Impact of healthcare access and HIV testing on utilisation of cervical cancer screening among US women at high risk of HIV infection: cross-sectional analysis of 2016 BRFSS data by Dongyu Zhang, Shailesh Advani, Megan Huchko, Dejana Braithwaite

A Study in Replication

Anand Rajan, ar1473 Juho Rana Kim, jr4102

Analysis of Large Scale Data P8508

Background

- Cervical cancer is a major gynecologic cancer affecting women's health both in the US and worldwide
 - It is the only gynecologic cancer with screening tests which help with early detection
- BRFSS 2016 Data and Documentation
- Study analyzes the association of cervical cancer screening with healthcare access and HIV testing among women at high risk of HIV infection



CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

Methodology + Results

- Study Population: 3448 women with a history of high-risk behaviors associated with HIV infection
- Exposures:
 - Clinical check-up
 - Personal healthcare provider
 - Health coverage
 - HIV testing history
- Outcome:
 - Cervical cancer screening
- Multivariable logistic regression model
 - Associations of healthcare access + HIV testing with uptake of cervical cancer screening; reported adjusted OR and 95%CI

• A total of 2911 (84.4%) of high-risk women underwent cervical cancer screening

- Factors inversely associated with cervical cancer screening uptake
 - Delayed clinical checkup
 - No health insurance
 - No history of HIV testing

*Marital Status

gen married=1 if marital==1 | marital==6
replace married=0 if marital==2 | marital==3 | marital==4 | marital==5
replace married=. if marital==9 | marital==.

*BMI

gen bmi=0 if _bmi5cat==1 | _bmi5cat==2 | _bmi5cat==3
replace bmi=1 if _bmi5cat==4
replace bmi=. if bmi5cat==.

*Physical Activity/Exercise

gen actexc=0 if _totinda==2 replace actexc=1 if _totinda==1 replace actexc=. if _totinda==9

*Heavy Drinker

gen funperson=0 if _rfdrhv5==1
replace funperson=1 if _rfdrhv5==2
replace funperson=. if rfdrhv5==9

*Smoking Status

gen smoker=0 if _smoker3==4
replace smoker=1 if _smoker3==1 | _smoker3==2
replace smoker=2 if _smoker3==3
replace smoker=. if _smoker3==9

*Self-reported Perceived Health Condition

gen healthcond=0 if genhlth==4 | genhlth==5 replace healthcond=1 if genhlth==1 | genhlth==2 | genhlth==3 replace healthcond=. if genhlth==7 | genhlth==9 | genhlth==.

*Routine Clinical Check-Up

gen clinicalcheck=0 if checkup1==1
replace clinicalcheck=1 if checkup1==2
replace clinicalcheck=2 if checkup1==3
replace clinicalcheck=3 if checkup1==4
replace clinicalcheck=. if checkup1==7 | checkup1==8 | checkup1==9 | checkup1==.

*Personal Healthcare Provider

gen provider=0 if persdoc2==1 | persdoc2==2
replace provider=1 if persdoc2==3
replace provider=. if persdoc2==7 | persdoc2==9 | persdoc2==.

*Health Coverage gen hlthcvg=0 if hlthpln1==1 replace hlthcvg=1 if hlthpln1==2 replace hlthcvg=. if hlthpln1==7 | hlthpln1==9

*Categorized age

gen agecat=0 if _ageg5yr==2 | _ageg5yr==3
replace agecat=1 if _ageg5yr==4 | _ageg5yr==5
replace agecat=2 if _ageg5yr==6 | _ageg5yr==7
replace agecat=3 if _ageg5yr==8 | _ageg5yr==9t

*Race

gen race=0 if _race_g1==1
replace race=1 if _race_g1==2
replace race=2 if _race_g1==4 | _race_g1==5
replace race=. if _race_g1==.

