# **Cervical Cancer Screening via HPV Self-Testing**

Is this a Screening Method that can be used to Increase Participation Rates for Rural US Women?

Authors: Nicolette Baharie PA-S, Jennifer Erickson PA-C, MPH

## **Background:**

Cervical cancer morbidity and mortality rates remain higher in rural women living in the United States (US) compared to urban residents, despite cervical cancer being highly treatable and preventable with screening tests.<sup>1,2</sup> Current screening recommendations include provider performed human papillomavirus (HPV) testing with cytology, also known as a Papanicolaou (PAP) test every 5 years for women aged 30–65.<sup>3</sup> However, over 20% of women have not been tested as

recommended,<sup>4</sup> and many rural women experience additional barriers to traditional screening methods including lack of time, increased travel distance, and lack of rural providers.<sup>5</sup> Recent studies, mostly outside of the US, have demonstrated that self-screening with high-risk HPV (hrHPV) self-swabs is a way to increased screening rates in underscreened women.

Traditional cytology-based screening has numerous limitations including low sensitivity, high demand on the healthcare system, and high costs.<sup>6</sup> Self-screening specifically examines for hrHPV infection as this is known to be more accurate in cervical cancer detection than cytology alone.<sup>5,7</sup>

## Methods:

A search was performed via PubMed on the topic of cervical cancer selfscreening in adult women. The search was conducted June 22, 2020 to December 15, 2020. Terms such as "self- cervical cancer screening", "self-cervical human papillomavirus (HPV) test", and "mailed in cervical cancer screening tests" were used. The search was set for studies published from 2015-2020, and no country restrictions were set; however, there was higher preference towards literature published in the United States.

#### Accuracy of HPV Self-Sampling

> A study by Wright et al.<sup>8</sup> found that testing of self-collected vaginal samples detected just as many cases of cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN) and invasive cervical cancer as traditional cytology. Similarly, a recent study in Sweden showed that there was increased detection of CIN when compared to cytology screening alone.<sup>9</sup>

> Petignat et al.<sup>10</sup> demonstrated that vaginal self-sampling was just as sensitive as provider performed HPV sampling for detection of HPV infection.

> Balasubramanian et al.<sup>11</sup> found that the sensitivity of self HPV testing was 16.7% greater than cytology-based screening, though the specificity of cytology is lower which is likely due to transient infections.

In all, studies conclude that the sensitivity and specificity of HPV self-sampling is sufficient to be used in low-resource settings to increase access to screening.

### **Screening Rates**

Self-screening via HPV DNA increases participation rates for women in hard-to-reach areas who would otherwise remain under-screened, or not screened at all. Recent studies demonstrate significantly increased screening rates when HPV self-sampling kits are mailed directly to under-screened women's homes compared to reminders to undergo traditional screening as shown in the different studies represented in the graph below.



Participation Rates after Reminder to Undergo Traditional Screening

Participation Rates for HPV Self-Testing via Mailed Kits



## Acceptability of Self-Sampling



women residing in Mississippi to explore screening preferences. **78.4**% of the women expressed they would prefer to undergo self-sampling over a traditional PAP. Of the women who underwent self-screening in this study. 390K tested positive for high-risk HPV infection.<sup>18</sup>

Crosby et al.<sup>18</sup> performed a study on rural





Shin et al.<sup>19</sup> asked women to answer yes or no to their experience in the above categories after undergoing PAP testing and HPV self-sampling. The percent of yes answers for both methods are shown in the above graph.

Some commonly reported difficulties of the self-testing process were uncertainty if the collection was performed properly, less trust in the accuracy of the test, and difficulty inserting the self-collection brush.<sup>19,20</sup> Women also cited missing the opportunity to talk to a gynecologist,<sup>21</sup> which may not be a concern in rural, US communities where women may not have easy access to a gynecologist.

# **Cost Effectiveness**

> Cervical cancer self-screening has the potential to reduce overall screening costs for women as an initial clinical encounter is not needed, and multiple factors impact the cost-effectiveness of self-screening including lower costs of materials and lower cost of testing.<sup>11,22,23</sup>

Mezei et al.<sup>24</sup> analyzed 13 studies that compared cytology versus HPV self-testing and concluded that self-collected HPV testing was cost effective when it yielded higher population coverage.

