

1 **Understanding motivations of older women**

2 **to continue or discontinue breast cancer screening**

3 **Short Title:** Breast cancer screening preferences of older women

4

5 Susan C. Weller, PhD,^{1,2,3,*} Monique R. Pappadis, PhD,^{1,3,4} Shilpa Krishnan, PhD,⁵

6 Marsja R. Stearnes, PhD,³ Kristin M. Sheffield, PhD,^{3,6,7} Alai Tan, MD, PhD,⁸ Jeffrey Z.

7 Qi,⁹ James S. Goodwin, MD.^{3,10}

8

9 ¹ Department of Population Health and Health Disparities, School of Public and
10 Population Health, University of Texas Medical Branch (UTMB), Galveston, TX 77555;

11 ² Department of Family Medicine, School of Medicine; UTMB;

12 ³ Sealy Center on Aging, UTMB;

13 ⁴ Department of Occupational Therapy, School of Health Professions, UTMB;

14 ⁵ Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Division of Physical Therapy, Emory
15 University, School of Medicine; Atlanta, GA, USA

16 ⁶ Department of Surgery, School of Medicine, UTMB;

17 ⁷Global Medical Affairs, Eli Lilly and Company, Indianapolis, IN 46285;

18 ⁸ College of Nursing, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210;

19 ⁹ Harvard College, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University;

20 ¹⁰ Department of Internal Medicine, UTMB.

21 All contributors were employed by the University of Texas Medical Branch at the time
22 this work was conducted.

23

24 ***Corresponding Author:**

25 Email: sweller@utmb.edu

26 **Word Count:** 252 Abstract, 3062 text, 4 Tables

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 **Background:** Breast cancer screening guidelines indicate screening in women over 75
29 years of age is optional, depending upon patient health and preferences.

30 **Objectives:** To link experiences and perceptions of older women concerning screening
31 to their intention to continue or discontinue screening.

32 **Design:** Qualitative comparative study, comparing continuers and discontinuers.

33 **Setting:** Community-residing adults.

34 **Participants:** A purposive sample (n=59) with equal representation of White, Black, and
35 Hispanic women by age (70-74 years and 75 and older) and educational level (≤ 12
36 grade and >12 grade).

37 **Measurements:** In-depth qualitative interviews explored women's perceptions of
38 mammograms, the benefits and risks of screening, and personal screening
39 experiences. Interviews were coded and quality-checked by two or more coders. A
40 qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) was used to identify combinations of personal
41 characteristics and themes linked to the intention to continue (n=32) or discontinue
42 (n=27) screening.

43 **Results:** Personal experience themes were strongly linked to the intention to continue
44 or discontinue. Women who mentioned recent screening (within three years) and either
45 a spontaneously mentioned cancer story concerning a friend or family member or a
46 doctor's screening recommendation intended to continue screening (91% true positive
47 rate, model sensitivity). Women who did not schedule screening and who did not
48 mention a cancer story or a doctor's recommendation (or neither) intended to

49 discontinue screening (81% true negative rate, model specificity). These themes
50 transcended differences in race/ethnicity, age, and educational level.
51 **Conclusion:** Continuation of breast cancer screening in older women is motivated by
52 their personal screening history combined with cancer experiences and/or a doctor’s
53 screening recommendation.
54
55 **Key words:** Mammography, breast cancer screening, older women, geriatrics,
56 qualitative comparative analysis

57 INTRODUCTION

58 Breast cancer screening guidelines have converged on the age when women should
59 start breast cancer screening, but ambiguity remains concerning when to stop. The US
60 Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) recently broadened the age for screening,
61 adding women 40-49 years of age, and now recommends screening for women 40-74
62 years of age, noting insufficient evidence of a benefit in women 75 and older.¹ The
63 American Cancer Society (ACS) and the American College of Obstetricians and
64 Gynecologists (ACOG) recommend screening beginning at 40 and continuing while
65 women are in good health with a life expectancy of 10 or more years.²⁻⁴ Screening of
66 women who are older or have limited life expectancy can expose them to unnecessary
67 treatment that may not prolong their life.⁵⁻⁷ By age 80, the average woman's life
68 expectancy is less than 10 years⁸ suggesting that discontinuation of screening would be
69 appropriate. However, the receptivity of older women to discontinuation of screening is
70 unclear, since half of women older than 75⁹ and many women with limited expectancy
71 continue to be screened.^{10,11} To facilitate discussions with older women about
72 screening, this paper explores women's rationales for continuation and discontinuation
73 of breast cancer screening.

74
75 Breast cancer incidence increases with older age and is highest in women 65 and older.
76 Incidence peaks for women in their 70s, then decreases slightly, but remains high until
77 their mid-80s.¹² Mortality due to breast cancer increases steadily with older age,¹³ but
78 can be reduced with mammography screening for breast cancers. Clinical trials
79 demonstrate that screening reduces breast cancer mortality 14% in women 50-59

80 years, 33% in those 60-69 years, and 20% in women 70-74 years of age.¹⁴ Although
81 incidence remains high for women aged 75 and older, no one in that age range was
82 enrolled in the clinical trials – thus, there is no evidence for or against the effectiveness
83 of mammography screening for women aged 75 and older.

