


# New USPSTF Cervical Cancer Screening Draft Recommendations Would Put Lives at Risk

The USPSTF (United States Preventive Services Task Force) **draft** recommendations<sup>1</sup>:

<p><b>UNCHANGED</b></p> <p><b>Pap-Along:</b> Grade A Interval = 3 years; Ages 21-65</p>	<p><b>NOW EXCLUDED</b></p> <p><b>Co-Testing:</b> Pap+HPV (Previous Grade A recommendation)</p>	<p><b>NOW INCLUDED</b></p> <p><b>HPV-Along*:</b> Grade A Interval = 5 years; Ages 30-65</p>
---	--	---

## USPSTF Analysis Did Not Consider Current US Medical Practice

USPSTF ANALYSIS	CHALLENGES
 <p><b>USPSTF</b> relied heavily on data from Europe and Canada.<sup>2</sup></p> <p>⚠ Did <b>not</b> take into account <b>HPV negative</b> cervical cancers.<sup>2</sup></p>	<p>Data from US clinical practice has shown, 1-in-5 cervical <b>cancers missed with HPV-Along* screening.</b><sup>3</sup></p>
<p>⚠ 5 of 7 studies evaluated used <b>conventional cytology.</b><sup>2</sup></p>	<p><b>Less than 5%</b> of US market uses conventional cytology – which <b>reduces performance</b> of co-testing in analysis.<sup>4</sup></p>
<p>⚠ HPV tests used <b>did not</b> have <b>FDA approval</b> for HPV-Along* screening.<sup>2</sup></p>	<p>US guidelines and clinical practice emphasize the <b>importance</b> of <b>FDA-approved</b> testing.<sup>5,6</sup></p>
<p>⚠ <b>All studies</b> used HPV <b>DNA</b> testing.<sup>2</sup></p>	<p><b>Co-testing with mRNA</b> is the most <b>widely used</b> screening strategy in the US – specificity would have been improved.<sup>7,8</sup></p>
<p>⚠ <b>Did not use genotyping</b> as part of co-testing.<sup>2</sup></p>	<p>Inclusion would have led to <b>immediate treatment</b> of 16/18+ results and may <b>improve model performance.</b></p>
<p>⚠ Despite inferior sensitivity inputs <b>HPV-Along*</b> showed decreased <b>mortality rates</b> vs. co-testing.<sup>2</sup></p>	<p><b>Co-testing</b> detects <b>more pre-cancer and cancer</b> than either test alone, proven by data from real-world US clinical practice.<sup>3,9-13</sup></p>

Recent **HRSA** recommendations and **ACOG** guidelines **include Co-Testing** for women age 30 to 65 as the **preferred screening strategy** for cervical cancer.<sup>5,6</sup>

TAKE ACTION BY  
**OCTOBER 9, 2017**

Visit **ProtectPapPlusHPV.com**  
to learn more and urge USPSTF to reconsider.



\* A positive HPV screening result may lead to further evaluation with cytology and/or colposcopy.

## References:

1. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Draft Recommendation Statement, Cervical Cancer: Screening. <https://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/Page/Document/draft-recommendation-statement/cervical-cancer-screening2>. Published September 2017. Accessed September 14, 2017.
2. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Draft Evidence Review: Cervical Cancer: Screening. <https://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/Page/Document/draft-evidence-review/cervical-cancer-screening2>. Published September 2017. Accessed September 14, 2017.
3. Blatt AJ, et al. Comparison of cervical cancer screening results among 256,648 women in multiple clinical practices. *Cancer Cytopathol.* 2015;123(5):282-288. doi:10.1002/cncy.21544. (Study included ThinPrep, SurePath, Hybrid Capture 2 Assay).
4. Laboratory Economics. The U.S. Anatomic Pathology Market: Forecast & Trends 2016. Poughkeepsie, NY: Laboratory Economics; 2016.
5. The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Practice Bulletin Number 168: Cervical Cancer Screening and Prevention. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2016;128(4):e111-e130.
6. Women's Preventive Services Initiative. Recommendations for preventive services for women: final report to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources & Services Administration. Washington, DC: American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; 2016.
7. Hologic, Inc. Data on file.
8. Aptima HPV Assay [package insert, AW-12820 Rev.001], San Diego, CA; Hologic, Inc., 2015.
9. Zhou H, et al. Clinical performance of the Food and Drug Administration-Approved high-risk HPV test for the detection of high-grade cervicovaginal lesions. *Cancer Cytopathol.* 2016;124(5):317-23. doi:10.1002/cncy.21687. (Study included cobas HPV test, SurePath, ThinPrep).
10. Katki HA, Kinney WK, Fetterman B, et al. Cervical cancer risk for women undergoing concurrent testing for human papillomavirus and cervical cytology: a population-based study in routine clinical practice. *Lancet Oncol.* 2011;12(7):663-72. PMID: 21684207. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045\(11\)70145-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(11)70145-0).
11. Gage JC, Hunt WC, Schiffman M, et al. Similar risk patterns after cervical screening in two large U.S. populations. *Cervical Dysplasia.* 2016;128(6):1248-57.
12. Gage JC, Schiffman M, Katki HA, et al. Reassurance against future risk of precancer and cancer conferred by a negative human papillomavirus test. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2014;106(8). PMID: 25038467. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jnci/dju153>. Accessed September 13, 2017.
13. Katki HA, Schiffman M, Castle PE, et al. Five-year risks of CIN 3+ and cervical cancer among women who test Pap-negative but are HPV-positive. *J Low Genit Tract Dis.* 2013;17(5 Suppl 1):S56-63.