



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Jennie L. Williams,
Stony Brook University, United States

*CORRESPONDENCE
Laura Fejerman
lfejerman@ucdavis.edu

SPECIALTY SECTION
This article was submitted to
Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Oncology

RECEIVED 01 November 2022
ACCEPTED 17 November 2022
PUBLISHED 06 January 2023

CITATION
Tamayo LI, Perez F, Perez A,
Hernandez M, Martinez A, Huang X,
Zavala VA, Ziv E, Neuhausen SL,
Carvajal-Carmona LG, Duron Y and
Fejerman L (2023) Cancer screening
and breast cancer family history in
Spanish-speaking Hispanic/Latina
women in California.
Front. Oncol. 12:1087022.
doi: 10.3389/fonc.2022.1087022

COPYRIGHT
© 2023 Tamayo, Perez, Perez,
Hernandez, Martinez, Huang, Zavala, Ziv,
Neuhausen, Carvajal-Carmona, Duron
and Fejerman. This is an open-access
article distributed under the terms of
the [Creative Commons Attribution
License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution
or reproduction in other forums is
permitted, provided the original
author(s) and the copyright owner(s)
are credited and that the original
publication in this journal is cited, in
accordance with accepted academic
practice. No use, distribution or
reproduction is permitted which does
not comply with these terms.

Cancer screening and breast cancer family history in Spanish-speaking Hispanic/Latina women in California

Lizeth I. Tamayo¹, Fabian Perez², Angelica Perez²,
Miriam Hernandez³, Alejandra Martinez⁴, Xiaosong Huang²,
Valentina A. Zavala², Elad Ziv⁵, Susan L. Neuhausen⁶,
Luis G. Carvajal-Carmona^{7,8}, Ysabel Duron⁹
and Laura Fejerman^{2,8*}

¹Department of Public Health Sciences, The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, United States,

²Department of Public Health Sciences, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA, United States,

³Vision y Compromiso, Los Angeles, CA, United States, ⁴Promoters for Better Health, Pomona, CA, United States, ⁵Department of General Internal Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, United States, ⁶Department of Population Sciences, Beckman Research Institute of City of Hope, Duarte, CA, United States, ⁷Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Medicine, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA, United States, ⁸Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of California Davis, Sacramento, CA, United States, ⁹The Latino Cancer Institute, San Jose, CA, United States

KEYWORDS

breast cancer health disparities, hereditary breast cancer, cancer education, Hispanic/Latina, cancer family history

A Corrigendum on:

Cancer screening and breast cancer family history in Spanish-speaking Hispanic/Latina women in California.

By Tamayo LI, Perez F, Perez A, Hernandez M, Martinez A, Huang X, Zavala VA, Ziv E, Neuhausen SL, Carvajal-Carmona LG, Duron Y and Fejerman L (2022) *Front. Oncol.* 12:940162. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2022.940162

In the original article, there was an error in [Table 2](#) as published. The percentages for [Table 2](#) “Due for Pap. Test (never or 3+ years ago)” for Los Angeles and Sacramento were incorrect. The count and percentage for San Francisco were incorrect. The corrected [Table 2](#) and its caption appear below.

TABLE 2 Screening behavior and interest in breast cancer genetics among 'Tu Historia Cuenta' study participants (N=1,042) overall and by recruitment area.

| Interest and awareness, N (%) | Overall | Los Angeles | Sacramento | San Francisco | P-value |
|---|----------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Number of Participants | 1,042 (100) | 530 (50.9) | 264 (25.3) | 248 (23.8) | |
| Interest in learning about genetics and BC | | | | | |
| No Interest | 14 (1.3) | 11 (2.1) | 0 (0.0) | 3 (1.2) | <0.001 |
| Some Interest | 220 (21.1) | 149 (28.1) | 23 (8.7) | 48 (19.4) | |
| Very Interested | 801 (76.9) | 364 (68.7) | 240 (90.9) | 197(79.4) | |
| Missing | 7 (0.7) | 6 (1.1) | 1 (0.4) | 0 (0.0) | |
| Genetic Testing Awareness | | | | | |
| Yes | 489 (46.9) | 224 (42.3) | 109 (41.3) | 156 (62.9) | <0.001 |
| No | 544 (52.2) | 297 (56.0) | 155 (58.7) | 92(37.1) | |
| Missing | 9 (0.9) | 9 (1.7) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | |
| Cancer Screening | | | | | |
| Breast Cancer Screening (Ages 40 to 74) | 636 | 356 | 160 | 120 | |
| Up to date with mammogram (<2 years ago) | 357 (56.1) | 187 (52.5) | 97 (60.6) | 73 (60.8) | 0.200 |
| Due for mammogram (never or 2+ years ago) | 272 (42.8) | 162 (45.5) | 63 (39.4) | 47 (39.2) | |
| Missing | 7 (1.1) | 7 (2.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | |
| Connected to EWC Program (of those due for mammogram) | 64 (23.5) | 53 (32.7) | 10 (15.9) | 1 (2.1) | <0.001 |
| Cervical Cancer Screening (Ages 21 to 65) | 1012 | 512 | 261 | 239 | |
| Ever had a pap smear | 831 (82.1) | 380 (74.2) | 233 (89.3) | 218 (91.2) | <0.001 |
| Up to date with pap smear | 742 (73.3) | 332 (64.8) | 207 (79.3) | 203 (84.9) | 0.103 |
| Due for Pap. Test (never or 3+ years ago) | 250 (24.7) | 165 (32.2) | 52 (19.9) | 33 (13.8) | |
| Missing | 19 (1.9) | 14 (2.7) | 2 (0.8) | 3 (1.3) | |
| Colorectal Cancer Screening (Age 50+) | 264 | 158 | 56 | 50 | |
| Up to date with colonoscopy | 62 (23.5) | 33 (20.9) | 14 (25.0) | 15 (30.0) | 0.355 |
| Due for colonoscopy | 189 (71.6) | 116 (73.4) | 42 (75.0) | 31 (62.0) | |
| Missing | 13 (4.9) | 9 (5.7) | 0 (0.0) | 4 (8.0) | |

