



## Complete Summary

---

### GUIDELINE TITLE

Screening for bladder cancer in adults: recommendation statement.

### BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF). Screening for bladder cancer in adults: recommendation statement. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2004 Jun. 5 p. [3 references]

### GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

This version updates a previously published guideline: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Guide to clinical preventive services. 2nd ed. Baltimore (MD): Williams & Wilkins; 1996. Chapter 17, Screening for bladder cancer. p. 181-6.

## COMPLETE SUMMARY CONTENT

SCOPE  
METHODOLOGY - including Rating Scheme and Cost Analysis  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS  
BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS  
QUALIFYING STATEMENTS  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE  
INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT CATEGORIES  
IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY  
DISCLAIMER

## SCOPE

### DISEASE/CONDITION(S)

Bladder cancer

### GUIDELINE CATEGORY

Prevention  
Screening

### CLINICAL SPECIALTY

Family Practice  
Internal Medicine  
Oncology  
Preventive Medicine  
Urology

### **INTENDED USERS**

Advanced Practice Nurses  
Allied Health Personnel  
Nurses  
Physician Assistants  
Physicians

### **GUIDELINE OBJECTIVE(S)**

- To summarize the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force recommendations on screening for bladder cancer in adults and the supporting scientific evidence
- To update the 1996 recommendations contained in the *Guide to Clinical Preventive Services*, Second Edition

### **TARGET POPULATION**

Asymptomatic adults seen in primary care settings

### **INTERVENTIONS AND PRACTICES CONSIDERED**

Screening for bladder cancer using screening tests such as microscopic urinalysis, urine dipstick, urine cytology, bladder tumor antigen (BTA), or nuclear matrix protein (NMP22) immunoassay

### **MAJOR OUTCOMES CONSIDERED**

- **Key Question 1:** Is there direct evidence that screening for bladder cancer reduces morbidity or mortality?
- **Key Question 2:** What are the accuracy and reliability of feasible screening tests for bladder cancer?
- **Key Question 3:** Does treatment of early-stage bladder cancer reduce morbidity and mortality from this disease?

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT EVIDENCE**

Searches of Electronic Databases

### **DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT THE EVIDENCE**

**Note from the National Guideline Clearinghouse (NGC):** A systematic evidence review was prepared by the RTI International-University of North

Carolina Evidence-based Practice Center (EPC) for the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) for use by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) (see the "Companion Documents" field).

### **Search Strategy**

A general search strategy, limited to the English language and the years 1994 to 2002, to search MEDLINE using "bladder neoplasms" as an "exploded" Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) term was employed. EPC staff combined "bladder neoplasms" separately with "mass screening," which yielded 28 citations, and with "meta-analysis," which yielded 23 citations. They then combined "bladder neoplasms" with "therapeutics/treatment" (1,984 citations) and combined those results with "outcome," which yielded 189 citations. Finally, they combined "bladder neoplasms" with "randomized controlled trial" and then combined those results with "single-blind or double-blind method," which yielded another 189 citations.

A separate search for 2 new bladder tumor markers, NMP22 (nuclear matrix protein 22) and BTA (bladder tumor antigen) was also performed. EPC staff used "tumor markers," "sensitivity and specificity," and "antigens, neoplasm" as "exploded" MeSH terms and combined them with NMP22, yielding 22 citations.

### **Study Selection**

Two reviewers independently analyzed all citations and culled abstracts that fit eligibility criteria for assessment. Two independent reviewers then obtained full text articles of potentially suitable abstracts and excluded those not meeting eligibility criteria.

## **NUMBER OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS**

Staff from the RTI International-University of North Carolina Evidence-based Practice Center found no high-quality direct evidence addressing the effectiveness of screening for bladder cancer on morbidity or mortality from that disease. They found no studies on the accuracy and reliability of screening tests for bladder cancer that allow accurate determination of the sensitivity or specificity of screening in the general primary care population. They found no high-quality trials that compared health outcomes in treated and untreated groups with the type of bladder cancer that would be detected by screening.

## **METHODS USED TO ASSESS THE QUALITY AND STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE**

Weighting According to a Rating Scheme (Scheme Given)

## **RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE**

The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) grades the **quality of the overall evidence** for a service on a 3-point scale (good, fair, poor):

### **Good**

Evidence includes consistent results from well-designed, well-conducted studies in representative populations that directly assess effects on health outcomes.