84
85 Screening declines from almost three-quarters of women under 75 reporting screening
86 to half of women over 75 reporting screening.⁹ For women in their 70s, shared decision-
87 making between doctor and patient can help guide the decision to continue or
88 discontinue screening.¹⁻³ Informed and shared decision-making are patient-centered
89 practices that inform patients about options and possible outcomes to help them make
90 choices that best match their preferences.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ A patient-centered perspective is
91 particularly important for breast cancer screening in older women because
92 mammography may have a net benefit for some patients but not others and because
93 older women may assign different values to the benefits and risks of screening.^{18,19}
94 Studies suggest that women care more about early detection of cancer than about the
95 negative aspects of screening, such as detection of cancers that would not affect
96 mortality.^{20,21} Although some older women may insist on continuing breast cancer
97 screening,²²⁻²⁴ screening decisions may be influenced by a doctor's recommendation,
98 personal screening history, and the reassurance that screening may offer.^{22,25-27}

99
100 This study explores factors associated with the decision to continue or discontinue
101 screening in women in the age range where discontinuation tends to occur (70 and
102 older). However, this study departs from previous descriptive studies of positive and

103 negative aspects of mammogram screening and screening preferences by instead
104 identifying combinations of key factors that predict the intention to continue or
105 discontinue screening. A qualitative comparative analysis (QCA)^{28,29} of in-depth
106 interviews identified themes and combinations of themes uniquely linked to continuation
107 or discontinuation of breast cancer screening. QCA is *similar to* logistic regression,
108 bridging qualitative and quantitative analyses, but is based on set and subset relations
109 rather than quantitative measures or probability.³⁰ A strength of QCA is its ability to
110 identify complex interactions with small sample sizes, allowing for asymmetry in
111 prediction, in case the factors predicting continuation differ from those predicting
112 discontinuation. Specifically, this study explored older women's perceptions of breast
113 cancer screening, to discover whether the decision to continue screening is driven
114 primarily by a physician's recommendation and if not, what other factors contribute to a
115 woman's screening intention.

116

117 **METHODS**

118 This study was part of a larger project examining older women's motivations for
119 screening, their willingness to discontinue screening,²⁴ their understanding of
120 overdiagnosis,³¹ and their preferences for communication about screening,³² but
121 departs from prior studies in attempting to identify the pathway between experiences
122 and the intention to screen.

123 **Participants.** Women 70 years and older with no prior history of breast cancer were
124 recruited from a local geriatric clinic, senior community living facilities, senior public
125 housing, local community centers, and churches in southeast Texas. Because of

126 disparities in screening,³³⁻³⁵ a purposive sample was sought with equal representation
127 across age, race/ethnicity, and educational level.³⁶ Approximately five women were
128 selected from each of the 12 categories formed by younger-old/older-old ages (70-74
129 vs. 75+), lower/higher education (≤ 12 vs. > 12 grade), and race/ethnicity (White, Black,
130 Hispanic). The sample size was adequate as a sample size of 5 can capture ideas with
131 a 30% or higher population prevalence and a sample of 16 (combining subgroups) can
132 capture ideas with a 10% or higher population prevalence (with 80% confidence);³⁷ a
133 comparison of ideas and themes from continuers and discontinuers aggregated across
134 demographic subgroups would ensure capturing the most salient ideas and themes.³⁸
135 The study was approved by the University's Institutional Review Board; participants
136 provided oral informed consent (audiotaped) and received a \$25 gift card for their time.
137 Women were recruited between 8/27/13 and 3/26/18. This study integrates their data
138 with a new analysis.

139
140 **Procedure.** Women were asked a series of open-ended questions about mammogram
141 screening (See Supplement, Table A). A first set of questions covered general
142 information about mammograms: their description, purpose, benefits, and risks. A
143 second set of questions explored the decision process. All interviews were audiotaped,
144 transcribed, and coded.

145
146 **Analysis.** Themes were identified by repetitions within and across transcripts.³⁹ For
147 each substantive theme, the interviewer (MS) did the first coding and drafted a
148 codebook in NVivo 10.⁴⁰ Then, a second and third person (MRP, SK) independently

149 coded themes, and team members (MS, AT, SW, MRP, SK) reviewed transcripts for
150 codes relevant to each theme and iteratively revised the codebook. Codes were quality-
151 checked via content analysis of transcripts using specific keywords and phrases
152 (“keywords in context”)⁴¹ with review and validation by team members. Content for the
153 decision process (who initiated screening, did the doctor recommend screening,
154 mention of a personal cancer story, mention of screening reminders, and whether
155 screening will be continued) was described by codes and quotes.

156
157 To see if narratives of women intending to continue screening differed from those who
158 did not, the salience of each theme/code was estimated within each group and a
159 qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) was conducted to identify key factors in the
160 decision pathway to continuation/discontinuation. Responses of each woman were
161 represented in a spreadsheet as a dichotomous profile representing the
162 presence/absence of themes mentioned when talking about mammograms. Theme
163 salience for discontinuers/continuers was estimated with the proportion in each group
164 mentioning each theme/code^{38,41,42} and compared with a chi square test.⁴³

165
166 QCA identified key factors (“prime implicants”)⁴¹ linked to the intention to screen by
167 comparing the profiles of thematic code usage of individuals intending to continue or
168 discontinue. QCA^{28-30,41} considers all possible combinations of codes and logical
169 relationships are used to link thematic codes to group membership (implemented in
170 Tosmana⁴⁴). QCA uses formal Boolean logic (set and subset relations) to identify
171 important distinguishing factors between subgroups. For example, if (1) all women

172 (young and old) with a doctor's recommendation wanted to continue screening and (2)
173 all women (young and old) without a doctor's recommendation wanted to discontinue
174 screening, then a doctor's recommendation distinguishes continuers from discontinuers,
175 while age does not.

176

177 **RESULTS**

178 **Sample Characteristics.** Fifty-nine English-speaking women were interviewed for this
179 study: 28 were 70-74 years old and 31 were 75 and older; 24 were White, 21 Black, and
180 14 Hispanic; and 29 had lower and 30 had higher educational levels. Although the
181 sampling target was for five women in each subcategory, some categories (e.g., older
182 Hispanics with higher educational levels) were difficult to locate and some were slightly
183 over-represented (e.g., White women with higher educational levels). Most women were
184 recruited from community settings and very few rated their health poorly. The interviews
185 lasted between 45 to 60 minutes.

186

187 **Intention to Continue or Discontinue Screening.** Approximately half of the women
188 (n=32) expressed an intention to continue screening and half (n=27) did not. Those who
189 were unsure about continuing (n=1) and those who stated their intention to follow their
190 doctor's recommendation to discontinue screening (n=4) were coded as discontinuers.
191 Those who reported they would follow their doctor's recommendation to continue
192 screening were considered continuers (n=2). The decision to continue/discontinue
193 screening was associated with older age (67% of discontinuers vs. 41% of continuers,
194 $p<.05$), but not education or race/ethnicity (Table 1).