Furthermore, there was also an error in Table 4 as published. The measurement of association should be RRR. An asterisk has also been added to the bottom of the table. The corrected Table 4 and its caption appear below.

TABLE 4 Multivariate multinomial logistic regression model testing the association between breast cancer screening behavior and demographic factors among ‘Tu Historia Cuenta’ participants ages 40 to 74 (N=587, 42 excluded from 629 due to missing data).

| Variable | RRR* | L95%CI | H95%CI | P-value |
|---|------|--------|--------|---------|
| Never had mammography (reference) | | | | |
| Mammography up to date | | | | |
| Age | 1.17 | 1.12 | 1.22 | <0.001 |
| Years residing in the US | 0.98 | 0.95 | 1.01 | 0.175 |
| Immigration status (US born vs. foreign born) | 0.95 | 0.34 | 2.61 | 0.917 |
| Educational Attainment (ref: no schooling) | | | | |
| Elementary | 2.56 | 1.00 | 6.53 | 0.050 |
| Middle school | 1.54 | 0.52 | 4.53 | 0.435 |
| High school | 3.00 | 1.10 | 8.20 | 0.032 |
| Associate degree | 2.07 | 0.66 | 6.48 | 0.211 |
| University degree | 2.28 | 0.68 | 7.62 | 0.182 |
| Region of residence (ref: Los Angeles) | | | | |
| Sacramento | 2.16 | 1.23 | 3.81 | 0.008 |
| San Francisco | 1.08 | 0.58 | 2.03 | 0.801 |
| Insurance Status (ref: no insurance) | | | | |
| Public | 1.58 | 0.98 | 2.57 | 0.062 |
| Private | 3.19 | 1.46 | 6.98 | 0.004 |
| English Fluency (ref: monolingual) | | | | |
| Limited English Use | 2.38 | 1.14 | 4.99 | 0.021 |
| Conversational | 2.16 | 1.10 | 4.25 | 0.026 |
| Fully Bilingual | 1.84 | 0.69 | 4.91 | 0.225 |
| Number of people in the household | 0.90 | 0.78 | 1.02 | 0.102 |
| Mammography more than 2 years ago | | | | |
| Age | 1.18 | 1.12 | 1.25 | <0.001 |
| Years in the US | 0.97 | 0.94 | 1.01 | 0.118 |
| Immigration status | 0.94 | 0.23 | 3.79 | 0.927 |
| Educational Attainment (ref: no schooling) | | | | |
| Elementary | 1.41 | 0.45 | 4.48 | 0.555 |
| Middle school | 2.05 | 0.55 | 7.63 | 0.283 |
| High school | 2.38 | 0.69 | 8.25 | 0.171 |
| Associate degree | 2.43 | 0.60 | 9.84 | 0.214 |
| University degree | 2.13 | 0.48 | 9.49 | 0.319 |
| Region of residence (ref: Los Angeles) | | | | |
| Sacramento | 2.33 | 1.14 | 4.75 | 0.020 |
| San Francisco | 0.84 | 0.36 | 1.94 | 0.678 |
| Insurance Status (ref: no insurance) | | | | |
| Public | 0.99 | 0.54 | 1.84 | 0.987 |
| Private | 1.63 | 0.61 | 4.33 | 0.329 |
| English Fluency (ref: monolingual Spanish) | | | | |
| Limited English Use | 1.60 | 0.65 | 3.98 | 0.307 |
| Conversational | 1.18 | 0.51 | 2.76 | 0.694 |
| Fully Bilingual | 0.42 | 0.10 | 1.71 | 0.226 |
| Number of people in the household | 0.84 | 0.70 | 0.99 | 0.039 |

*Relative Risk Ratio.

In addition, there were also errors in Table 5 as published. The sublabels under English Fluency have been updated to match the ones previously used. Furthermore, Insurance status, English fluency and Number of people

in household for those with cervical screening 3 years ago were cut off from the table and have been added back in. The corrected Table 5 and its caption appear below.