### **Fair**

Evidence is sufficient to determine effects on health outcomes, but the strength of the evidence is limited by the number, quality, or consistency of the individual studies, generalizability to routine practice, or indirect nature of the evidence on health outcomes.

### **Poor**

Evidence is insufficient to assess the effects on health outcomes because of limited number or power of studies, important flaws in their design or conduct, gaps in the chain of evidence, or lack of information on important health outcomes.

## **METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE**

Review

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE**

Not stated

## **METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Balance Sheets  
Expert Consensus

## **DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

When the overall quality of the evidence is judged to be good or fair, the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) proceeds to consider the magnitude of net benefit to be expected from implementation of the preventive service. Determining net benefit requires assessing both the magnitude of benefits and the magnitude of harms and weighing the two.

The USPSTF classifies benefits, harms, and net benefits on a 4-point scale: "substantial," "moderate," "small," and "zero/negative."

"Outcomes tables" (similar to "balance sheets") are the USPSTF's standard resource for estimating the magnitude of benefit. These tables, prepared by the topic teams for use at USPSTF meetings, compare the condition specific outcomes expected for a hypothetical primary care population with and without use of the preventive service. These comparisons may be extended to consider only people of specified age or risk groups or other aspects of implementation. Thus, outcomes tables allow the USPSTF to examine directly how the preventive service affects benefits for various groups.

When evidence on harms is available, the topic teams assess its quality in a manner like that for benefits and include adverse events in the outcomes tables. When few harms data are available, the USPSTF does not assume that harms are small or nonexistent. It recognizes a responsibility to consider which harms are likely and judge their potential frequency and the severity that might ensue from implementing the service. It uses whatever evidence exists to construct a general confidence interval on the 4-point scale (e.g., substantial, moderate, small, and zero/negative).

Value judgments are involved in using the information in an outcomes table to rate either benefits or harms on the USPSTF's 4-point scale. Value judgments are also needed to weigh benefits against harms to arrive a rating of net benefit.

In making its determinations of net benefit, the USPSTF strives to consider what it believes are the general values of most people. It does this with greater confidence for certain outcomes (e.g., death) about which there is little disagreement about undesirability, but it recognizes that the degree of risk people are willing to accept to avert other outcomes (e.g., cataracts) can vary considerably. When the USPSTF perceives that preferences among individuals vary greatly, and that these variations are sufficient to make trade-off of benefits and harms a "close-call," then it will often assign a C recommendation (see the "Recommendation Rating Scheme" field). This recommendation indicates the decision is likely to be sensitive to individual patient preferences.

The USPSTF uses its assessment of the evidence and magnitude of net benefit to make recommendations. The general principles the USPSTF follows in making recommendations are outlined in Table 5 of the companion document cited below. The USPSTF liaisons on the topic team compose the first drafts of the recommendations and rationale statements, which the full panel then reviews and edits. Recommendations are based on formal voting procedures that include explicit rules for determining the views of the majority.

From: Harris RP, Helfand M, Woolf SH, Lohr KN, Mulrow, CD, Teutsch SM, Atkins D. Current methods of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force: a review of the process. Methods Work Group, Third U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. *Am J Prev Med* 2001 Apr;20(3S):21-35.

## **RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

The USPSTF grades its recommendations according to one of 5 classifications (A, B, C, D, I) reflecting the strength of evidence and magnitude of net benefit (benefits minus harms):

### **A**

The USPSTF strongly recommends that clinicians provide [the service] to eligible patients. The USPSTF found good evidence that [the service] improves important health outcomes and concludes that benefits substantially outweigh harms.

### **B**

The USPSTF recommends that clinicians provide [the service] to eligible patients. The USPSTF found at least fair evidence that [the service] improves important health outcomes and concludes that benefits outweigh harms.

## **C**

The USPSTF makes no recommendation for or against routine provision of [the service]. The USPSTF found at least fair evidence that [the service] can improve health outcomes but concludes that the balance of benefits and harms is too close to justify a general recommendation.

## **D**

The USPSTF recommends against routinely providing [the service] to asymptomatic patients. The USPSTF found at least fair evidence that [the service] is ineffective or that harms outweigh benefits.

