Table E-5. Key Question 1, first outcome

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Author,Year | Groups  | Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used  | Timing of Measurement,Data Source  | N analyzed for This Outcome  | Results by Group | Differences in Groups  | Statistical Methods Used, Covariates Controlled for in Analysis |
| Cox 20011 | G1: Control (not abstracted)G2: Gain frame and statistical (framing)G3: Loss frame and statistical (framing)G4: Gain frame and anecdotal (framing + narrative)G5: Loss frame and anecdotal (framing +narrative) | Behavioral intentions to use or apply the evidence Perceived likelihood of having a mammogram after seeing advertisement. Higher numbers indicate greater perceived likelihood of getting a mammogram | Immediate posttestSelf-report | 174 overallG2: 29G3: 29G4: 29G5: 29 | Mean likelihood (7-point Likert scale where a higher number means greater likelihood):G2: 5.48G3: 4.37G4: 4.07G5: 5.54 | Significant interaction effect: F (1,103): 10.87, p=0.001G4 vs. G5: 1.47 a (p<0.01)G2 vs. G3: 1.11 a (p=0.06)G2 vs. G4: 1.41 a (ns)G2 vs. G5: 1.17 a (ns)G3 vs. G4: 0.3 a (ns)G3 vs. G5: 1.17 a (p<0.01) | ANOVANR  |
| Elder 2005,220063 | G1: Control (“off the shelf” materials covering same modules and content as lay health workers and tailored conditions) G2: Tailored print condition G3: Lay health worker tailored print condition  | Clinical outcomes % calories from fat  | Baseline, 12 week followup, and 12 month followupSelf-report face-to-face interview | BaselineN=357G1: 119G2: 118G3: 12012 weekFollowupN=313G1: 107G2: 99G3: 10712 month FollowupN=281G1: 98G2: 90G3: 93 | Percentage at baseline minus percentage at 12 weeksG1: 31.5-30.0=1.5 G2: 31.0-30.4=0.6 G3: 31.5-29.3= 2.2Percentage at 12 weeks minus percentage at 12 months Not reported | Difference of differences between G2 vs. G1: -0.9 a (favoring G1=fewer calories from fat)Differences among the 3 groups at 12 weeks controlling for baseline level not significant F=0.81, p=0.45Not reported | Tukey-Kramer multiple comparison testMixed-effects regressionBaseline measure |

Table E-5. Key question 1 first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Author,Year | Groups  | Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used  | Timing of Measurement,Data Source  | N analyzed for This Outcome  | Results by Group | Differences in Groups  | Statistical Methods Used, Covariates Controlled for in Analysis |
| Jibaja-Weiss 20034 | G1: No intervention control (499 for cervical, 239 for breast)G2: PF letters targeted to women age 40 and older (460 for cervical, 239 for breast)G3: PT letter (524 for cervical, 261 for breast) | Clinical outcomes Scheduling a pap appointment- EHR record of appointments made and receiving a Pap- EHR record of completed visit | Within 12 months after letter was sentMedical record | Overall N=1483 | Scheduled- p<0.001PercentageG1: 44.7%G2: 53.3%G3: 39.7%Received- p<0.001PercentageG1: 39.9%G2: 43.9%G3: 23.7% | Scheduling Difference G2-G1: 8.6% a Scheduling Difference G3-G2: -13.6% aScheduling Difference G3-G1: -5% aScreened Difference G2-G1: 4% a Screened Difference G3-G2: -20.2% aScreened Difference G3-G1: -16.2% a | Chi-squaredNone |
| Myers, 20075  | G1: ControlG2: Targeted interventionG3: Tailored interventionG4: Tailored intervention + telephone followup | Health-related decisions or behavior (applicable for general public/patients)Colorectal cancer screening -- Defined as having had 1 or more documented stool blood tests (SBTs) of any type (FOBT or FIT) or a self-reported or documented flexible sigmoidoscopy (FS), colonoscopy, or double-contrast barium enema (DCBE) X-ray procedure | 24-month study periodSelf-report and objective measurement | Overall N=1546G1=387G2=387G3=386G4=386 | G1=33%G2=46%G3=44%G4=48% | Univariate analyses (odds ratio):G3 vs. G2=0.94, p<0.683G4 vs. G2=1.14, p<0.683G4 vs. G3=1.21, p<0.580Multivariate analyses (odds ratio):G1=1.00G2=1.84, p<0.0001G3=1.69, p=0.001G4=2.08, p<0.0001G3 vs. G2=0.92, p=0.568G4 vs. G2=1.13, p=0.409G4 vs. G3=1.24 p=0.162 | In univariate analysis, odds ratio was adjusted for baseline perceived susceptibility and social influence |

