist items fulfilled by each study reporting cervical
206 cancer screening data on the AHRQ methodology checklist was 4.6 (SD = 1.5) (**Table**
207 **2**). Only one of the 10 studies discussed assessments undertaken for quality assurance
208 purposes.¹⁷ Only one study described how confounding was assessed or control.¹⁸ Only
209 two studies summarized patient response rates and completeness of data
210 collection.^{28,34} Only two studies explained patient exclusions from analysis.^{21,24}

211 **Discussion**

212 Main findings

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

219 Comparison with existing literature

220 In 2018, the national average of all eligible persons up-to-date with screening
221 was 72.4% (95% CI 70.8–73.9) for breast cancer and 82.9% (95% CI 81.6–84.0) for
222 cervical cancer.³⁵ Within the uninsured population in the US, screening rates were
223 39.5% (95% CI 32.8–46.5) for breast cancer and 65.0% (95% CI 60.6–69.1) for cervical
224 cancer.³⁵ In our review, we found that approximately half of the studies included on
225 breast cancer screening and one in ten of studies included on cervical cancer screening
226 reported screening rates at or above the overall national average.^{16,29,30,32,36} If
227 comparing with national screening rates for the uninsured only, all studies on breast
228 cancer screening and five in ten studies on cervical cancer screening met or surpassed
229 the national average.^{28,31,32,36,37} This suggests that, while there is substantial variation,
230 people receiving care at SRFCs can achieve similar rates of breast and cervical cancer
231 screening when compared with insured and uninsured populations receiving care at
232 established settings, but further work is needed to close gaps in preventative care.

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

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

252 Limitations

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

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

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

273 Conclusions and implications

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

279

Acknowledgements

280

No acknowledgements to disclose.

281

282 **References**

- 283 1. Street W. Breast Cancer Facts & Figures 2019-2020. :44.
- 284 2. Hall IJ. Patterns and Trends in Cancer Screening in the United States. *Prev*
285 *Chronic Dis*. 2018;15. doi:10.5888/pcd15.170465
- 286 3. Hoerger TJ, Ekwueme DU, Miller JW, et al. Estimated Effects of the National
287 Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program on Breast Cancer Mortality.
288 *Am J Prev Med*. 2011;40(4):397-404. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2010.12.017
- 289 4. Tangka FKL, O'Hara B, Gardner JG, et al. Meeting the cervical cancer screening
290 needs of underserved women: The National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early
291 Detection Program, 2004–2006. *Cancer Causes Control*. 2010;21(7):1081-1090.
292 doi:10.1007/s10552-010-9536-3
- 293 5. Palma ML, Arthofer A, Halstead KM, Wahba JM, Martinez DA. Service Learning in
294 Health Care for Underserved Communities: University of Iowa Mobile Clinic, 2019.
295 *Am J Public Health*. 2020;110(9):1304-1307. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2020.305755
- 296 6. Schweitzer PJ, Rice TR. The student-run clinic: a new opportunity for psychiatric
297 education. *Acad Psychiatry J Am Assoc Dir Psychiatr Resid Train Assoc Acad*
298 *Psychiatry*. 2012;36(3):233-236. doi:10.1176/appi.ap.10110163
- 299 7. Taylor J, Thomas D, Tornheim J, Meah Y. Hypertension Outcomes at a Student-
300 Run Clinic for the Uninsured. *J Stud-Run Clin*. 2015;1(1). Accessed October 24,
301 2021. <https://journalsrc.org/index.php/jsrc/article/view/4>
- 302 8. Wahle B, Meyer K, Faller M, Kochhar K, Sevilla J. Assessment of Hypertension
303 Management and Outcomes at an Indianapolis Student-Run Free Clinic. *J Health*
304 *Care Poor Underserved*. 2017;28(2):694-706. doi:10.1353/hpu.2017.0068