## **I**

The USPSTF concludes that the evidence is insufficient to recommend for or against routinely providing [the service]. Evidence that [the service] is effective is lacking, of poor quality, or conflicting and the balance of benefits and harms cannot be determined.

## **COST ANALYSIS**

A formal cost analysis was not performed and published cost analyses were not reviewed.

## **METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION**

Comparison with Guidelines from Other Groups  
External Peer Review  
Internal Peer Review

## **DESCRIPTION OF METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION**

Peer Review. Before the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) makes its final determinations about recommendations on a given preventive service, the Evidence-based Practice Center and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality send a draft systematic evidence review to 4 to 6 external experts and to federal agencies and professional and disease-based health organizations with interests in the topic. They ask the experts to examine the review critically for accuracy and completeness and to respond to a series of specific questions about the document. After assembling these external review comments and documenting the proposed response to key comments, the topic team presents this information to the Task Force in memo form. In this way, the Task Force can consider these external comments and a final version of the systematic review before it votes on its recommendations about the service. Draft recommendations are then circulated for comment from reviewers representing professional

societies, voluntary organizations and Federal agencies. These comments are discussed before the whole USPSTF before final recommendations are confirmed.

Recommendation of Others. Recommendations for screening for bladder cancer from the following groups were discussed: the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care and the American Academy of Family Physicians.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) grades its recommendations (A, B, C, D, or I) and the quality of the overall evidence for a service (good, fair, poor). The definitions of these grades can be found at the end of the "Major Recommendations" field.

The USPSTF recommends against routine screening for bladder cancer in adults. **D recommendation.**

*The USPSTF found fair evidence that screening with available tests can detect bladder cancer in asymptomatic individuals. The potential benefit of screening would be small, at best, for the following reasons: there is fair evidence that many of the cancers detected by screening have a low tendency to progress to invasive disease; there is a relatively low overall prevalence of asymptomatic bladder cancer that would eventually lead to important clinical consequences; and there is limited evidence that early treatment of bladder cancer detected through screening improves long-term health outcomes. The potential harms of screening are at least small: screening tests have a low positive predictive value and yield many false positive results, leading to unnecessary invasive procedures. As a result, the USPSTF concluded that the potential harms of screening for bladder cancer outweigh any potential benefits.*

### Clinical Considerations

- Bladder cancer is 2 to 3 times more common in men than in women and is unusual before age 50. Bladder cancer is heterogeneous; it is a spectrum of conditions, most of which are not life-threatening.
- Screening tests--such as microscopic urinalysis, urine dipstick, urine cytology, or such new tests as bladder tumor antigen (BTA) or nuclear matrix protein (NMP22) immunoassay--can detect bladder cancers that are clinically unapparent. However, because of the low prevalence of bladder cancer, the positive predictive value of these tests is low.
- Smoking increases the risk for bladder cancer; about 50% of all cases of bladder cancer occur in current or former smokers. Smokers should be counseled on quitting smoking.
- People in occupations that involve exposure to chemicals used in the dye or rubber industries may also have increased risk for bladder cancer. The USPSTF did not review the evidence for targeted screening for those with occupational exposure.

### Definitions:

## **Strength of Recommendations**

The USPSTF grades its recommendations according to one of 5 classifications (A, B, C, D, I) reflecting the strength of evidence and magnitude of net benefit (benefits minus harms):

### **A**

The USPSTF strongly recommends that clinicians provide [the service] to eligible patients. The USPSTF found good evidence that [the service] improves important health outcomes and concludes that benefits substantially outweigh harms.

### **B**

The USPSTF recommends that clinicians provide [the service] to eligible patients. The USPSTF found at least fair evidence that [the service] improves important health outcomes and concludes that benefits outweigh harms.

### **C**

The USPSTF makes no recommendation for or against routine provision of [the service]. The USPSTF found at least fair evidence that [the service] can improve health outcomes but concludes that the balance of benefits and harms is too close to justify a general recommendation.

### **D**

The USPSTF recommends against routinely providing [the service] to asymptomatic patients. The USPSTF found at least fair evidence that [the service] is ineffective or that harms outweigh benefits.

### **I**

The USPSTF concludes that the evidence is insufficient to recommend for or against routinely providing [the service]. Evidence that [the service] is effective is lacking, of poor quality, or conflicting and the balance of benefits and harms cannot be determined.