*Educational Background

gen education=0 if _educag==1 | _educag==2
replace education=1 if _educag==3
replace education=2 if _educag==4
replace education=. if _educag==9

*Comorbidities/Common Illnesses********* *create binary variables for each illness gen asthmabi=0 if asthma3==2 replace asthmabi=1 if asthma3==1 replace asthmabi=. if asthma3==7 | asthma3==9 | asthma3==. gen copdbi=0 if chccopd1==2 replace copdbi=1 if chccopd1==1 replace copdbi=. if chccopd1==7 | chccopd1==9 | chccopd1==. gen diabetebi=0 if diabete3==3 replace diabetebi=1 if diabete3==1 | diabete3==2 replace diabetebi=. if diabete3==7 | diabete3==9 | diabete3==. gen mibi=0 if michd==2 replace mibi=1 if michd==1 replace mibi=. if michd==. gen chdbi=0 if cvdcrhd4==2 replace chdbi=1 if cvdcrhd4==1 replace chdbi=. if cvdcrhd4==7 | cvdcrhd4==9 | cvdcrhd4==. gen strokebi=0 if cvdstrk3==2 replace strokebi=1 if cvdstrk3==1 replace strokebi=. if cvdstrk3==7 | cvdstrk3==9 | cvdstrk3==. gen kidneybi=0 if chckidny==2 replace kidnevbi=1 if chckidnv==1 replace kidneybi=. if chckidny==7 | chckidny==9 | chckidny==. gen arthritisbi=0 if havarth3==2 replace arthritisbi=1 if havarth3==1 replace arthritisbi=, if havarth3==7 | havarth3==9 | havarth3==. drop if asthmabi==. | copdbi==. | diabetebi==. | mibi==. | chdbi==. | strokebi==. | kidneybi==. | arthritisbi==. gen countillness = asthmabi+copdbi+diabetebi+mibi+chdbi+strokebi+kidneybi+arthritisbi gen illness=0 if countillness==0 replace illness=1 if countillness==1 replace illness=2 if countillness>1 drop if clinicalcheck==. | provider==. | hlthcvg==. | race==. | education==. | married==. | bmi==. | act<u>exc==. | funperson==. | smoker==.</u> healthcond==.

HIV TEST

Convert idate (string) to time variable
gen interviewdate = date(idate, "DMY")
format interviewdate %td
#Extract month and year from interviewdate variable
gen interviewmonth = month(interviewdate)
gen interviewyr = year(interviewdate)
#Create a new variable (interviewYM) with year and month from interviewdate
gen interviewYM = ym(interviewyr, interviewmonth)
format interviewYM %tm

*Convert hivtstd3 (string) to time variable

tostring hivtstd3, generate (hivstring)
gen HIVdate = date(hivstring, "MY")
format HIVdate %tm
#Extract month and year from hivtstd3 variable
gen HIVmonth = month(HIVdate)
gen HIVyr = year(HIVdate)
#Create a new variable (hivYM) with year and month from hivtstd3
gen hivYM = ym(HIVyr, HIVmonth)
format hivYM %tm

*any missing values/refused to answer values were not counted in building these variables

drop if HIVyr==1191

*generate variable to determine time since last test with interview date as point of reference gen timesincetest = interviewYM - hivYM tab timesincetest * negative variable outut (negative months) were observed when tabbing timesincetest * counting 257 negative observations which will not be counted in var timetest gen timetest=0 if timesincetest>=0 & timesincetest<=12 replace timetest=1 if timesincetest>12 & timesincetest<=400 tab timetest

gen hivtest=0 if hivtst6==1 & timetest==0
replace hivtest=1 if hivtst6==1 & timetest==1
replace hivtest=2 if hivtst6==2
replace hivtest=. if hivtst6==7 | hivtst6==9 | hivtst6==.*/

The Study Sample



Figure 1 Flowchart of selection of study population. A total of 3448 women at a high risk of HIV infection were included for current study. BRFSS, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System.

