

Cervical screening: Why aren't we catching everyone?

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 27 October 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

Despite established cervical cancer screening guidelines and clear benefits, a significant proportion of eligible individuals do not participate in routine screening, leading to preventable diagnoses of advanced disease.

A comprehensive systematic review, commissioned by the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care, found that HPV self-sampling demonstrated comparable accuracy to clinician-collected samples for detecting high-risk HPV and high-grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasia, offering a critical pathway to improve screening uptake.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- **The Pivot:** HPV self-sampling offers comparable accuracy to clinician-collected samples for high-risk HPV detection, addressing a key barrier to screening.
- **The Data:** Self-sampling interventions increased screening rates among under-screened individuals by 1.5 to 2.5 times compared to usual care.
- **The Action:** Clinicians should consider integrating HPV self-sampling into screening programs, particularly for populations with historically low participation.

Cervical cancer screening programs aim to detect precancerous lesions or early-stage cancer, primarily through cytology (Pap tests) or HPV testing. The goal is to reduce incidence and mortality by identifying and treating cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN) before it progresses. Despite established guidelines and clear benefits, a significant proportion of eligible individuals do not participate in routine screening, leading to preventable diagnoses of advanced disease. Understanding the effectiveness and acceptability of alternative screening methods, such as HPV self-sampling, is critical to improving public health outcomes.

The Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care commissioned a comprehensive systematic review to update its recommendations on cervical cancer screening. This review focused on evidence from Very High Development Index countries, examining screening effectiveness, comparative effectiveness of strategies and intervals, comparative test accuracy, and interventions to improve screening rates. The target population included individuals with a cervix, aged 15 years or older, who were sexually active and asymptomatic for cervical cancer. The review also considered adverse pregnancy outcomes associated with conservative management of CIN, drawing on two existing systematic reviews.¹

Evaluating the Accuracy of Self-Sampling

The core question for any new screening modality is its diagnostic accuracy compared to the established standard. For HPV self-sampling, the review assessed its ability to detect high-risk HPV (hrHPV) genotypes, which are responsible for nearly all cervical cancers. The analysis included studies comparing self-collected samples with clinician-collected samples, typically obtained via a speculum examination. This comparison is vital because a less accurate test, even if

more accessible, could lead to missed diagnoses or unnecessary follow-up procedures.

The systematic review found that HPV self-sampling demonstrated comparable accuracy to clinician-collected samples for the detection of hrHPV.^{1,3} Specifically, the sensitivity of self-sampling for hrHPV detection was high, meaning it correctly identified most individuals with the virus.^{1,3} The specificity was also robust, indicating it correctly identified individuals without hrHPV.¹ These findings are important for validating self-sampling as a reliable method for the initial detection of the primary etiological agent of cervical cancer. The review did not provide specific numerical values for sensitivity and specificity, but characterized the accuracy as 'comparable' to clinician-collected samples, a key qualitative assessment for clinical utility.¹

This comparable accuracy extends to the detection of high-grade CIN (CIN2+ and CIN3+), which are the direct precursors to invasive cervical cancer.¹ While HPV testing identifies the presence of the virus, the ultimate goal of screening is to prevent these advanced lesions. The review indicated that self-sampling's ability to identify individuals at risk for CIN2+ or CIN3+ was consistent with clinician-collected methods.¹ This suggests that a positive self-sample HPV test can reliably trigger appropriate follow-up, such as colposcopy, without an undue burden of false positives or, more critically, false negatives that could delay diagnosis.¹

Impact on Screening Uptake

Beyond accuracy, the primary rationale for introducing HPV self-sampling is to improve screening rates, particularly among populations that are under-screened or never-screened.² These groups often face significant barriers to traditional clinic-based screening, including lack of access, time constraints, cultural factors, fear, embarrassment, or previous negative experiences. The review specifically examined interventions designed to improve screening rates among these hard-to-reach populations, a critical public health objective. Millions of women are overdue for cancer screening tests across Europe, highlighting the urgency of effective outreach.

Interventions involving HPV self-sampling significantly increased screening participation.¹ The review reported that these interventions led to a 1.5 to 2.5 times higher screening rate among under-screened or never-screened individuals compared to usual care.¹ This substantial increase shows the practical utility of self-sampling as a public health tool. Usual care typically involves invitation letters or opportunistic screening during routine medical visits, which often fail to engage these specific populations.¹ The convenience and privacy offered by self-sampling appear to overcome many of the barriers associated with clinic visits.¹

The effectiveness of these interventions varied based on the specific delivery model. For instance, mailing self-sampling kits directly to eligible individuals' homes proved highly effective.¹ This approach removes the need for a clinic visit entirely for the initial screening step, making it particularly appealing for those with geographical or logistical challenges. Other models included offering self-sampling kits in non-clinical settings or through community outreach programs.¹ The review did not detail the comparative effectiveness of these different delivery models, but the overall trend pointed to a clear benefit of self-sampling in boosting participation.¹

Considerations for Implementation

Implementing HPV self-sampling on a broader scale requires careful consideration of several factors beyond just accuracy and uptake. The review highlighted the importance of informed individuals' values and preferences. Patient preference for self-sampling is generally high, driven by factors such as convenience, privacy, and reduced discomfort

compared to a speculum examination.³ This positive perception is a strong indicator of potential long-term adherence to screening programs that incorporate self-sampling. But ensuring adequate understanding of the test, its implications, and the need for follow-up is paramount. Misinformation or lack of clear guidance could undermine the benefits of increased participation. For a comprehensive understanding of clinical practice, the Oxford Handbook of General Practice, 5th Edition remains an invaluable resource.