## **Strength of Evidence**

The USPSTF grades the quality of the overall evidence for a service on a 3-point scale (good, fair, poor):

### **Good**

Evidence includes consistent results from well-designed, well-conducted studies in representative populations that directly assess effects on health outcomes.

### **Fair**

Evidence is sufficient to determine effects on health outcomes, but the strength of the evidence is limited by the number, quality, or consistency of the individual studies, generalizability to routine practice, or indirect nature of the evidence on health outcomes.

### **Poor**

Evidence is insufficient to assess the effects on health outcomes because of limited number or power of studies, important flaws in their design or conduct, gaps in the chain of evidence, or lack of information on important health outcomes.

### **CLINICAL ALGORITHM(S)**

None provided

## **EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **TYPE OF EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

The type of evidence supporting the recommendations is identified in the "Major Recommendations" field.

## **BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **POTENTIAL BENEFITS**

The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) found fair evidence that screening with available tests can detect bladder cancer in asymptomatic individuals. The potential benefit of screening would be small, at best, for the following reasons: there is fair evidence that many of the cancers detected by screening have a low tendency to progress to invasive disease; there is a relatively low overall prevalence of asymptomatic bladder cancer that would eventually lead to important clinical consequences; and there is limited evidence that early treatment of bladder cancer detected through screening improves long-term health outcomes.

### **POTENTIAL HARMS**

The potential harms of screening for bladder cancer are at least small: screening tests have a low positive predictive value and yield many false positive results, leading to unnecessary invasive procedures. As a result, the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) concluded that the potential harms of screening for bladder cancer outweigh any potential benefits.

## **QUALIFYING STATEMENTS**

### **QUALIFYING STATEMENTS**

Recommendations made by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force are independent of the U.S. Government. They should not be construed as an official position of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE

### DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

The experiences of the first and second U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF), as well as that of other evidence-based guideline efforts, have highlighted the importance of identifying effective ways to implement clinical recommendations. Practice guidelines are relatively weak tools for changing clinical practice when used in isolation. To effect change, guidelines must be coupled with strategies to improve their acceptance and feasibility. Such strategies include enlisting the support of local opinion leaders, using reminder systems for clinicians and patients, adopting standing orders, and audit and feedback of information to clinicians about their compliance with recommended practice.

In the case of preventive services guidelines, implementation needs to go beyond traditional dissemination and promotion efforts to recognize the added patient and clinician barriers that affect preventive care. These include clinicians' ambivalence about whether preventive medicine is part of their job, the psychological and practical challenges that patients face in changing behaviors, lack of access to health care or of insurance coverage for preventive services for some patients, competing pressures within the context of shorter office visits, and the lack of organized systems in most practices to ensure the delivery of recommended preventive care.

Dissemination strategies have changed dramatically in this age of electronic information. While recognizing the continuing value of journals and other print formats for dissemination, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality will make all U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) products available through its [Web site](#). The combination of electronic access and extensive material in the public domain should make it easier for a broad audience of users to access U.S. Preventive Services Task Force materials and adapt them for their local needs. Online access to U.S. Preventive Services Task Force products also opens up new possibilities for the appearance of the annual, pocket-size *Guide to Clinical Preventive Services*.

To be successful, approaches for implementing prevention have to be tailored to the local level and deal with the specific barriers at a given site, typically requiring the redesign of systems of care. Such a systems approach to prevention has had notable success in established staff-model health maintenance organizations, by addressing organization of care, emphasizing a philosophy of prevention, and altering the training and incentives for clinicians. Staff-model plans also benefit from integrated information systems that can track the use of needed services and generate automatic reminders aimed at patients and clinicians, some of the most consistently successful interventions. Information systems remain a major challenge for individual clinicians' offices, however, as well as for looser affiliations

of practices in network-model managed care and independent practice associations, where data on patient visits, referrals, and test results are not always centralized.

## **IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS**

Foreign Language Translations  
Patient Resources  
Pocket Guide/Reference Cards

For information about [availability](#), see the "Availability of Companion Documents" and "Patient Resources" fields below.

## **INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT CATEGORIES**

### **IOM CARE NEED**

Staying Healthy

### **IOM DOMAIN**

Effectiveness  
Patient-centeredness

## **IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY**

### **BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)**

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF). Screening for bladder cancer in adults: recommendation statement. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2004 Jun. 5 p. [3 references]

### **ADAPTATION**

Not applicable: The guideline is not adapted from another source.