Our Selection Criteria Process

486,303 Participants in 2016 BRFSS



Final Sample for analysis(N=3417)

Statistical Analysis

The analyses were as follows:

- > Table 1: Characteristics of women at high risk for HIV infection
 - No Cervical Cancer Screening vs Cervical Cancer screening
 - Cervical cancer screening was defined as the following
 - Women aged between 21 and 65 having a pap test within 3 years
 - Women aged between 30 and 65 having a Pap test within the last 5 years accompanied by an HPV test
 - χ2 Test
- Table 2: Associations of healthcare access and HIV test with cervical cancer screening in women at a high risk of HIV infection
 - Adjusted and Crude Odds Ratios
 - Crude ORs were calculated using a multivariable logistic regression that included the four factors in the table
 - Adjusted odds ratios used the same logistic regression model but adjusted for the following variables:
 - age, race, education, marital status, obesity, physical activity, alcohol consumption, smoking status, comorbidity, and overall health condition
- Table 3: Associations of healthcare access and HIV test with cervical cancer screening in subgroups defined by education

Table 1 Study characteristics of women at high risk of HIV infection—2016 BRFSS						
	Overall (n=3448)	Had no cervical cancer screening (n=537 15.6%)	Had cervical cancer screening (n=2911 84.4%)			
Study characteristics	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	P value [‡]		
Age at interview (years)						
25–34	1477 (42.8)	184 (34.3)	1293 (44.4)	< 0.01		
35–44	913 (26.5)	128 (23.8)	785 (27.0)			
45–54	658 (19.1)	118 (22.0)	540 (18.5)			
55–64	400 (11.6)	107 (19.9)	293 (10.1)			
Race						
White	2567 (74.5)	411 (76.5)	2156 (74.1)	0.06		
Black	583 (16.9)	73 (13.6)	510 (17.5)			
Other	298 (8.6)	53 (9.9)	245 (8.4)			
Level of education completed						
High school or less	1129 (32.7)	249 (46.4)	880 (30.2)	<0.01		
Attended college	1056 (30.6)	167 (31.1)	889 (30.6)			
Graduated from college	1263 (36.6)	121 (22.5)	1142 (39.2)			
Marital status*						
Unmarried	2120 (61.5)	331 (61.6)	1789 (61.5)	0.94		
Married	1328 (38.5)	206 (38.4)	1122 (38.5)			
Obesity (BMI ≥30 kg/m²)						
No	2164 (62.8)	332 (61.8)	1832 (62.9)	0.63		
Yes	1284 (37.2)	205 (38.2)	1079 (37.1)			
Regular physical exercise						
No	819 (23.8)	186 (34.6)	633 (21.8)	<0.01		
Yes	2629 (76.2)	351 (65.4)	2278 (78.2)			

Table 1 - Original

Heavy drinker				
No	2905 (84.3)	448 (83.4)	2457 (84.4)	0.57
Yes	543 (15.7)	89 (16.6)	454 (15.6)	
Smoking status				
Never	1541 (44.7)	189 (35.2)	1352 (46.5)	<0.01
Current smoker	1229 (35.6)	270 (50.3)	959 (32.9)	
Former smoker	678 (19.7)	78 (14.5)	600 (20.6)	
Number of comorbidities†				
0	1845 (53.5)	258 (48.0)	1587 (54.5)	<0.01
1	949 (27.5)	147 (27.4)	802 (27.6)	
≥2	654 (19.0)	132 (24.6)	522 (17.9)	
Overall health condition				
Fair or poor	784 (22.7)	176 (32.8)	608 (20.9)	<0.01
Good, very good or excellent	2664 (77.3)	361 (67.2)	2303 (79.1)	

Table 1 - Original (cont.)