195

196

197 **TABLE 1: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS BY SCREENING INTENT**

	DISCONTINUE (n=27)	CONTINUE (n=32)
Demographics		
Age (75+ yrs)*	67% (18/27)	41% (13/32)
Education (> High School)	48% (13/27)	53% (17/32)
Race/Ethnicity		
White	44% (12/27)	38% (12/32)
African-American	33% (9/27)	38% (12/32)
Hispanic	22% (6/27)	25% (8/32)
Community Recruitment	86% (19/22)	90% (26/29)
Self-Rated Health (very poor)	7% (2/27)	0% (0/32)

198

* p< .05

199

200

201 Many women said they would continue screening as long as they lived (*“As long as I*
 202 *live,” “I guess until I die,”* or *“As long as I am able”*) or that they did not intend to stop (*“I*
 203 *would not consider stopping”* or *“I don’t intend to stop”*). Some linked continuation to a
 204 doctor’s recommendation, for example: *“Probably indefinitely unless the doctor would*
 205 *cut me off and say that it’s not necessary any longer.”*

206

207 Discontinuation was expressed simply as *“I figure I’m through having them,”* often linked
 208 to advanced age: *“I’m 83 years old and I don’t feel like I really need one,”* or *“I probably*
 209 *won’t have one next year, just because I don’t think it’s necessary for somebody 76*
 210 *years old next year, and I’ve never had any problems at all,”* or to a doctor’s

211 recommendation in the context of age, “*The suggestion was when I first started out to*
212 *get them annually, and then later. I don’t remember exactly when we moved it forward,*
213 *and then after 60, probably five years. Then I have nothing after maybe 70, and I*
214 *haven’t had any.*”

215

216 **General Descriptions, Purpose, Benefits, and Risks of Mammograms.** Most of the
217 women were very familiar with mammograms. Only two women had never had one and
218 one additional woman said that she had one, but described a screening procedure that
219 may have been an MRI. Narratives concerning mammogram descriptions, purpose,
220 benefits, and risks were fairly consistent across age, educational, and racial/ethnic
221 groups with few meaningful differences between discontinuers and continuers (Table 2).
222 Women described mammograms as an X-ray or machine; an image, picture, or photo of
223 the breast; or more generally as a test, exam, check, or screen of the breast. The
224 purpose was to detect cancer; detect lumps or nodes; or detect abnormalities. Benefits
225 were to detect cancer (themes describing the purpose of screening often were repeated
226 and emphasized), to detect lumps/nodes/abnormalities; to detect problems early to get
227 timely treatment; to live longer; and to gain health reassurance. Some reported that
228 mammograms had no risk, while others reported risk due to radiation exposure.
229 Pain/discomfort was reported as a risk, as was the possibility of an inaccurate reading.
230 Only two of the 15 codes appeared to differ in salience between discontinuers and
231 continuers. Discontinuers were somewhat more likely to describe mammograms as a
232 “breast X-ray” (56% vs. 35%, $p < .18$) and cite the benefit of “cancer detection” (48% vs.
233 28%, $p < .20$).

234

235

236 **TABLE 2: MAMMOGRAM CHARACTERISTICS AND THEMATIC CODES BY INTENT TO CONTINUE SCREENING**

Theme, code (<i>examples</i>)	DISCONTINUE	CONTINUE
Description		
Breast X-ray (“ <i>It’s an X-ray of your breasts.</i> ”)	56% (15/27)	36% (11/31)
Breast exam (“ <i>test of the breast</i> ”)	26% (7/27)	23% (7/31)
Breast image (“ <i>when they do the image of the breast</i> ”)	22% (6/27)	32% (10/31)
Purpose		
Detect cancer (“ <i>To find out whether you have cancer.</i> ”)	62% (16/26)	66% (21/32)
Detect lump (“ <i>To see if you have any growths or detect lumps that shouldn’t be there.</i> ”)	42% (11/26)	28% (9/32)
Detect abnormality (“ <i>To detect tumors or abnormalities in the tissue.</i> ”)	19% (5/26)	19% (6/32)
Benefits		
Detect cancer (“ <i>Test of the breast to make sure there’s no cancer cells or cancer.</i> ”)	48% (13/27)	28% (9/32)
Detect lump/abnormality (“ <i>To detect any abnormalities in your breast.</i> ”)	26% (7/27)	31% (10/32)
Timely treatment (“ <i>to catch it early</i> ” or “ <i>catch it in time</i> ”)	26% (7/27)	38% (12/32)
Health Reassurance (“ <i>To tell if you’re alright or if you’re not</i> ”)	22% (6/27)	25% (8/32)
Live longer (“ <i>keep myself healthy and alive for my children</i> ”)	7% (2/27)	9% (3/32)
Risks		
No risk (“ <i>I never heard of any risks</i> ”)	26% (7/27)	38% (12/32)
Radiation/cancerous (“ <i>The possibility of getting cancer from the X-ray.</i> ”)	30% (8/27)	22% (7/32)
Pain or discomfort (“ <i>women don’t like to be squeezed. They always said it hurts so hard.</i> ”)	22% (6/27)	19% (6/32)
Inaccurate reading (“ <i>False readings</i> ” or “ <i>mistakes</i> ”)	15% (4/27)	6% (2/32)

238 **Decision Process for Screening.** Discussions about the screening process revealed
239 personal experiences that were more strongly linked to the intention to
240 continue/discontinue screening than were general descriptions of mammograms,
241 including the purpose, benefits, and risks of mammograms. Self-initiation of screening
242 appointments, having a doctor's recommendation, recent screening (≤ 3 years), and
243 spontaneous mention of a cancer story involving a friend or family member showed
244 large, statistically significant differences in salience between the two groups (Table 3).
245