### **DATE RELEASED**

1996 (revised 2004 Jun)

### **GUIDELINE DEVELOPER(S)**

United States Preventive Services Task Force - Independent Expert Panel

### **GUIDELINE DEVELOPER COMMENT**

The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) is a federally-appointed panel of independent experts. Conclusions of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force do

not necessarily reflect policy of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) or its agencies.

## **SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING**

United States Government

## **GUIDELINE COMMITTEE**

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF)

## **COMPOSITION OF GROUP THAT AUTHORED THE GUIDELINE**

*Task Force Members\**: Alfred O. Berg, MD, MPH, Chair (Professor and Chair, Department of Family Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA); Janet D. Allan, PhD, RN, CS, Vice-chair (Dean, School of Nursing, University of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD); Ned Calonge, MD, MPH (Acting Chief Medical Officer, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Denver, CO); Paul Frame, MD (Tri-County Family Medicine, Cohocton, NY, and Clinical Professor of Family Medicine, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY); Joxel Garcia, MD, MBA (Deputy Director, Pan American Health Organization, Washington, DC); Russell Harris, MD, MPH (Associate Professor of Medicine, Sheps Center for Health Services Research, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, NC); Mark S. Johnson, MD, MPH (Professor of Family Medicine, University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey-New Jersey Medical School, Newark, NJ); Jonathan D. Klein, MD, MPH (Associate Professor, Department of Pediatrics, University of Rochester School of Medicine, Rochester, NY); Carol Loveland-Cherry, PhD, RN (Executive Associate Dean, School of Nursing, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI); Virginia A. Moyer, MD, MPH (Professor, Department of Pediatrics, University of Texas at Houston, Houston, TX); C. Tracy Orleans, PhD (Senior Scientist, The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Princeton, NJ); Albert L. Siu, MD, MSPH (Professor and Chairman, Brookdale Department of Geriatrics and Adult Development, Mount Sinai Medical Center, New York, NY); Steven M. Teutsch, MD, MPH (Executive Director, Outcomes Research and Management, Merck & Company, Inc., West Point, PA); Carolyn Westhoff, MD, MSc (Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Professor of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY); and Steven H. Woolf, MD, MPH (Professor, Department of Family Practice and Department of Preventive and Community Medicine and Director of Research, Department of Family Practice, Virginia Commonwealth University, Fairfax, VA)

*\*Member of the USPSTF at the time this recommendation was finalized.* For a list of current Task Force members, go to [www.ahrq.gov/clinic/uspstfab.htm](http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/uspstfab.htm).

## **FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force has an explicit policy concerning conflict of interest. All members and evidence-based practice center (EPC) staff disclose at each meeting if they have an important financial conflict for each topic being discussed. Task Force members and EPC staff with conflicts can participate in

discussions about evidence, but members abstain from voting on recommendations about the topic in question.

From: Harris RP, Helfand M, Woolf SH, Lohr KN, Mulrow, CD, Teutsch SM, Atkins D. Current methods of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force: a review of the process. Methods Work Group, Third U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Am J Prev Med 2001 Apr;20(3S):21-35.

## **GUIDELINE STATUS**

This is the current release of the guideline.

This version updates a previously published guideline: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Guide to clinical preventive services. 2nd ed. Baltimore (MD): Williams & Wilkins; 1996. Chapter 17, Screening for bladder cancer. p. 181-6.

## **GUIDELINE AVAILABILITY**

Electronic copies: Available from the [U.S. Preventive Services Task Force \(USPSTF\) Web site](#).

Print copies: Available from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Publications Clearinghouse. For more information, go to <http://www.ahrq.gov/news/pubsix.htm> or call 1-800-358-9295 (U.S. only).

## **AVAILABILITY OF COMPANION DOCUMENTS**

The following are available:

Evidence Reviews:

- Screening for bladder cancer: a brief evidence update for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Rockville (MD); Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2004 Jun. 5 p.

Electronic copies: Available from the [U.S. Preventive Services Task Force \(USPSTF\) Web site](#).

