

# Self-sampling vs. reminder letter: effects on cervical cancer screening attendance and coverage

<b>Submission date</b> 13/02/2010	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 06/04/2010	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 10/04/2012	<b>Condition category</b> Cancer	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data

**Plain English summary of protocol**  
Not provided at time of registration

## Contact information

**Type(s)**  
Scientific

**Contact name**  
Dr Ahti Anttila

**Contact details**  
Pieni Roobertinkatu 9  
Helsinki  
Finland  
00130

## Additional identifiers

## Study information

**Scientific Title**  
Self-sampling vs. reminder letter: A randomised controlled trial to investigate the effects on cervical cancer screening attendance and coverage

**Study objectives**  
Self-sampling is more efficient than a written reminder letter in improving cervical cancer screening attendance and coverage among current non-attendees

## **Ethics approval required**

Old ethics approval format

## **Ethics approval(s)**

This study was approved by the Ethical Committee in Hospital District of Helsinki and Uusimaa in March 2008 (ref: 430/E9/07 HUS). It was also approved by the City of Espoo.

## **Study design**

Randomised open label controlled parallel group trial

## **Primary study design**

Interventional

## **Study type(s)**

Screening

## **Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied**

Cervical cancer screening

## **Interventions**

All non-participants after the primary cervical cancer screening invitation in the city of Espoo in years 2008 and 2009 received either a high-risk (hr) Human Papillomavirus (HPV) self-sampling test or a written reminder letter.

Both arms received an information letter on the study, information pamphlet on cervical cancer screening and HPV.

Participants in the self-sampling arm also received an informed consent sheet, Pantarhei Screener® self-sampling device (Panterhei Devices, Netherlands) and user instruction sheet on the use of the self-sampling test. Women to be screened were asked to use the sample within 2 weeks of its arrival and mail the sample within 24 hours of sample taking. Results of the screening test were promised within 2 months of the return.

## **Intervention Type**

Other

## **Phase**

Not Applicable

## **Primary outcome(s)**

Increase in attendance and coverage of cervical cancer screening

## **Key secondary outcome(s)**

1. Prevalence of hrPV-infections higher among those women that do not participate cervical cancer screening after the primary invitation.
2. Feasibility, usability and acceptance of self-testing among women

## **Completion date**

31/05/2010

## **Eligibility**

**Key inclusion criteria**

Women, ages 30-65, living in the city of Espoo who received an invitation to cervical cancer screening but did not take part.

**Participant type(s)**

Patient

**Healthy volunteers allowed**

No

**Age group**

Adult

**Sex**

Female

**Key exclusion criteria**

Address information for non-participants was updated from the Population Register Centre before the interventions were sent and women who had no address information available, were dead or living outside Espoo were excluded.

**Date of first enrolment**

01/11/2008

**Date of final enrolment**

31/05/2010

**Locations****Countries of recruitment**

Finland

**Study participating centre**

Pieni Roobertinkatu 9

Helsinki

Finland

00130

**Sponsor information****Organisation**

Finnish Cancer Organisations (Finland)

**ROR**

<https://ror.org/05pgg4z49>

# Funder(s)

## Funder type

Research organisation

## Funder Name

Finnish Cancer Organisations (Finland)

# Results and Publications

## Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

### IPD sharing plan summary

Not provided at time of registration

## Study outputs

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
<a href="#">Results article</a>	results	01/09/2011		Yes	No