		Had no cervical	Had cervical cancer	
	Overall	cancer screening	screening	
	(n=3,417)	(n=648 18.96%)	(n=3,417 81.04%)	
Study characteristics	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	P value
Age at interview (years)				
25-34	1,392 (40.74)	207 (31.94)	1185 (42.80)	0.000
35-44	896 (26.22)	155 (23.92)	741 (26.76)	
45-54	706 (20.66)	168 (25.93)	538 (19.43)	
55-64	423 (12.38)	118 (18.21)	305 (11.01)	
Race				
White	2,544 (74.45)	477 (73.61)	2,067 (74.65)	0.360
Black	588 (17.21)	108 (16.67)	480 (17.33)	
Other	285 (8.34)	63 (9.72)	222 (8.02)	
Level of education completed				
High school or less	1,077 (31.52)	281 (43.36)	796 (28.75)	0.000
Attended college	1,067 (31.23)	197 (30.40)	870 (31.42)	
Graduated from college	1,273 (37.25)	170 (26.23)	1,103 (39.83)	
Marital status				
Unmarried	2,089 (61.14)	387 (59.72)	1,702 (61.47)	0.412
Married	1,328 (38.86)	261 (40.28)	1.067 (38.53)	
Obesity (BMI≥30kg/m^2)				
No	2,160 (63.21)	394 (60.80)	1,766 (63.78)	0.157
Yes	1,257 (36.79)	254 (39.20)	1,003 (36.22)	
Regular physical exercise				
No	812 (23.76)	211 (32.56)	601 (21.70)	0.000
Yes	2,605 (76.24)	437 (67.44)	2,168 (78.30)	

Table 1 - Replication

Heavy Drinker				
No	2,880 (84.28)	550 (84.88)	2,330 (84.15)	0.645
Yes	537 (15.72)	98 (15.12)	439 (15.85)	
Smoking status				
Never	1,504 (44.02)	252 (38.89)	1,252 (45.21)	0.000
Current smoker	1,235 (36.14)	287 (44.29)	948 (34.24)	
Former smoker	678 (19.84)	109 (16.82)	569 (20.55)	
Number of comorbidities				
0	1,790 (52.39)	294 (45.37)	1,496 (54.03)	0.000
1	955 (27.95)	197 (30.40)	758 (27.37)	
≥2	672 (19.67)	157 (24.23)	515 (18.60)	
Overall health condition				
Fair or poor	770 (22.53)	205 (31.64)	565 (20.40)	0.000
Good, very good or excellent	2,647 (77.47)	443 (68.36)	2,204 (79.60)	

Table 1 - Replication (cont.)

Analysis of Demographics Table (Table 1)

- > A total of 3417 participants were included in our study after selection criteria process.
 - 81.04% of participants qualified as having had cervical cancer screening, where as ~19% of the participants had no cervical cancer screening
 - The majority of participants in our analysis are white (n=2544, 74.45%)
- Chi-Squared Test Interpretations
 - Concurrently with the results of the original study, women with cervical cancer screening tended to be younger, completed higher levels of education, more likely to complete regular physical exercise, be non-current smokers, have lower number of comorbidities, and have better overall health status
 - Evaluated based on the threshold of $\alpha = 0.05$
 - No evidence suggesting marital status, obesity, and alcohol consumption were distributed differently across screening history
- Differences to the original study
 - Differences in cell counts and p-values, but conclusions were similar to original study

 Table 2
 Associations of healthcare access and HIV test with cervical cancer screening in women at a high risk of HIV infection

Factors	Overall distribution n (%)	Cervical cancer screening percentage and 95% CI	cOR and 95% CI (n=3448)	aOR and 95% CI† (n=3448)
Last clinical check-up*				
<1 year ago (REF)	2347 (68.1)	88.9 (87.6 to 90.1)	1	1
1–<2 years ago	502 (14.6)	86.3 (83.0 to 89.0)	0.78 (0.59 to 1.04)	0.74 (0.54 to 1.00)
2–<5 years ago	298 (8.6)	72.5 (67.1 to 77.3)	0.33 (0.25 to 0.44)	0.31 (0.23 to 0.43)
≥5 years ago	301 (8.7)	58.1 (52.5 to 63.6)	0.17 (0.13 to 0.23)	0.19 (0.14 to 0.26)
Had personal healthcare provid	er			
Yes (REF)	2671 (77.5)	86.4 (85.0 to 87.6)	1	1
No	777 (22.5)	77.7 (74.7 to 80.5)	0.55 (0.45 to 0.67)	0.93 (0.72 to 1.20)
Had healthcare coverage				
Yes (REF)	3013 (87.4)	86.5 (85.2 to 87.6)	1	1
No	435 (12.6)	70.3 (65.9 to 74.5)	0.37 (0.29 to 0.47)	0.60 (0.46 to 0.79)
Had HIV test				
Had test within last year (REF)	1215 (35.2)	90.6 (88.8 to 92.1)	1	1
Had test over 1 year ago	1202 (34.9)	83.8 (81.6 to 85.8)	0.53 (0.42 to 0.68)	0.64 (0.49 to 0.84)
Had no test	1031 (29.9)	77.9 (75.2 to 80.3)	0.36 (0.29 to 0.46)	0.46 (0.35 to 0.61)