246 **TABLE 3: DECISION PROCESS THEMATIC CODES BY INTENT TO CONTINUE SCREENING**

247

Theme, code (<i>examples</i>)	DISCONTINUE	CONTINUE
Decision Process		
Doctor initiated screening <i>("It's usually set-up with my primary care that she'll tell me, 'this year you'll go for eye, or bone density, or mammogram,' you know, and I just know that it's...I go every spring, and that's it.")</i>	74% (20/27)	69% (22/32)
Self-Initiated screening* <i>("Sometimes I remind my doctor that it's time.")</i>	7% (2/27)	31% (10/32)
Reminder <i>("I just got the letter last month I think it was.")</i>	19% (5/27)	22% (7/32)
Personal cancer story** <i>("There is breast cancer in my family," or "...on my father's side of the family there's been all kinds of cancers.")</i>	33% (9/27)	75% (24/32)
Doctor recommended screening (verbally) ** <i>("My doctor is the one that says," or, "I just went along with it.")</i>	19% (5/27)	69% (22/32)
Recent screening, screening within past three years**	41% (11/27)	91% (29/32)

248

* p< .05, ** p< .001

249

250 Women described the initiation of screening as doctor-initiated, self-initiated, or both.
251 Those who intended to continue screening were more likely to report **self-initiation of**
252 **screening appointments** (31% vs. 7%, $p < .05$). Although it was expected that
253 screening might be influenced by a doctor scheduling an appointment or by a call/letter
254 reminder, only a **doctor's verbal recommendation** influenced intent. A doctor's
255 recommendation was reported much more often by those who intended to continue
256 screening (69% vs. 19%, $p < .001$). Those who desired to continue screening were more
257 likely to have **had a recent mammogram** (91% vs. 41%, $p < .001$) and were more likely
258 to **spontaneously mention a cancer story involving family or friends** (75% vs. 33%,
259 $p < .001$).

260
261 **Themes Linked to the Decision to Continue.** Of the 21 thematic codes (Tables 2 and
262 3) and three demographic characteristics (age, race/ethnicity, educational level), only
263 five factors were associated with the intent to continue screening: younger age,
264 reporting a cancer story involving family or friends, self-initiation of screening, recent
265 screening, and receiving a doctor's recommendation (Supplement, Table B). Of the 32
266 possible combinations of the presence/absence of the five factors, only 19 occurred in
267 the 59 cases and only four of the themes (excluding age) were linked to the intention to
268 continue/discontinue. Table 4 shows the 19 combinations of the factors that occurred in
269 the 59 narratives, the case counts for each distinct profile of themes, and the
270 classification rules linked to continuation/discontinuation. For example, there were 15
271 women who reported a personal cancer story (+), a doctor's recommendation (+), and
272 recent screening (+); 14 (6+7+1) wanted to continue and 1 to discontinue.

273

274 **TABLE 4: PROFILES FOR ALL 59 CASES & PREDICTION RULES**

Profile	Older Age	Initiated Screen	Cancer Story	Dr. Recom	Recent Screen	Continue # Cases (n=32)	Discontinue # Cases (n=27)
CONTINUE RULE#1: Recent Screen + Cancer Story + Doctor's Recommendation							
	+	-	+	+	+	6	1
	-	-	+	+	+	7	0
	-	+	+	+	+	1	0
CONTINUE RULE#2: Recent Screen + Cancer Story - No Doctor's Recommendation							
	+	+	+	-	+	5	0
	-	+	+	-	+	2	0
	+	-	+	-	+	1	1
CONTINUE#3: Recent Screen + Doctor's Recommendation - No Cancer Story							
	-	+	-	+	+	1	0
	+	+	-	+	+	0	1
	-	-	-	+	+	6	0
	+	-	-	+	+	0	2
DISCONTINUE RULE#1: No Initiated Screening - No Cancer Story - No Doctor's Recommendation							
	+	-	-	-	-	0	6
	+	-	-	-	+	0	3
	-	-	-	-	-	0	2
	-	-	-	-	+	0	3
DISCONTINUE RULE#2: No Initiated Screening - No Cancer Story + Doctor's Recommendation							
	+	-	-	+	-	1	0
	-	-	-	+	-	0	1
DISCONTINUE RULE#3: No Initiated Screening + Cancer Story - No Doctor's Recommendation							
	+	-	+	-	-	0	4
	-	-	+	-	-	1	2
Unaccounted for							
	-	+	+	-	-	1	1
TOTAL						32	27

275

276

277 The intention to continue screening was motivated by recent screening, a cancer

278 experience, and a doctor's recommendation, regardless of age. Women with all *three* of

279 these factors intended to continue (Rule #1). All continuers had a recent mammogram
280 screening, but it was not sufficient to predict continued screening. The power of a
281 personal cancer experience (Rule #2) or a doctor's recommendation to continue
282 screening (Rule #3) was clear as women of all demographic groups were motivated to
283 continue screening if they had recent screening *and* either a cancer story or a doctor's
284 recommendation or both. These three factors correctly classified 29/32 cases desiring
285 to continue (91% true positives).

286
287 Similarly, the intention to discontinue was characterized by the absence of a cancer
288 story, absence of a doctor's recommendation, and the absence of self-initiated
289 screening (Rule #4). All who intended to discontinue had not self-initiated screening in
290 the past, although they may or may not have been recently screened. Failure to self-
291 initiate screening combined with the absence of a doctor's recommendation (Rule #5)
292 and/or a personal cancer story/experience (Rule #6) predicted intent to discontinue. A
293 doctor's recommendation to screen was ignored by women who did not self-initiate
294 screening and had no motivating personal cancer story. These factors correctly
295 classified 22/27 cases desiring to discontinue (81% true negatives). One profile (two
296 women who self-initiated screening, reported a cancer story, but did not have a doctor's
297 recommendation; bottom, Table 4) remained unaccounted for (one woman wanted to
298 continue and one wanted to discontinue). Since a classification rule accommodating this
299 profile would count as either a correct continuation and an error for discontinuation or
300 vice versa, we simply counted it as an error against both continuation and
301 discontinuation predictions.