- 305 9. Zucker J, Gillen J, Ackrivo J, Schroeder R, Keller S. Hypertension management in
306 a student-run free clinic: meeting national standards? *Acad Med J Assoc Am Med*
307 *Coll.* 2011;86(2):239-245. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e31820465e0
- 308 10. Rojas SM, Smith SD, Rojas S, Vaida F. Longitudinal hyperlipidemia outcomes at
309 three student-run free clinic sites. *Fam Med.* 2015;47(4):309-314.
- 310 11. Ryskina KL, Meah YS, Thomas DC. Quality of diabetes care at a student-run free
311 clinic. *J Health Care Poor Underserved.* 2009;20(4):969-981.
312 doi:10.1353/hpu.0.0231
- 313 12. Mehta PP, Santiago-Torres JE, Wisely CE, et al. Primary Care Continuity Improves
314 Diabetic Health Outcomes: From Free Clinics to Federally Qualified Health
315 Centers. *J Am Board Fam Med JABFM.* 2016;29(3):318-324.
316 doi:10.3122/jabfm.2016.03.150256
- 317 13. Smith SD, Marrone L, Gomez A, Johnson ML, Edland SD, Beck E. Clinical
318 outcomes of diabetic patients at a student-run free clinic project. *Fam Med.*
319 2014;46(3):198-203.
- 320 14. Liberman KM, Meah YS, Chow A, Tornheim J, Rolon O, Thomas DC. Quality of
321 mental health care at a student-run clinic: care for the uninsured exceeds that of
322 publicly and privately insured populations. *J Community Health.* 2011;36(5):733-
323 740. doi:10.1007/s10900-011-9367-5
- 324 15. Suen J, Attrill S, Thomas JM, Smale M, Delaney CL, Miller MD. Effect of student-
325 led health interventions on patient outcomes for those with cardiovascular disease
326 or cardiovascular disease risk factors: a systematic review. *BMC Cardiovasc*
327 *Disord.* 2020;20(1):332. doi:10.1186/s12872-020-01602-1

- 328 16. Khalil S, Hatch L, Price CR, et al. Addressing Breast Cancer Screening Disparities
329 Among Uninsured and Insured Patients: A Student-Run Free Clinic Initiative. *J*
330 *Community Health*. 2020;45(3):501-505. doi:10.1007/s10900-019-00767-x
- 331 17. Zucker J, Lee J, Khokhar M, Schroeder R, Keller S. Measuring and assessing
332 preventive medicine services in a student-run free clinic. *J Health Care Poor*
333 *Underserved*. 2013;24(1):344-358. doi:10.1353/hpu.2013.0009
- 334 18. Butala NM, Murk W, Horwitz LI, Graber LK, Bridger L, Ellis P. What is the quality of
335 preventive care provided in a student-run free clinic? *J Health Care Poor*
336 *Underserved*. 2012;23(1):414-424. doi:10.1353/hpu.2012.0034
- 337 19. Rostom A, Dubé C, Cranney A, et al. *Appendix D. Quality Assessment Forms*.
338 Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2004. Accessed November 2,
339 2021. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK35156/>
- 340 20. Hunter D, Brustrom J, Garrett K. Encouraging Breast and Prostate Cancer
341 Screening at a Student-run Clinic through Free Comprehensive Vision Testing.
342 *Fuel Energy Abstr*. 2010;78. doi:10.1016/j.ijrobp.2010.07.1335
- 343 21. Kamimura A, Chernenko A, Nourian MM, Aguilera G, Assasnik N, Ashby J. The
344 Role of Health Literacy in Reducing Negative Perceptions of Breast Health and
345 Treatment Among Uninsured Primary Care Patients. *J Community Health*.
346 2016;41(4):858-863. doi:10.1007/s10900-016-0164-z
- 347 22. Kamimura A, Myers K, Ashby J, Trinh HN, Nourian MM, Reel JJ. Women in Free
348 Clinics: An Assessment of Health-Related Quality of Life for Prevention and Health
349 Education. *J Community Health*. 2015;40(4):793-801. doi:10.1007/s10900-015-
350 0002-8