The review also touched upon adverse pregnancy outcomes associated with the conservative management of CIN. While not directly related to self-sampling accuracy or uptake, this aspect is critical for overall screening program design. Conservative management, often chosen for younger individuals with low-grade CIN, aims to preserve fertility but carries a small risk of progression or, if treatment is eventually required, potential obstetric complications. The systematic review drew on existing evidence to inform the Task Force's recommendations, ensuring that the benefits of early detection are weighed against potential harms of intervention. This holistic view is essential for developing guidelines that optimize patient safety and outcomes.¹

Still, the review did not provide granular data on the specific types of hrHPV detected by self-sampling versus clinician-collected samples, nor did it detail the performance characteristics across different age groups or ethnic populations. These nuances can be important for tailoring screening strategies. For example, while HPV vaccination programs are making progress in aiding cervical cancer elimination, screening remains critical for unvaccinated cohorts and for detecting infections with non-vaccine HPV types.² The generalizability of the findings to all Very High Development Index countries, given variations in healthcare systems and population demographics, also warrants careful interpretation. The review focused on the broad utility of self-sampling, but local context will always influence optimal implementation.

Where it falls short

The systematic review, while comprehensive, did not examine the cost-effectiveness of widespread HPV self-sampling implementation.^{3,4} While increased uptake is a clear benefit, the economic implications for healthcare systems, including the cost of kits, laboratory processing, and managing increased demand for follow-up procedures, are significant.⁴ A full economic analysis would be necessary to guide policy decisions on large-scale rollout. The review did not explicitly address the psychological impact of self-sampling, such as potential anxiety from a positive result or the perceived responsibility of accurate sample collection. These patient-reported outcomes are increasingly recognized as important measures of screening program success.

Another limitation is the lack of detailed information on the specific types of self-sampling devices or collection methods used across the included studies. Different devices may have varying levels of user-friendliness and sample adequacy rates, which could influence overall program effectiveness. The review's broad conclusion of 'comparable accuracy' might mask subtle differences that could be clinically relevant in specific contexts. Future research should aim to standardize reporting on these methodological details to allow for more precise comparisons and recommendations.

The review also did not specifically address the optimal interval for self-sampling or how it integrates with existing screening algorithms. While it informs the update to recommendations, the practical integration into national screening programs, which often have established intervals for cytology or primary HPV screening, requires further operational research. Determining whether self-sampling should be offered as a primary screening tool, a catch-up mechanism, or an alternative for non-attenders will depend on local resources and existing infrastructure. The long-term impact on

overall cervical cancer incidence and mortality, beyond just uptake, will only be measurable years after widespread implementation.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The evidence for HPV self-sampling is clear: it works, and people use it. For European GPs and specialists, this means a tangible tool to address the persistent problem of under-screened populations. We have long known that clinic-based screening presents barriers, but now we have a validated alternative that can significantly boost participation without compromising accuracy for high-risk HPV detection.

Integrating self-sampling into national screening programs should move beyond pilot projects. Mailing kits directly to eligible individuals, particularly those identified as overdue, offers a pragmatic solution to improve coverage. This approach could reduce the administrative burden on clinics while empowering patients to take control of their health in a private, convenient manner. The data supports a proactive, rather than reactive, approach to engaging these groups.

But implementation is not just about sending out kits. Clinicians must ensure robust pathways for follow-up are in place for positive self-samples. A positive HPV result from a self-sample requires the same diligent colposcopy referral and management as a positive clinician-collected sample. The challenge shifts from getting patients to screen to ensuring they complete the diagnostic cascade, which is a different, but equally critical, public health hurdle.

The goal is to prevent cervical cancer. Self-sampling is not a replacement for clinical care, but a powerful adjunct to it. It expands the reach of screening, bringing more individuals into the protective umbrella of early detection. The evidence demands that we leverage this tool effectively to reduce the burden of this preventable cancer.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. Articles that carry a signed Editor's take have been read in full by William Lopes. The others are not individually read by an editor, so check the cited source before relying on a figure.

REFERENCES

1. Arbyn M, Smith SB, Temin S, Sultana F, Castle P. Detecting cervical precancer and reaching underscreened women by using HPV testing on self samples: updated meta-analyses. *BMJ*. 2018;363:k4823. doi:10.1136/bmj.k4823
2. Bhatla N, Aoki D, Sharma DN, Sankaranarayanan R. Cancer of the cervix uteri: 2025 update. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*. 2025;171 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):87-108. doi:10.1002/ijgo.70277
3. Colonetti T, Rodrigues Uggioni ML, Meller Dos Santos AL, et al. Self-sampling for HPV testing in cervical cancer screening: A scoping review. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2024;296:20-51. doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2024.02.032
4. Malone C, Barnabas RV, Buist DSM, Tiro JA, Winer RL. Cost-effectiveness studies of HPV self-sampling: A systematic review. *Prev Med*. 2020;132:105953. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2019.105953

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com