

Mullen PD, Allen JD, Glanz K, Fernandez ME, Bowen DJ, Pruitt SL, Glenn BA, Pignone M. Measures used in studies of informed decision making about cancer screening: A systematic review. [Special Issue] *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 2006;32(3):188-201.

**Table 2: Decision-Aid Studies by Cancer Site and Study Design (k=36)**

Citations	Design	Sample <sup>a</sup>	Constructs
<b>Prostate Cancer Screening Intervention Trials (Prostate Specific Antigen "PSA")<sup>b</sup> k=16</b>			
Bridge 02 (19)	Pre-post, 1-group: Interactive slide show	n=191: 44% Af Am, 41% white; SES=NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> </ul>
Bridge 04 (20)	Pre-post 1-group: Interactive slide show	n=880: 39% Af Am, 55% white; SES=42% HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Discussion w/ clinician (intention)</li> <li>• Discussion w/ clinician</li> </ul>
Davison 99* (21)	RCT: Group education (PSA, DRE)	n=100: Canada; SES= 44% <HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived threat</li> <li>• Role preference</li> <li>• Discussion w/ clinician (<i>role performance</i>)</li> <li>• Screening</li> <li>• Decisional conflict</li> </ul>
Flood 96a* (14)*	Controlled trial: Video (PSA, DRE)	n=409: Canada; SES=55% some college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Treatment preference</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
Flood '96b* (15)	Controlled trial, crossover: Video + brochure (PSA, DRE)	n=222: Canada; SES=72% some college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Treatment preference</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
Frosch '01* (22)	Controlled trial: 1) Discussion, 2) Video, 3) #1 + #2	n=176: 6% Af Am, 78% white; SES=22% <HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Role preference</li> <li>• Decisional self-efficacy</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
Frosch '03 (23)	Randomized trial: 1) Online slide presentation, 2) Video	n=226: 91% white; SES=27% college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Role preference</li> <li>• Treatment preference</li> <li>• Decisional self-efficacy</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
Gattellari '03 (24)	RCT: Decision aid booklet	n=248: Australia; SES=36% ≥ HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Perceived risk</li> <li>• Perceived severity</li> <li>• Decisional balance</li> <li>• Role preference</li> <li>• Decisional self-efficacy</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> <li>• Decisional conflict</li> </ul>

**Mullen PD, Allen JD, Glanz K, Fernandez ME, Bowen DJ, Pruitt SL, Glenn BA, Pignone M. Measures used in studies of informed decision making about cancer screening: A systematic review. [Special Issue] *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 2006;32(3):188-201.**

Gattellari '05, '04 (25,26)	Cluster RCT: 1) Video, 2) Decision aid booklet (PSA, DRE)	n=514: Australia; SES=16% ≥HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Perceived risk</li> <li>• Perceived benefit</li> <li>• Decisional balance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role preference</li> <li>• Decisional self-efficacy</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> <li>• Decisional conflict</li> </ul>
Partin '04 (27)	RCT: 1) Pamphlet, 2) Video	n=1110: 95% white; SES=22% <HS, 38% HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Discussion w/ clinician</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
Ruthman '04 (28)	Controlled trial: Video (PSA, DRE)	n=104: 9% Af Am, 91% white; SES= Mean yrs school 11.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Role preference</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> </ul>
Schapira '00* (29)	RCT: Decision aid pamphlet (PSA, DRE)	n=257: 90-95% white; SES=65% HS reading level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
Sheridan '04 (30)	Time series: Pamphlet, read to patients w/ measures after each part	n=188: 26% Af Am, 70% white; SES= 67% ≥some college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Perceived threat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> </ul>
Volk '03, O'Dell '99, Volk '99* (31-33)	RCT: 1) Video + brochure + utility assessment, 2) Video	n=160: 19% Af Am; SES=22% <HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening</li> <li>• Satisfaction w/ decision</li> </ul>
Wilt '01* (34)	RCT: Fact sheet	n=342: 89-91% white; SES=65-67% ≥HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Treatment preference</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion w/ clinician</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
Wolf '98,* Wolf '96 (35,36)	RCT: Pamphlet read aloud	n=205: SES=68% 68% <HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived risk</li> <li>• Perceived severity</li> <li>• Perceived benefits (screening efficacy)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived barriers</li> <li>• Utilities</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> </ul>
<b>Prostate Cancer Screening Cross-Sectional Surveys (PSA)<sup>b</sup> k=3</b>				
Volk '97 (37)	Convenience sample	n=10 couples: 10% Af Am, 80% white; SES= 60% some college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilities</li> <li>- couples rated separately</li> </ul>	- couples rated together

Mullen PD, Allen JD, Glanz K, Fernandez ME, Bowen DJ, Pruitt SL, Glenn BA, Pignone M. Measures used in studies of informed decision making about cancer screening: A systematic review. [Special Issue] *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 2006;32(3):188-201.