302

303 **DISCUSSION**

304 Few studies describe the breast cancer screening preferences of older women, and
305 those that do rarely link specific attributes and themes to actual screening or the
306 intention to screen.^{27,45-49} This is the first study to directly link themes to the intention to
307 screen. Themes identified in this study are similar to those identified in other
308 studies,^{22,25,46} but in addition to listing salient themes, here we identified combinations of
309 themes explicitly motivating the intention to continue or discontinue screening in older
310 women. Continued screening is primarily a function of past screening behavior (recent
311 screening), but past screening must be combined with a personal cancer experience
312 and/or a doctor's verbal recommendation to motivate future screening. Women who
313 have been recently screened and who have had a friend or family member with cancer
314 are likely to continue to screen with or without a doctor's recommendation. For women
315 who have been screened but who do not know someone with cancer, a doctor's
316 recommendation is the tipping point for continuing screening. While other studies on
317 women in their 70s identified the importance of a doctor's recommendation,²⁶ this study
318 shows a doctor's recommendation to get screened only activates future screening when
319 combined with recent screening.

320

321 Discontinuation of screening is similarly a function of past screening, but discontinuation
322 is determined by whether a woman has self-initiated screening rather than whether she
323 was recently screened. Women who did not self-initiate their screening appointments
324 and who have not known someone with cancer and/or do not have a doctor's

325 recommendation are likely to discontinue screening. If a doctor does not give a
326 recommendation for screening and the doctor's office or health care system does not
327 schedule screening, screening is likely to be discontinued. A woman can override this
328 passive discontinuation option, however, by scheduling her own appointment, especially
329 if she has known someone with cancer. Often, discontinuation of breast cancer
330 screening seems to follow a passive path.

331

332 The role of older age in the decision to discontinue has been unclear. Some assume
333 that older age may be a consideration for patients, as mammogram screening declines
334 with age (with large decreases occurring at 75 and 80 years).^{9,50} However, older age
335 has not been directly linked to a desire to discontinue.²⁵ Older-old women in this study
336 were more likely to express a desire to discontinue, but results indicated that other
337 factors played more important roles in a woman's decision to continue or discontinue
338 screening than simply older age.

339

340 Women in this study were generally healthy, as few rated their health as poor. Poor self-
341 rated health is linked to higher mortality^{51,52} and the two women who rated their health
342 as poor intended to discontinue screening. There were no systematic racial/ethnic or
343 educational differences in narratives linked to the intention to continue/discontinue
344 breast cancer screening. These findings parallel those from a national survey that did
345 not find race, age, or health status differences in utilization.⁴⁹

346

347 Women in this study also were fairly well-informed about breast cancer screening. All
348 women were able to describe a mammogram and its purpose. Previous studies
349 described harms and risks of screening mammography, including possible unnecessary
350 diagnostic procedures, costs, complications, as well as pain and anxiety.^{1,18} In this
351 study, women reported pain, possible radiation risk, and the possibility of inaccurate
352 results, but not risk from unnecessary treatment. Furthermore, these perceived risks did
353 not motivate their decision to continue or discontinue. Risks of mammogram screening
354 are sometimes cited as reasons to discontinue screening, but women appear to
355 prioritize detection of cancer over potential risks.^{18,25,53} Thus, screening may offer the
356 benefit of health reassurance (“better to know” or “peace of mind”).^{20,25,53} However, in
357 this study the effects of perceived risks and benefits were surpassed by a personal
358 cancer story, a story that may express a perceived higher personal risk for cancer.
359 Experiences of friends and family may lead women to overestimate breast cancer
360 incidence, mortality, and the predictive value of mammography – and thus, overestimate
361 their own personal risk of being diagnosed with and dying from breast cancer.^{18,54}
362
363 Physicians are an important source of information on screening and affect patient
364 uptake of screening.^{22,26,49} In older women who have been recently screened, a
365 provider can influence the decision to screen.^{25,47} This study supports the idea that a
366 tipping point in the decision for many older women may be the recommendation – or
367 lack of a recommendation – to get screened. Cessation may be a harder decision than
368 continuing and discussion of cessation may even compromise patient-provider trust,²³
369 but a simple reduction in reminders may reduce overuse in older patients.²⁵

370

371 A limitation of this study is the possible inaccuracy in recollections of past behaviors and
372 reports on future intentions. Women may decide what they want to do and then report
373 information that supports that action. For example, a woman who wants to be screened
374 may be more likely to remember and report that her doctor recommended it. Also,
375 women were not followed prospectively to verify their intentions, although intention is a
376 strong predictor of behavior and can serve as a proxy for actual behavior.⁴⁷ Another
377 limitation is that the study was based on a small regional sample and, as for most
378 qualitative studies, results are suggestive and not definitive. In-depth exploration allows
379 for the identification of new ideas and processes that need to be validated with an
380 independent, representative sample. However, the replication of many themes in this
381 study with those in prior studies^{22,25,27,46,47} adds evidence toward the validity of our
382 findings.

383

384 A strength of the study was that QCA facilitated the understanding of complex
385 relationships among factors linked to the intention to screen, winnowing down almost
386 two dozen themes to a less than a handful. QCA bridges qualitative and quantitative
387 approaches by combining qualitative data with a systematic analysis of cases.⁵⁵
388 However, results can be sensitive to the selection of explanatory variables or the
389 addition of more cases. Our analysis focused on the five factors that maximally
390 discriminated continuers and discontinuers and, although QCA estimates a causal
391 model, our models did not incorporate temporal relationships, as the outcome variable
392 was intention to screen and not prospectively verified behavior. Never-the-less, QCA

393 suggests the path between themes, experiences, and perceptions to the intention to
394 continue or discontinue screening.