Table 2 - Original

	distribution	Cervical cancer screening	cOR and 95% CI	aOR and 95% Cl
Factors	n (%)	percentage and 95% Cl	(n=3417)	(n=3417)
Last clinical check-up				
<1 year ago (REF)	2,335 (68.33)	83.51	1	1
1–<2 years ago	498 (14.57)	85.74	1.2 (0.9–1.7)	1.12 (0.83–1.49)
2–<5 years go	296 (8.66)	77.03	0.7 (0.5–1.0)	0.63 (0.46–0.87)
≥5 years ago	288 (8.43)	56.94	0.3 (0.2–0.4)	0.25 (0.18–0.33)
Had personal healthcare provider				
Yes (REF)	2,674 (78.26)	82.42	1	1
No	743 (21.74)	76.04	0.96 (0.76–1.20)	0.86 (0.67-1.09)
Had healthcare coverage				
Yes (REF)	3,028 (88.62)	82.20	1	1
No	389 (11.38)	71.98	0.77 (0.58-1.01)	0.88 (0.67–1.17)
Had HIV test				
Did have HIV test	2,412 (72.28)	83.58	1	1
Did not have HIV test	925 (27.72)	75.35	0.6 (0.5–0.7)	0.67 (0.55–0.82)

Table 2 - Replication

Healthcare Access and HIV testing associations

Stata Code for building Multivariable Regression Models:

*Crude OR & 95% CI logit cervical provider hlthcvg hivtest i.clinicalcheck, or *Adjusted OR & 95% CI logit cervical provider hlthcvg hivtest i.clinicalcheck agecat race education married bmi actexc funperson smoker illness healthcond, or

- > Similar distributions of cancer screening percentages across the factors to the original study
- > Odds Ratios and Confidence Intervals
 - Many of the 95% confidence intervals for the odds ratios included the value of 1, thus many of the odds ratio lack significance
 - Major differences in ORs and confidence intervals as opposed to the original study
 - Healthcare Coverage
 - Difference in categories for HIV testing (binary variables vs 3-level categorical variable)
 - To what degree did this affect or change our regression model?
- > Conclusions regarding clinical check up time and HIV testing

Table 3 Associations of healthcare access and HIV test with cervical cancer screening in subgroups defined by education					
	Less than college level (n=2185)		At or above college level (n=1263)		
Factors	n (%)	aOR and 95% CI	n (%)	aOR and 95% CI	P interaction†
Last clinical check-up*					
<1 year ago (REF)	1475 (67.5)	1	872 (69.0)	1	0.04
1-<2 years ago	297 (13.6)	0.86 (0.60 to 1.24)	205 (16.2)	0.51 (0.29 to 0.89)	
2-<5 years ago	199 (9.1)	0.39 (0.27 to 0.57)	99 (7.8)	0.19 (0.10 to 0.33)	
≥5 years ago	214 (9.8)	0.18 (0.12 to 0.25)	87 (6.9)	0.22 (0.11 to 0.42)	
Had personal healthcare provider					
Yes (REF)	1661 (76.0)	1	1010 (80.0)	1	0.47
No	524 (24.0)	0.98 (0.73 to 1.32)	253 (20.0)	0.78 (0.48 to 1.27)	
Had healthcare coverage					
Yes (REF)	1835 (84.0)	1	1178 (93.3)	1	0.84
No	350 (16.0)	0.58 (0.42 to 0.78)	85 (6.7)	0.59 (0.30 to 1.15)	
Had HIV test					
Had test within last year (REF)	818 (37.4)	1	397 (31.4)	1	0.59
Had test over 1 year ago	731 (33.5)	0.62 (0.45 to 0.84)	471 (37.3)	0.73 (0.41 to 1.31)	
Had no test	636 (29.1)	0.48 (0.35 to 0.66)	395 (31.3)	0.43 (0.24 to 0.77)	