- 351 23. Kumar NR, DuVernois G, Almeida-Monroe V, Siegert N, De Groot AS. Evaluating
352 the Impact of a Student-Run Women’s Clinic on Access to Gynecologic Care for
353 Uninsured Women in Rhode Island. *R I Med J* 2013. 2019;102(10):52-56.
- 354 24. Mootz A, Santiago ABD, Gutierrez J, Steffen K, Swinney I, Francis M. Providing
355 Women’s Cancer Screening and Education in an Underserved Border Population.
356 *J Stud-Run Clin*. 2018;4(1). Accessed October 26, 2021.
357 <https://journalsrc.org/index.php/jsrc/article/view/62>
- 358 25. Tran C, Ngo L, Crowley M, Tran S, Robinson WR. Impact of a Student-Run Clinic
359 in a Non-Profit Substance Abuse Rehabilitation Facility for Women [32B]. *Obstet*
360 *Gynecol*. 2019;133:29S. doi:10.1097/01.AOG.0000559415.87312.23
- 361 26. Weston C, Page R, Jones-Schubart K, Akinlotan M. Improving Cancer Screening
362 for Underserved Women Through an FNP Student-Led Clinic. *J Nurse Pract*.
363 2018;14(5):e101-e104. doi:10.1016/j.nurpra.2018.01.013
- 364 27. Chau J, Kibria F, Landi M, et al. HPV Knowledge and Vaccine Acceptance in an
365 Uninsured Hispanic Population in Providence, RI. *R I Med J*. 2014;96.
- 366 28. Buntrock A, Bormann J, Kazi S, Waligoske K, Wallum M, Beard M. Incorporation of
367 Women’s Health Maintenance Screening in the USD Coyote Clinic. *S D Med J S D*
368 *State Med Assoc*. 2020;73(10):470-472.
- 369 29. Hu ZI, Smith DM. Cancer Screening Rates in a Student-Run Free Clinic. *Ochsner*
370 *J*. 2016;16(1):37-40.
- 371 30. Burger M, Taddeo MS, Hushla D, Pasarica M. Interventions for Increasing the
372 Quality of Preventive Care at a Free Clinic. *Cureus*. 2020;12(1):e6562.
373 doi:10.7759/cureus.6562

- 374 31. Slaughter G. Beyond Disease-Oriented Care for the Uninsured: Increasing Access
375 to Prevention. Published online February 28, 2018. Accessed October 26, 2021.
376 <https://repository.arizona.edu/handle/10150/626889>
- 377 32. Price CR, Hatch LA, Radisic A, et al. Enhancing Adherence to Cervical Cancer
378 Screening Guidelines at a Student-Run Free Clinic. *J Community Health*.
379 2020;45(1):128-132. doi:10.1007/s10900-019-00724-8
- 380 33. Veras Y, Medina S, Almeida-Monroe, RN V, Rosales D, De Groot A. Cervical
381 Cancer Screening Trends at a Free Clinic for the Uninsured in Providence, Rhode
382 Island. In: ; 2019. Accessed October 26, 2021.
383 https://apha.confex.com/apha/2019/meetingapi.cgi/Paper/450898?filename=2019_
384 [Abstract450898.pdf&template=Word](https://apha.confex.com/apha/2019/meetingapi.cgi/Paper/450898?filename=2019_Abstract450898.pdf&template=Word)
- 385 34. Butala NM, Chang H, Horwitz LI, Bartlett M, Ellis P. Improving Quality of Preventive
386 Care at a Student-Run Free Clinic. *PLoS ONE*. 2013;8(11):e81441.
387 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0081441
- 388 35. Sabatino SA. Cancer Screening Test Receipt — United States, 2018. *MMWR Morb*
389 *Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7002a1
- 390 36. Menning M, Nabower A, Medder J, Geske J, Margalit R. The Impact of a
391 Multifaceted Intervention on the Rate of Preventive Services Offered in a Student-
392 Run Clinic. *J Stud-Run Clin*. 2016;2(2). Accessed October 26, 2021.
393 <https://studentrunfreeclinics.org/journalsrc.org/index.php/jsrc/article/view/14>
- 394 37. Russi AE, Bhaumik S, Herzog JJ, Tschoe M, Baumgartner AC. Impact of an
395 education-centered medical home on quality at a student-volunteer free clinic. *Med*
396 *Educ Online*. 2018;23(1):1505401. doi:10.1080/10872981.2018.1505
397




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