395

396 QCA offers a way to interpret patterns in qualitative data that is systematic and
397 transparent. Our analysis systematically compared narratives of women expressing a
398 desire to continue with those who might discontinue and estimated true positive and
399 true negative classification rates for each group. QCA results, however, may not be
400 unique: there may be more than one set of rules to account for response patterns.
401 Classification of cases can be complicated and the trade-off is a more complex set of
402 rules with greater accuracy versus a more parsimonious solution with reduced
403 accuracy. Here, a few cases were counted as errors, when they could have been
404 accommodated with extra classification rules. Thus, we opted for fewer rules that
405 slightly reduced the true negative rate.

406

407 **Conclusion.** Among the many positive and negative aspects of screening, only a few
408 tend to motivate older women to continue or discontinue breast cancer screening.
409 Foremost is their past screening behavior. Then, intentions are motivated by a personal
410 cancer experience in a friend or relative and/or a doctor's recommendation. Some may
411 be ready to discontinue, especially those who delay or skip reminders, and may be most
412 influenced by a discussion with their physician about continuing or discontinuing
413 screening.

414

415

416 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

417 **Funding Sources:** This work was supported by US federal grants from AHRQ (R24
418 HS022134 to JSG), NIH (K05 CA134923 to JSG; P30 AG024832 to Elena Volpi), and
419 NIDILRR (90AR5009 to Kenneth J. Ottenbacher).

420

REFERENCES

- 422
423
- 424 1. U. S. Preventive Services Task Force, Nicholson WK, Silverstein M, et al. Screening
425 for Breast Cancer: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement.
426 *JAMA*. Apr 30 2024;doi:10.1001/jama.2024.5534

 - 427 2. Oeffinger KC, Fontham ET, Etzioni R, et al. Breast Cancer Screening for Women at
428 Average Risk: 2015 Guideline Update From the American Cancer Society. *JAMA*. Oct
429 20 2015;314(15):1599-614. doi:10.1001/jama.2015.12783

 - 430 3. American Cancer Society. American Cancer Society Recommendations for the Early
431 Detection of Breast Cancer. [https://www.cancer.org/cancer/types/breast-](https://www.cancer.org/cancer/types/breast-cancer/screening-tests-and-early-detection/american-cancer-society-recommendations-for-the-early-detection-of-breast-cancer.html)
432 [cancer/screening-tests-and-early-detection/american-cancer-society-recommendations-](https://www.cancer.org/cancer/types/breast-cancer/screening-tests-and-early-detection/american-cancer-society-recommendations-for-the-early-detection-of-breast-cancer.html)
433 [for-the-early-detection-of-breast-cancer.html](https://www.cancer.org/cancer/types/breast-cancer/screening-tests-and-early-detection/american-cancer-society-recommendations-for-the-early-detection-of-breast-cancer.html).

 - 434 4. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Practice Bulletin Number 179:
435 Breast Cancer Risk Assessment and Screening in Average-Risk Women. *Obstet*
436 *Gynecol*. Jul 2017;130(1):e1-e16. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000002158

 - 437 5. Welch HG, Prorok PC, O'Malley AJ, Kramer BS. Breast-Cancer Tumor Size,
438 Overdiagnosis, and Mammography Screening Effectiveness. *N Engl J Med*. Oct 13
439 2016;375(15):1438-1447. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1600249

- 440 6. Advani S, Abraham L, Buist DSM, et al. Breast biopsy patterns and findings among
441 older women undergoing screening mammography: The role of age and comorbidity. *J*
442 *Geriatr Oncol*. Mar 2022;13(2):161-169. doi:10.1016/j.jgo.2021.11.013
- 443 7. Tan A, Kuo YF, Goodwin JS. Potential overuse of screening mammography and its
444 association with access to primary care. *Med Care*. Jun 2014;52(6):490-5.
445 doi:10.1097/MLR.000000000000115
- 446 8. Social Security. Period Life Table, 2021, as used in the 2024 Trustees Report.
447 <https://www.ssa.gov/oact/STATS/table4c6.html>
- 448 9. National Center for Health Statistics. Table 33. Use of mammography among women
449 aged 40 and over. Hyattsville, MD. *Health, United States, 2018*. 2018;
- 450 10. Schonberg MA, Breslau ES, McCarthy EP. Targeting of mammography screening
451 according to life expectancy in women aged 75 and older. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. Mar
452 2013;61(3):388-95. doi:10.1111/jgs.12123
- 453 11. Freedman RA, Keating NL, Pace LE, Lii J, McCarthy EP, Schonberg MA. Use of
454 Surveillance Mammography Among Older Breast Cancer Survivors by Life Expectancy.
455 *J Clin Oncol*. Sep 20 2017;35(27):3123-3130. doi:10.1200/JCO.2016.72.1209
- 456 12. Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program. Breast: SEER incidence rates
457 by age at diagnosis, 2016-2020, by sex, delay-adjusted SEER incidence rate, all

458 races/ethnicities. National Cancer Institute. Accessed Sept 5, 2024,
459 [https://seer.cancer.gov/statistics-](https://seer.cancer.gov/statistics-network/explorer/application.html?site=55&data_type=1&graph_type=3&compareBy=sex&chk_sex_3=3&rate_type=2&race=1&advopt_precision=1&advopt_show_ci=on&hdn_view=0#resultsRegion0)
460 [network/explorer/application.html?site=55&data_type=1&graph_type=3&compareBy=se](https://seer.cancer.gov/statistics-network/explorer/application.html?site=55&data_type=1&graph_type=3&compareBy=sex&chk_sex_3=3&rate_type=2&race=1&advopt_precision=1&advopt_show_ci=on&hdn_view=0#resultsRegion0)
461 [x&chk_sex_3=3&rate_type=2&race=1&advopt_precision=1&advopt_show_ci=on&hdn](https://seer.cancer.gov/statistics-network/explorer/application.html?site=55&data_type=1&graph_type=3&compareBy=sex&chk_sex_3=3&rate_type=2&race=1&advopt_precision=1&advopt_show_ci=on&hdn_view=0#resultsRegion0)
462 [view=0#resultsRegion0](https://seer.cancer.gov/statistics-network/explorer/application.html?site=55&data_type=1&graph_type=3&compareBy=sex&chk_sex_3=3&rate_type=2&race=1&advopt_precision=1&advopt_show_ci=on&hdn_view=0#resultsRegion0).