> Additionally, HPV self-screening appears to be most costeffective when there has been a longer time since the women's last PAP smear.<sup>23</sup>

## **Follow Up After a Positive Result**

For a screening program to be successful, a patient should undergo appropriate follow-up with colposcopy or cervical biopsy after a positive screening result.<sup>3</sup>

However, There is conflicting information regarding follow up after self-screening. Some studies suggest that women who screen positive will follow up due to a positive result acting as a re-entry point to the healthcare system.<sup>6</sup> Nonetheless, many women remain uninsured or have other barriers to healthcare access that would make them less likely to follow up. Studies that incorporated direct referral after a positive screening result had higher follow-up rates than studies that used a triage policy after a positive screening result, as well as studies that sent reminder letters after a positive test, and have a provider explain the consequences of not following up.<sup>16, 25</sup>

## Conclusion

HPV self-screening is an adequately accurate way to increase screening rates for women residing in low resource settings, such as rural America, and lack access to traditional screening. Future efforts should be directed towards research within the US healthcare system, with focus on best ways for community education, how to identify which women need screening, as well as ways to increase follow-up after a positive result despite certain barriers such as lack of health insurance. As it stands, cervical cancer screening guidelines in the US are robust and dynamic; however, with more research, HPV self-sampling could be a viable option to increase screening rates in rural, underscreened US women.