Volk '04 (38)	Convenience sample	n=68 couples: 17% Af Am, 66% white; SES= 60% some college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilities</li> </ul>	
Weinrich '04 (39)	Convenience sample	n=81: 74% Af Am, 26% white; SES=42% <HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>	
<b>Prostate Cancer Screening Prospective Cohort Study (PSA)<sup>b</sup> k=1</b>				
Vadaparampil '04 (40)	Convenience sample	n=107: 92% white; SES=28% college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived risk</li> <li>• Perceived severity</li> <li>• Perceived benefits (screening efficacy)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decisional self-efficacy</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
<b>Colorectal Cancer Screening Intervention Trials (Fecal occult blood test "FOBT")<sup>b</sup> k=7</b>				
Adams '96 (16)	RCT: Oral presentation	n=97: SES=22% <HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
Braun '05 (41)	Cluster RCT: Presentation + brochure + FOBT kit + follow-up phone calls	n=131: 90% Hawaiian; SES=11% HS/GED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Decision self-efficacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
Campbell '04 Katz '04 (42,43)	Cluster RCT: 1) Tailored print material, 2) Lay health advisor, 3) #1 + #2	n=850: 99% Af Am; SES=58% <HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>	
Dolan '02* (44)	RCT: Analytic hierarchy process-based education	n=97: 98% white; SES= 19% < HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Role preference</li> <li>• Discussion w/ clinician (role performance)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening</li> <li>• Decisional conflict</li> </ul>
Pignone '99 (45)	Pre- post-test one group trial: Oral information + flip chart (FOBT, flex sig)	n=146: 43% Af Am, 52% white; SES=<HS 53%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test preference</li> </ul>	

Mullen PD, Allen JD, Glanz K, Fernandez ME, Bowen DJ, Pruitt SL, Glenn BA, Pignone M. Measures used in studies of informed decision making about cancer screening: A systematic review. [Special Issue] *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 2006;32(3):188-201.

Pignone '00* (46)	RCT: Video + stage-targeted brochure + chart marker	n=249: 13% Af Am, 87% white; SES=79% HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion w/ clinician</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
Wolf '00* (47)	RCT: Scripts re: risks, benefits--1) rel risk reduction, 2) absolute risk reduction (FOBT, flex sig)	n=399: 23-28% non-white; SES = 47-55% HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Perceived benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test preference</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> </ul>
<b>Colorectal Cancer Screening Cross-Sectional Survey (FOBT)<sup>b</sup> k=1</b>				
Messina '05 (48)	Random population-based samples from 5 towns (FOBT, flex sig, colonoscopy, double contrast barium enema)	n=2119: 92% white; SES=36% <HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived risk</li> <li>• Decisional balance</li> <li>• Perceived benefits</li> <li>• Perceived barriers</li> <li>• Attitude re: screening</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role preference</li> <li>• Discussion w/ clinician (<i>role performance</i>)</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
<b>Colorectal Cancer Screening Qualitative Study (FOBT)<sup>b</sup> k=1</b>				
Wackerbarth '05 (49)	Semi-structured individual interviews with a convenience sample (Specific test=NR)	n=30: 77% white; SES=NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived threat</li> <li>• Perceived benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived barriers</li> <li>• Role preference</li> </ul>
<b>Breast Cancer Screening Intervention Trials (Mammography)<sup>b</sup> k=2</b>				
Lewis '03 (50)	RCT: Video	n=179: 35-42% Af Am, 60% white; SES=~66% >college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Decisional balance</li> </ul>	
Rimer '01* Rimer '02* (10,12)	RCT: Tailored print material + phone counseling	n=1287: 15% Af Am, 82% white; SES=24% <HS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Perceived risk</li> <li>• Decisional balance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived benefits</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
<b>Breast Cancer Screening Cross-Sectional Surveys (Mammography)<sup>b</sup> k=3</b>				
Clark '98 (51)	Convenience sample	n=1323: 95% white; SES=NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge</li> <li>• Decisional balance</li> <li>• Perceived barriers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role preference</li> <li>• Discussion w/ clinician (intention)</li> <li>• Screening (intention)</li> </ul>

Mullen PD, Allen JD, Glanz K, Fernandez ME, Bowen DJ, Pruitt SL, Glenn BA, Pignone M. Measures used in studies of informed decision making about cancer screening: A systematic review. [Special Issue] *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 2006;32(3):188-201.

Davey '05 (52)	Convenience sample	n=106: Australia; SES=44% [high school] certificate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived benefits</li> <li>• Attitude re: test</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role preference</li> <li>• Screening</li> <li>• Decisional conflict</li> </ul>
Nekhlyudov '05 (53)	Convenience sample	n=96: 19% Af Am; SES = 22% < college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role preference</li> </ul>	
<b>Breast Cancer Screening Qualitative Study (Mammography)<sup>b</sup> k=1</b>				
Fowler '03 (17)	Qualitative study	n=30: 100% Af Am; SES=NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role preference</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>
<b>Cervical Cancer Screening Cross-Sectional Surveys (Papanicolou test)<sup>b</sup> k=1</b>				
Watson '93 (18)	Convenience sample	n=678: 96% white; SES=51% graduate degree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived risk</li> <li>• Perceived severity</li> <li>• Perceived benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived barriers</li> <li>• Role preference</li> <li>• Screening</li> </ul>

Notes: Af Am=African American, SES=socioeconomic status, re:=about, HS=high school, DRE=digital rectal examination, flex sig=flexible sigmoidoscopy

\*=study was included in the review by Briss 04 (3).

<sup>a</sup>All studies conducted in the U.S. unless specified.

<sup>b</sup>These tests were the focus of the study unless specified in column 2.