463 13. Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program. Breast: US mortality rates by
464 age at death, 2016-2020, by sex, all races/ethnicities. National Cancer Institute.
465 Accessed Sept 5, 2024, [https://seer.cancer.gov/statistics-](https://seer.cancer.gov/statistics-network/explorer/application.html?site=55&data_type=2&graph_type=3&compareBy=sex&chk_sex_3=3&rate_type=2&race=1&advopt_precision=1&advopt_show_ci=on&hdn_view=0#resultsRegion0)
466 [network/explorer/application.html?site=55&data_type=2&graph_type=3&compareBy=se](https://seer.cancer.gov/statistics-network/explorer/application.html?site=55&data_type=2&graph_type=3&compareBy=sex&chk_sex_3=3&rate_type=2&race=1&advopt_precision=1&advopt_show_ci=on&hdn_view=0#resultsRegion0)
467 [x&chk_sex_3=3&rate_type=2&race=1&advopt_precision=1&advopt_show_ci=on&hdn_view=0#result](https://seer.cancer.gov/statistics-network/explorer/application.html?site=55&data_type=2&graph_type=3&compareBy=sex&chk_sex_3=3&rate_type=2&race=1&advopt_precision=1&advopt_show_ci=on&hdn_view=0#resultsRegion0)
468 [sRegion0](https://seer.cancer.gov/statistics-network/explorer/application.html?site=55&data_type=2&graph_type=3&compareBy=sex&chk_sex_3=3&rate_type=2&race=1&advopt_precision=1&advopt_show_ci=on&hdn_view=0#resultsRegion0).

469 14. Nelson HD, Cantor A, Humphrey L, et al. *Screening for Breast Cancer: A*
470 *Systematic Review to Update the 2009 U.S. Preventive Services Task Force*
471 *Recommendation*. Evidence Syntheses No 124. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare
472 Research and Quality; 2016.

473 15. Barry MJ, Edgman-Levitan S. Shared decision making--pinnacle of patient-centered
474 care. *N Engl J Med*. Mar 1 2012;366(9):780-1. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1109283

475 16. Rimer BK, Briss PA, Zeller PK, Chan EC, Woolf SH. Informed decision making:
476 what is its role in cancer screening? *Cancer*. Sep 1 2004;101(5 Suppl):1214-28.
477 doi:10.1002/cncr.20512

- 478 17. Hersch JK, Nickel BL, Ghanouni A, Jansen J, McCaffery KJ. Improving
479 communication about cancer screening: moving towards informed decision making.
480 *Public Health Res Pract.* Jul 26 2017;27(2)doi:10.17061/phrp2731728
- 481 18. Pace LE, Keating NL. A systematic assessment of benefits and risks to guide breast
482 cancer screening decisions. *JAMA.* Apr 2 2014;311(13):1327-35.
483 doi:10.1001/jama.2014.1398
- 484 19. Walter LC, Schonberg MA. Screening mammography in older women: a review.
485 *JAMA.* Apr 2 2014;311(13):1336-47. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.2834
- 486 20. Mathioudakis AG, Salakari M, Pylkkanen L, et al. Systematic review on women's
487 values and preferences concerning breast cancer screening and diagnostic services.
488 *Psychooncology.* May 2019;28(5):939-947. doi:10.1002/pon.5041
- 489 21. Yu J, Nagler RH, Fowler EF, Kerlikowske K, Gollust SE. Women's Awareness and
490 Perceived Importance of the Harms and Benefits of Mammography Screening: Results
491 From a 2016 National Survey. *JAMA Intern Med.* Sep 1 2017;177(9):1381-1382.
492 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2017.2247
- 493 22. Schonberg MA, Ramanan RA, McCarthy EP, Marcantonio ER. Decision making and
494 counseling around mammography screening for women aged 80 or older. *J Gen Intern
495 Med.* Sep 2006;21(9):979-85. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.00487.x

- 496 23. Torke AM, Schwartz PH, Holtz LR, Montz K, Sachs GA. Older adults and forgoing
497 cancer screening: "I think it would be strange". *JAMA Intern Med.* Apr 8
498 2013;173(7):526-31. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.2903
- 499 24. Houston AJ, Pappadis MR, Krishnan S, et al. Resistance to discontinuing breast
500 cancer screening in older women: A qualitative study. *Psychooncology.* Jun
501 2018;27(6):1635-1641. doi:10.1002/pon.4708
- 502 25. Brotzman LE, Shelton RC, Austin JD, et al. "It's something I'll do until I die": A
503 qualitative examination into why older women in the U.S. continue screening
504 mammography. *Cancer Med.* Oct 2022;11(20):3854-3862. doi:10.1002/cam4.4758
- 505 26. Schonberg MA, McCarthy EP, York M, Davis RB, Marcantonio ER. Factors
506 influencing elderly women's mammography screening decisions: implications for
507 counseling. *BMC Geriatr.* Nov 16 2007;7:26. doi:10.1186/1471-2318-7-26
- 508 27. Eisinger F, Viguier J, Blay JY, et al. Uptake of breast cancer screening in women
509 aged over 75 years: a controversy to come? *Eur J Cancer Prev.* Jan 2011;20 Suppl
510 1:S13-5. doi:10.1097/01.cej.0000391564.03265.3f
- 511 28. Ragin CC, Mayer SE, Drass KA. Assessing Discrimination: A Boolean Approach.
512 *American Sociological Review.* 1984;49(2):221-234. doi:10.2307/2095572