#### **References:**

Yu L, Sabatino SA, White MC. Rural- urban and racial/ethric disparities in invasive cervical cancer incidence in the united states, 2010-2014. Preventing Chronic Disease. 2019;10:e70, www.cdc.eov/ocd/nsues/2019/18/0447.tem.
Cervical Cancer, Center for Disease Control and Prevention website. https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/cervical/basic_info/index.htm. [Updated August 7, 2019]. Accessed June 30, 2020.
Feldman S, Peipert IF. Screening for cervical cancer. UptoDate online. Waltham, MA, 2019. (Updated April 21, 2020). Accessed July 29, 2020. Gapta S PC, Palmer C, BK EM, et al. Self-sampling for human papillomavirus testing: increased cervical cancer screening participation and incorgoration in international screening.
programs. Pronteirs in Public Health. 2018;6:77. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29680381/.
Tranberg M, Bech IH, Blaaker J, Jensen JS, Svanholm H, Andersen B. Preventing convical cancer using HPV self-sampling: direct mailing of test-kits increases screening participation
more than timely opt in procedures - a randomized controlled trial. BMC Concer. DI 2018;18(1):273. doi:10.1186/c12885-018-4165-4. Podersen HN, Smith (W, Race CS, et al. Implementation considerations using HPV self-collection to reach women under-screened for convical cancer in high-income settings.
Current Oncology, 2018;25:4-7, DOI: https://doi.org/10.3747/cp.25.3827
Verdooft F, Jentschke M, Hillemanns P, Racey CS, Snijders PJF, Arbyn M. Reaching women who do not participate in the regular cervical cancer screening programme by offering
self-sampling kits: a systemic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. Europeon Journal of Cencer. 2015;51:2375-2385. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ajca.2015.07.006.
Wright TC, Denny L, Kuhn L, Pollack A, Lorincz A. HPV DNA testing of self-collected vaginal samples companed with cytologic screening to detect cervical cancer. JAMA. 2000;283(1):81-6. doi:10.1001/jama.283.1.81
Madzima TV, Mardana V, Loffers A. Everprise role of HPV self-sampline in cervical cancer screening for hard-to-reach women. Consultan Fornity Physician. 2017;63:597-601.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28807952/.
Petignat P, Faltin DL, Bruchim L, Tramer MR, Franco EL, Courtee F. Are self-collected samples comparable to physician collected cervical specimens for human papillomavirus DNA
testing? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Gynecologic Oncology. 2007;105:530-535. www.elsevier.com/locate/ygyno. Balasubramanian A, Kulasingam Si, Baer A, et al. Accuracy and cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer scneering by high-risk HPV DNA testing of self-collected vaginal samples. J Low
balactorananana, Autorogani Si, Sarri, et al. Accuracy and continenteeness of cervical cancer screening by regrinal mire one listing or set-concord vagna samples. J can Genet Tract Dis. 2020;14(3):135-135. doi:10.1097/GT.100313633866358.
Haguenoer K, Sengchanh S, Gaudy-Graffin C, et al. Vaginal self-sampling is a cost-effective way to increase participation in a cervical cancer screening programme: a randomised
trial. 847, 2014;111:2187-2196. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2014.5104dbT.
Starewski A, Cadman L, Mesher D, et al. HPV self-sampling as an alternative strategy in non-attenders for cervical screening a randomized controlled trial. British Journal of Concer. 2011;104:015-020, www.bicancer.com
2011;10:912-920; www.spancer.com Winer RL, Lin J. Tro M, et al. Effect of Maled Haman Paol Jenavirus Test Kits vs Usual Care Reminders on Cervical Cancer Screening Uotake. Precancer Detection. and Treatment: A
Randemized Clinical Trial. JAMA Netw Open. 2015;2(11) e1914729. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.14729
Rossi GP, Fortunato C, Barbarino P, et al. Self-sampling to increase participation in cervical cancer screening: an RCT comparing home mailing, distribution in pharmacies, and recall
letter. BX. 2015;112:667-675. doi:10.1038/bjc.2015.11.
Arbyn M, Smith SB, Temin S, Sultana F, Castle P. Detecting cervical precancer and reaching under screened women by using HPV testing on self samples: updated meta-analyses. BMJ 2018;36:4823. doi: 10.1136/bmi.iv4823.
HMC. 2010;(should on: 10.11 segremponent). Some of the second sec
setting. Sexual Health. 1254):275-286. doi: 10.1071/SH14236_AC
Crosby RA, Hagensee ME, Fisher R, Stradtman LR, Collins T. Self-cellected vaginal swabs for HPV screening: an exploratory study of rural black Mississippi women. Preventive Medicine Reports. 2017;7:227-211. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gmedr.2016.12.014.
Shin HY, Lee B, Hwang S, et al. Evaluation of satisfaction with three different cervical cancer screening modalities: clinician collects pap test vs. HPV test by self-sampling, vs HPV
test by urine sample. Journal of Gyne Oncology. 2019;30(5):e76. https://doi.org/10.3802/jgo.2019.30.e76.
Anderson C, Breithaupt L, Des Marais A, et al. Acceptability and ease of use of mailed HPV self-collection among infrequently screened women in North Carolina. Sex Transm Infect. 2018;94:131-137. doi:doi:10.1136/sextrans-2017-033235
AD16/994131-137. doi:10.1136/94888891.0121/453233 Hanley SIR, Fujita H, Yokoyama S, et al. HeV self-sampling in Jaganese warnen: a feasibility study in a population with limited experience of tampon use. / Med Screen.
2016;23(3):164-170. doi:10.1177/0969141315625702
Nelson EJ, Maynard BR, Loux T, Falla J, Gordon R, Arnold L. The acceptability of self-sampled screening for HPV DNA: a systemic review and meta-analysis. Sex Transm Infect.
2017;93:56-51. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2016-052609.
Malare C, Barnabas RV, Baint DSM, Tiro JA, Wirer RL. Cost effectiveness studies of HPV self-sampling: a systemic review. Preventive Medicine. 2020;132:305953. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vomed.2029.305953.
entry in the second s

 More // doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2019.105993.
More JAX, Amstrong HL, Pedersson HH, et al. Cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer screening methods in low-and middle-income countries: a systemic review. Int / Concer. 2017;114:1474.44. doi:10.1016/j.indownet.rbit.eu.in.in.eu/2019/2012/14

nderson C, Breithaupt L, Des Marais A, et al. Acceptability and ease of use of malied HPV self-collection among infrequently screened women in North Carolina. Sex Transm 016(94:131-137. doi:doi:10.1136/unetrans-2017-051235