Table 3 - Original

	Less than college level (n= 2,144)		At or above college level	(n= 1,273)
Factors	n (%)	aOR and 95% CI	n (%)	aOR and 95% CI
Last clinical check-up				
<1 year ago (REF)	1,452 (67.72)	1	883 (69.36)	1
1-<2 years ago	296 (13.81)	1.23 (0.86–1.76)	202 (15.87)	0.94 (0.58–1.55)
2–<5 years go	195 (9.10)	0.70 (0.48-1.04)	101 (7.93)	0.51 (0.29-0.91)
≥5 years ago	201 (9.38)	0.23 (0.16–0.33)	87 (6.83)	0.28 (0.16–0.50)
Had personal healthcare provider				
Yes (REF)	1,652 (77.05)	1	1,022 (80.28)	1
No	492 (22.95)	0.82 (0.61-1.10)	251 (19.72)	0.92 (0.60-1.43)
Had healthcare coverage				
Yes (REF)	1,833 (85.49)	1	1,195 (93.87)	1
No	311 (14.51)	0.86 (0.63–1.18)	78 (6.13)	0.92 (0.48–1.79)
Had HIV test				
Did have HIV test	1,540 (73.54)	1	872 (70.15)	1
Did not have HIV test	554 (26.46)	0.70 (0.55–0.89)	371 (29.85)	0.62 (0.43–0.89)

Healthcare Access/HIV Test in education subgroups

Stata Code for Regression Models:

*Adjusted OR & 95% CI for less than college level logit cervical provider hlthcvg hivtest i.clinicalcheck agecat race married bmi actexc funperson smoker illness healthcond if education2==0, or

*Adjusted OR & 95% CI for at or above college level

logit cervical provider hlthcvg hivtest i.clinicalcheck agecat race married bmi actexc funperson smoker illness healthcond if education2==1, or

- ➢ HIV testing
 - Those who did not have an HIV test had lower odds of having gotten cervical cancer screening across both education subgroups
 - Value of 1 does not fall within 95% Cl, thus significant odds ratio
 - Conclusions similar to models that did not adjust for education
- Comparing to Original Study
 - Similar distributions of cancer screening within each education subgroup across factors
 - However, major differences in value and significance of Odds Ratio
 - Clinical Checkup
 - Healthcare Coverage

Discussion and Limitations

- Conclusions garnered from results:
 - Lack of HIV testing and delayed clinical check-ups were inversely associated with cervical cancer screening
 - $\circ \qquad \text{Differences in conclusion from original study}$
- Through building comprehensive logistic regression models we found that the demographic variables were influential when adjusted for in the model
 - Moreover, for specific demographic characteristics there were difference in cervical cancer screening percentages, based on the chi-squared values
 - I.e education, smoker status, and more
 - Logistic models did not convey high predictive accuracy either given the lack of significance for many of the predictors in the model
- We expanded upon the study by adjusting for income in our regression models
 - Income did not have significant influence on the factors, not were there significant interaction effects
- Limitations
 - Obstacles regarding variable building
 - Lack of transparency regarding certain variables by the authors
- > Future Recommendations

Work Cited

Zhang D, Advani S, Huchko M, Braithwaite D. Impact of healthcare access and HIV testing on utilisation of cervical cancer screening among US women at high risk of HIV infection: cross-sectional analysis of 2016 BRFSS data. BMJ Open. 2020 Jan 6;10(1):e031823. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031823. PMID: 31911515; PMCID: PMC6955489.