Table E-5. Key question 1 first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Author,Year | Groups  | Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used  | Timing of Measurement,Data Source  | N analyzed for This Outcome  | Results by Group | Differences in Groups  | Statistical Methods Used, Covariates Controlled for in Analysis |
| Schneider 20016 | G1: Gain frame and multicultural G2: Loss frame and multicultural G3: Gain frame and Latina targetingG4: Loss frame and Latina targeting Group sizes not reported | Clinical outcomes Self-reported likelihood of getting a mammogram in the past 12 months within 6 months after seeing video, comparing “loss” to “gain” frames holding type of targeting constant; and looking at their interactive effect | 6 month call or postcardSelf-report | Overall N=752 | Percentage Overall= 41%G1: 36%G2: 50%G3: 41% G4: 36% | G2 vs. G1: 14%a=OR=1.81 (p<0.01)(favoring G2)G4 vs. G3: -5%a=OR=1.22 (p=0.10)(favoring G3)Using hierarchical logistic regression, controlling for past year’s use (6 months after exposure): Framing x Targeting interaction=Chi-square: 5.15, p<0.05OR [CIs]: Past year’s Mammography use: 1.44 [0.98, 2.11]Loss framing: 1.27 [0.78, 2.08]Targeting: 1.20 [0.72,1.99]Frame x Target: 2.27 [1.12, 4.63] | Absolute differencesNone |

Table E-5. Key question 1 first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Author,Year | Groups  | Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used  | Timing of Measurement,Data Source  | N analyzed for This Outcome  | Results by Group | Differences in Groups  | Statistical Methods Used, Covariates Controlled for in Analysis |
| Vernon 20087del Junco 20088 | G1: No intervention control (1,840 for 12 months, 754 for 24 months)G2: Targeted (1,857 for 12 months, 825 for 24 months) G3: Targeted and tailored (1,803 for 12 months, 781 for 24 months) | Clinical outcomes Self-reported likelihood of getting a breast cancer screening within 12 months after exposure to the letter | Year 1Self-report | Overall N=5500G1: N=1840G2: N=1857G3: N=1803 | Crude Incidence using ITT analysis:G1: 44.7%G2: 46.9%G3: 46.0% | ITT differenceG3 vs. G2: -0.9% a (favoring G2)Chi-square: 1.70 2 d.f .p=0.427Cox proportional hazard rate ratio [CI] using ITT: Differences were not significant. G1: 1.00G2: 1.07 [0.97,1.18]G3: 1.05 [0.95,1.15] | Chi-squared None |

Table E-5. Key question 1 first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Author,Year | Groups  | Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used  | Timing of Measurement,Data Source  | N analyzed for This Outcome  | Results by Group | Differences in Groups  | Statistical Methods Used, Covariates Controlled for in Analysis |
| Yu 20139 | G1: Loss frame with an individualistic appeal (framing + targeting)G2: Loss frame with a collectivistic appeal (framing + targeting)G3: Gain frame with an individualistic appeal (framing + targeting)G4: Gain frame with a collectivistic appeal (framing + targeting) | Behavioral intentions to use or apply the evidence.Intention to get a flu shot: A set of statements with 10-point Likert-type scales (1=strongly disagree; 10=strongly agree) was used to evaluate the likelihood that participants would take the actions that the messages advocated, including: (1) I intend to behave in ways that are consistent with the message; (2) I am going to make an effort to do what the message urged me to do; and (3) I plan to act in ways that are compatible with the position promoted by the message. Items were summed and averaged to create a new index. | Once immediately following exposure to brochure (immediate posttest)Self-report | OverallN=242 | NR | A significant message frames x cultural appeals interaction effect on behavioral intention.U.S. participants: F(1, 122) = 5.78, p<0.05, η2 =.05Hong Kong participants:F(1, 122) = 11.57, p<0.01, η2 =.09When the message was loss-framed, Americans who read the other appeal (M=6.49, SE=.44) reported a significantly higher intention to get a flu shot than those who read the self appeal(M=4.39, SE=.41), t(62) = 3.56, p<0.01. When the message was loss-framed, Hong Kong Chinese who read the other appeal (M=6.04, SE = .40) reported a significantly higher intention than those who read the self appeal (M=4.51, SE = .36), t(52)= 2.96, p<0.01. | ANOVANR |

Table E-5. Key question 1 first outcome (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Author,Year | Groups  | Outcome #1, Exact Measure Used  | Timing of Measurement,Data Source  | N analyzed for This Outcome  | Results by Group | Differences in Groups  | Statistical Methods Used, Covariates Controlled for in Analysis |
| Yu 20139 (continued) |  |  |  |  |  | When the message was gain framed, the self appeal yielded a marginally significant higher mean (M=5.54, SE = .37) on behavioral intention than the other appeal (M=4.55, SE = .43), t(60) = 1.88, p=0.06. |  |

Abbreviations: ANOVA = analysis of variance; CI = confidence interval; d.f. = degrees of freedom; EHR = electronic health record; G = group; ITT = intention to treat; NR = not reported; ns=not significant; OR = odds ratio