- 513 29. Rihoux B, De Meur G. Chapter 3: Crisp-Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis
514 (csQCA). In: Rihoux B, Ragin CC, eds. *Configurational Comparative Methods:
515 Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Related Techniques*. Sage Publications;
516 2009:33-68.
- 517 30. Grofman B, Schneider CQ. An Introduction to Crisp Set QCA, with a Comparison to
518 Binary Logistic Regression. *Political Research Quarterly*. 2009;62(4):662-672.
519 doi:10.1177/1065912909338464
- 520 31. Pappadis MR, Volk RJ, Krishnan S, et al. Perceptions of overdetection of breast
521 cancer among women 70 years of age and older in the USA: a mixed-methods analysis.
522 *BMJ Open*. Jun 14 2018;8(6):e022138. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-022138
- 523 32. Hoover DS, Pappadis MR, Houston AJ, et al. Preferences for Communicating about
524 Breast Cancer Screening Among Racially/Ethnically Diverse Older Women. *Health
525 Commun*. Jun 2019;34(7):702-706. doi:10.1080/10410236.2018.1431026
- 526 33. Bynum JP, Braunstein JB, Sharkey P, Haddad K, Wu AW. The influence of health
527 status, age, and race on screening mammography in elderly women. *Arch Intern Med*.
528 Oct 10 2005;165(18):2083-8. doi:10.1001/archinte.165.18.2083
- 529 34. Ahmed AT, Welch BT, Brinjikji W, et al. Racial Disparities in Screening
530 Mammography in the United States: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Am Coll
531 Radiol*. Feb 2017;14(2):157-165 e9. doi:10.1016/j.jacr.2016.07.034

- 532 35. Monticciolo DL. Current guidelines and gaps in breast cancer screening. *J Am Coll*
533 *Radiol.* Oct 2020;17(10):1269-1275. doi:10.1016/j.jacr.2020.05.002
- 534 36. Johnson JC. *Selecting ethnographic informants*. Qualitative research methods.
535 Sage Publications; 1990:96 p.
- 536 37. Fugard AJB, Potts HWW. Supporting thinking on sample sizes for thematic
537 analyses: a quantitative tool. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology:*
538 *Theory & Practice*. 2015;18(6):669–684. doi:10.1080/13645579.2015.1005453
- 539 38. Weller SC, Vickers B, Bernard HR, et al. Open-ended interview questions and
540 saturation. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(6):e0198606. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0198606
- 541 39. Ryan GW, Bernard HR. Techniques to Identify Themes. *Field Methods*.
542 2003;15(1):85-109. doi:10.1177/1525822X02239569
- 543 40. QSR International Pty Ltd. *NVivo 10 Qualitative Data Analysis Software*. Version 10.
544 QSR International Pty Ltd; 2012.
- 545 41. Bernard HR, Ryan GW. *Analyzing Qualitative Data: Systematic Approaches*. SAGE
546 Publications; 2009
- 547 42. Weller SC, Romney AK. *Systematic Data Collection, Qualitative Research Methods*.
548 vol 10. Sage Publications; 1988.

- 549 43. SPSS Inc. *SPSS*. Chicago: SPSS Inc.; 1990.
- 550 44. Cronqvist L. *Tosmana*. Version 1.521. University of Trier, Germany; 2016.
- 551 <http://www.tosmana.net>
- 552 45. Pillay J, Guitard S, Rahman S, et al. Patient preferences for breast cancer
553 screening: a systematic review update to inform recommendations by the Canadian
554 Task Force on Preventive Health Care. *Syst Rev*. May 28 2024;13(1):140.
555 doi:10.1186/s13643-024-02539-8
- 556 46. Dickson-Swift V, Adams J, Spelten E, Blackberry I, Wilson C, Yuen E. Breast cancer
557 screening motivation and behaviours of women aged over 75 years: a scoping review.
558 *BMC Womens Health*. Apr 24 2024;24(1):256. doi:10.1186/s12905-024-03094-z
- 559 47. Schoenborn NL, Gollust SE, Nagler RH, et al. Effect of Messaging on Support for
560 Breast Cancer Screening Cessation Among Older US Women: A Randomized Clinical
561 Trial. *JAMA Netw Open*. Aug 1 2024;7(8):e2428700.
562 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.28700
- 563 48. Smith J, Cvejic E, Houssami N, et al. Randomized Trial of Information for Older
564 Women About Cessation of Breast Cancer Screening Invitations. *J Gen Intern Med*. Jun
565 2024;39(8):1332-1341. doi:10.1007/s11606-024-08656-3

- 566 49. Fox SA, Siu AL, Stein JA. The importance of physician communication on breast
567 cancer screening of older women. *Arch Intern Med*. Sep 26 1994;154(18):2058-68.
- 568 50. Blustein J, Weiss LJ. The use of mammography by women aged 75 and older:
569 factors related to health, functioning, and age. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. Aug 1998;46(8):941-6.
570 doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.1998.tb02746.x
- 571 51. Idler EL, Angel RJ. Self-rated health and mortality in the NHANES-I Epidemiologic
572 Follow-up Study. *Am J Public Health*. Apr 1990;80(4):446-52. doi:10.2105/ajph.80.4.446
- 573 52. Benjamins MR, Hummer RA, Eberstein IW, Nam CB. Self-reported health and adult
574 mortality risk: an analysis of cause-specific mortality. *Soc Sci Med*. Sep
575 2004;59(6):1297-306. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2003.01.001
- 576 53. Collins K, Winslow M, Reed MW, et al. The views of older women towards
577 mammographic screening: a qualitative and quantitative study. *Br J Cancer*. May 11
578 2010;102(10):1461-7. doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6605662
- 579 54. Hoffman RM, Lewis CL, Pignone MP, et al. Decision-making processes for breast,
580 colorectal, and prostate cancer screening: the DECISIONS survey. *Med Decis Making*.
581 Sep-Oct 2010;30(5 Suppl):53S-64S. doi:10.1177/0272989X10378701

582 55. Rihoux B. Bridging the Gap Between the Qualitative and Quantitative Worlds? A

583 Retrospective and Prospective View on Qualitative Comparative Analysis. *Field*

584 *Methods*. 2003;15(6):351-365. doi:10.1177/1525822X03257690

585