TABLE 5 Multivariate multinomial logistic regression model testing the association between cervical cancer screening behavior and demographic factors among 'Tu Historia Cuenta' participants ages 21 to 65 (N=932, 80 excluded from 1012 due to missing data).

| Variable | RRR* | L95% | H95% | P-Value |
|---|------------------|------|-------|---------|
| Never had cervical cancer screening | Reference | | | |
| Cervical cancer screening up to date | | | | |
| Age | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.03 | 0.929 |
| Years residing in the US | 1.01 | 0.99 | 1.04 | 0.314 |
| Immigration status (US born vs. foreign born) | 0.56 | 0.26 | 1.23 | 0.150 |
| Educational Attainment (ref: no schooling) | | | | |
| Elementary | 1.37 | 0.64 | 2.93 | 0.424 |
| Middle school | 1.37 | 0.56 | 3.40 | 0.492 |
| High school | 2.03 | 0.88 | 4.70 | 0.099 |
| Associate degree | 1.24 | 0.48 | 3.20 | 0.663 |
| University degree | 1.31 | 0.50 | 3.41 | 0.583 |
| Region of residence (ref: Los Angeles) | | | | |
| Sacramento | 2.57 | 1.56 | 4.22 | <0.001 |
| San Francisco | 3.71 | 2.05 | 6.71 | <0.001 |
| Insurance Status (ref: no insurance) | | | | |
| Public | 1.06 | 0.70 | 1.62 | 0.776 |
| Private | 3.73 | 1.67 | 8.34 | 0.001 |
| English Fluency (ref: monolingual) | | | | |
| Limited English Use | 1.21 | 0.65 | 2.28 | 0.548 |
| Conversational | 1.46 | 0.83 | 2.55 | 0.184 |
| Fully Bilingual | 0.64 | 0.29 | 1.40 | 0.264 |
| Number of people in the household | 1.06 | 0.96 | 1.17 | 0.259 |
| Cervical cancer screening 3 years ago | | | | |
| Age | 1.02 | 0.98 | 1.06 | 0.419 |
| Years residing in the US | 1.03 | 0.99 | 1.07 | 0.158 |
| Immigration status (US born vs. foreign born) | 0.55 | 0.17 | 1.80 | 0.324 |
| Educational Attainment (ref: no schooling) | | | | |
| Elementary | 1.16 | 0.30 | 4.49 | 0.828 |
| Middle school | 2.26 | 0.51 | 9.96 | 0.281 |
| High school | 2.82 | 0.69 | 11.54 | 0.150 |
| Associate degree | 3.65 | 0.80 | 16.73 | 0.095 |
| University degree | 1.41 | 0.27 | 7.24 | 0.683 |
| Region of residence (ref: Los Angeles) | | | | |
| Sacramento | 2.58 | 1.27 | 5.26 | 0.009 |
| San Francisco | 3.20 | 1.32 | 7.74 | 0.010 |
| Insurance Status (ref: no insurance) | | | | |
| Public | 0.36 | 0.19 | 0.69 | 0.002 |
| Private | 0.77 | 0.25 | 2.33 | 0.638 |
| English Fluency (ref: monolingual) | | | | |
| Limited English Use | 1.25 | 0.48 | 3.22 | 0.645 |
| Conversational | 0.86 | 0.35 | 2.13 | 0.747 |
| Fully Bilingual | 0.78 | 0.23 | 2.57 | 0.678 |
| Number of people in the household | 1.13 | 0.98 | 1.30 | 0.088 |

*Relative Risk Ratio.

Lastly, there was also an error in Table 6 as published. The sublabels under English Fluency have been updated to match the ones previously used. The corrected Table 6 and its caption appear below.

TABLE 6 Multivariate logistic regression model testing the association between colorectal screening behavior and demographic factors among ‘Tu Historia Cuenta’ participants ages 50+ (N=240, 24 excluded from 264 due to missing data).

| Never Colonoscopy as reference | OR | L95% | H95% | P-Value |
|---|------|------|-------|---------|
| Age | 1.04 | 0.98 | 1.11 | 0.165 |
| Years residing in the US | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.03 | 0.882 |
| Immigration status (US born vs. foreign born) | 0.98 | 0.24 | 3.98 | 0.980 |
| Educational Attainment (ref: no schooling) | | | | |
| Less than High School | 2.78 | 1.24 | 6.47 | 0.015 |
| High School or more | 6.40 | 2.21 | 19.37 | 0.001 |
| Region of residence (ref: Los Angeles) | | | | |
| Sacramento | 1.24 | 0.52 | 2.93 | 0.621 |
| San Francisco | 0.99 | 0.40 | 2.37 | 0.974 |
| Insurance Status (ref: no insurance) | | | | |
| Public | 1.24 | 0.52 | 2.93 | 0.621 |
| Private | 0.99 | 0.40 | 2.37 | 0.974 |
| English Fluency (ref: monolingual) | | | | |
| Limited English Use | 0.79 | 0.26 | 2.54 | 0.681 |
| Conversational | 1.02 | 0.35 | 3.14 | 0.971 |
| Fully Bilingual | 1.47 | 0.39 | 5.83 | 0.571 |
| Number of people in the household | 0.81 | 0.66 | 0.99 | 0.042 |

The authors apologize for these errors and state that they do not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.

Publisher’s note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.