Background Articles:

- Woolf SH, Atkins D. The evolving role of prevention in health care: contributions of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Am J Prev Med 2001 Apr;20(3S):13-20.
- Harris RP, Helfand M, Woolf SH, Lohr KN, Mulrow, CD, Teutsch SM, Atkins D. Current methods of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force: a review of the process. Methods Work Group, Third U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Am J Prev Med 2001 Apr;20(3S):21-35.
- Saha S, Hoerger TJ, Pignone MP, Teutsch SM, Helfand M, Mandelblatt JS. The art and science of incorporating cost effectiveness into evidence-based recommendations for clinical preventive services. Cost Work Group of the

Third U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Am J Prev Med 2001 Apr;20(3S):36-43.

Electronic copies: Available from [U.S. Preventive Services Task Force \(USPSTF\) Web site](#).

The following are also available:

- The guide to clinical preventive services, 2006. Recommendations of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), 2006. 228 p. Electronic copies available from the [AHRQ Web site](#).
- A step-by-step guide to delivering clinical preventive services: a systems approach. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), 2002 May. 189 p. Electronic copies available from the [AHRQ Web site](#). See the related QualityTool summary on the [Health Care Innovations Exchange Web site](#).

Print copies: Available from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Publications Clearinghouse. For more information, go to <http://www.ahrq.gov/news/pubsix.htm> or call 1-800-358-9295 (U.S. only).

The [Electronic Preventive Services Selector \(ePSS\)](#), available as a PDA application and a web-based tool, is a quick hands-on tool designed to help primary care clinicians identify the screening, counseling, and preventive medication services that are appropriate for their patients. It is based on current recommendations of the USPSTF and can be searched by specific patient characteristics, such as age, sex, and selected behavioral risk factors.

## **PATIENT RESOURCES**

The following is available:

- The pocket guide to good health for adults. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2003.

Electronic copies: Available from the [U.S. Preventive Services Task Force \(USPSTF\) Web site](#). Copies also available in Spanish from the [USPSTF Web site](#). See the related QualityTool summary on the [Health Care Innovations Exchange Web site](#).

Print copies: Available from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Publications Clearinghouse. For more information, go to <http://www.ahrq.gov/news/pubsix.htm> or call 1-800-358-9295 (U.S. only).

Please note: This patient information is intended to provide health professionals with information to share with their patients to help them better understand their health and their diagnosed disorders. By providing access to this patient information, it is not the intention of NGC to provide specific medical advice for particular patients. Rather we urge patients and their representatives to review this material and then to consult with a licensed health professional for evaluation of treatment options suitable for them as well as for diagnosis and answers to their personal medical questions. This patient information has been derived and prepared from a guideline for health care professionals included on NGC by the

authors or publishers of that original guideline. The patient information is not reviewed by NGC to establish whether or not it accurately reflects the original guideline's content.

## **NGC STATUS**

This summary was completed by ECRI on June 30, 1998. The information was verified by the guideline developer on December 1, 1998. This summary was updated by ECRI on June 24, 2004.

## **COPYRIGHT STATEMENT**

Requests regarding copyright should be sent to: Gerri M. Dyer, Electronic Dissemination Advisor, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (formerly the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research), Center for Health Information Dissemination, Suite 501, Executive Office Center, 2101 East Jefferson Street, Rockville, MD 20852; Facsimile: 301-594-2286; E-mail: [gdyer@ahrq.gov](mailto:gdyer@ahrq.gov).

## **DISCLAIMER**

### **NGC DISCLAIMER**

The National Guideline Clearinghouse™ (NGC) does not develop, produce, approve, or endorse the guidelines represented on this site.

All guidelines summarized by NGC and hosted on our site are produced under the auspices of medical specialty societies, relevant professional associations, public or private organizations, other government agencies, health care organizations or plans, and similar entities.

Guidelines represented on the NGC Web site are submitted by guideline developers, and are screened solely to determine that they meet the NGC Inclusion Criteria which may be found at <http://www.guideline.gov/about/inclusion.aspx>.

NGC, AHRQ, and its contractor ECRI Institute make no warranties concerning the content or clinical efficacy or effectiveness of the clinical practice guidelines and related materials represented on this site. Moreover, the views and opinions of developers or authors of guidelines represented on this site do not necessarily state or reflect those of NGC, AHRQ, or its contractor ECRI Institute, and inclusion or hosting of guidelines in NGC may not be used for advertising or commercial endorsement purposes.

Readers with questions regarding guideline content are directed to contact the guideline developer.

© 1998-2008 National Guideline Clearinghouse

Date Modified: 9/22/2008

