

Online Supplementary Material

Dietrich AJ, Tobin JN, Cassells A, et al. Translation of an efficacious cancer-screening intervention to women enrolled in a Medicaid managed care organization. *Ann Fam Med*. 2007;5(4):320-327.

<http://www.annfammed.org/cgi/content/full/5/4/320/DC1>

Supplemental Table 2. Comparisons of Up-to-Date Status at Follow-up Among Women Who Were Reached by Telephone at Least Once, Still Eligible, and Willing to Participate, Excluding Women Who Were Up-to-Date on a Given Screening at Baseline

Screening	PCM	AMOP	Unadjusted Comparison		Adjusted Comparison*	
	No. (%) Up-to-Date	No. (%) Up-to-Date	OR (95% CI)	P Value	OR (95% CI)	P Value
Breast	(n = 157) 81 (51.6)	(n = 138) 60 (43.5)	1.39 (0.85-2.25)	.16	1.39 (0.88-2.20)	.16
Cervical	(n = 113) 52 (46.0)	(n = 111) 35 (31.5)	1.85 [†] (1.04-3.32)	.03	1.86 [†] (1.08-3.21)	.03
Colorectal [‡]	(n = 127) 27 (21.3)	(n = 133) 17 (12.8)	1.84 (0.91-3.82)	.07	–	–

PCM = prevention care management; AMOP = Affinity Mammography Outreach Program (the comparison group); OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval.

* Breast and cervical cancer-screening comparisons are adjusted for age (40 to 49 years, 50 years and older). Because the colorectal analysis includes only women aged 50 years and older, there is no adjusted comparison for this screening.

† $P \leq .05$.

‡ Smaller n values for colorectal screening reflect the subset of the study population who were eligible for this screening (aged 50 years and older).