Cervical cancer screening practices among women in Ghana: evidence from wave 2 of the WHO study on global AGEing and adult health
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Abstract

Background: Cervical cancer is the third most common cancer that affects women worldwide. It has been and remains the leading cause of cancer mortality among women in Ghana. Despite the fact that cervical cancer is preventable through early detection and treatment of precancerous lesions, anecdotal evidence from gynaecological clinics in Ghana indicates that most patients present with a late stage of the disease. This study assesses the cervical cancer screening practices among women in Ghana.

Methods: Data from the World Health Organization’s (WHO) multi-country Study on AGEing and adult health (SAGE) wave 2 conducted between 2014 and 2015 in Ghana was used. We employed binary logistic regression models to analyse data on 2711 women to examine factors associated with having pelvic examination among women aged ≥18 years. Among those who had pelvic examination, we applied binary logistic regression models to analyse factors associated with receiving Pap smear test as a subgroup analysis.

Results: Of the 2711 women aged 18 years or older surveyed, 225 (8.3%) had ever had a pelvic examination and only 66 (2.4%) of them reported ever having done a Pap smear test. For those who had pelvic examination, only 26.94% had Pap smear test. Ethnic group, marital status, father’s educational level and difficulty with self-care were independently associated with undergoing pelvic examination. Only age and healthcare involvement were independently associated with pelvic examination within the past 5 years to the survey. Marital status, satisfaction with healthcare and healthcare involvement were independently associated with Pap smear test.

Conclusion: Even though cervical cancer is preventable through early detection of precancerous lesions using Pap smear test, the patronage of this screening test is still very low in Ghana. Factors influencing the low patronage in Ghana include the marital status of women, their level of satisfaction with healthcare as well as their level of involvement with healthcare. These may be the consequences of a weak health system and the lack of a national policy on cervical cancer screening.
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Background
Cervical cancer is the third most common cancer that affects women worldwide and kills nearly 300,000 women annually [28]. The disease disproportionately affects poor people with at least 80% of cervical cancer deaths occurring in developing countries [19]. While cervical cancer is gradually becoming a rare disease in many developed countries, the same cannot be said of its occurrence in developing countries [11, 25]. It has been and remains the leading cause of cancer death among women in Ghana [29, 30].

Cervical cancer is however, one of the preventable human cancers; its prevention is based on the early diagnosis and treatment of precancerous lesions [8]. The screening test involves a pelvic examination during which a smear of cervical cells is taken for the Papanicolaou test (Pap smear test). Visual inspection with acetic acid (VIA) could also be done during the pelvic examination. Anecdotal evidence from gynaecological clinics in Ghana indicates that most patients present with a late stage of the disease in spite of the fact that it is preventable. The major reason for the late presentation is the absence or very low coverage for cervical cancer screening in several African countries, [7, 13], including Ghana. Several reasons have been proffered for the low coverage of cervical cancer screening services in less developed countries. These include; the ignorance about the disease and its screening practices as well as perceptions and attitudes based on cultural and religious beliefs [9, 22]. The poor health infrastructure and other competing health interests may be other reasons for this low coverage [5, 6, 14].

To the best of our knowledge, there is no published data on the uptake of cervical cancer screening using a nationally representative sample in Ghana. In this study therefore, we aimed at determining the uptake of cervical cancer screening (pelvic examination +/− Pap smear test) and the factors influencing this uptake.

Methods
We used data from the World Health Organization’s (WHO) study on global AGEleng and adult health in Ghana which is part of a nationwide representative and a multi-country longitudinal study conducted among six countries. The study collects data to augment available sources of ageing data for informed health policy and programmes. The World Health Organization and the University of Ghana Medical School through the Department of Community Health collaborated to implement the Wave 2 of the study between 2014 and 2015. The methods used in the survey is available elsewhere [12].

Study population
The study comprised of participants aged ≥50 years and additional smaller sample of participants between the ages of 18–49 years old were interviewed. Some of the data collected include subjective wellbeing and quality of life, health care utilization and preventive health behaviours, risk factors and perceived health status, socio-demographic and work history, chronic health conditions and health services coverage among others. This study was based on all ages of women in the study. Additional details about the study can be found at the WHO website (http://www.who.int/healthinfo/sage/cohorts/en/).

Outcome variable
The WHO SAGE asked two specific questions: (1) ‘When was the last time you had a pelvic examination, if ever?’ (and provided a follow specific explanation as ‘By pelvic examination, I mean when a doctor or nurse examined your vagina and uterus?’) and (2) ‘The last time you had the pelvic examination, did you have a PAP smear test?’ (and provided a follow specific explanation as ‘By PAP smear test, I mean did a doctor or nurse use a swab or stick to wipe from inside your vagina, take a sample and send it to a laboratory?’). Thus, the main outcome variables in this study are (i) whether a woman ever received a pelvic examination (as a screening tool for cervical cancer) and (ii) whether a woman ever had a pap smear test. These are self-reports based on the questions, “When was the last time you had a pelvic examination, if ever?” and “The last time you had the pelvic examination, did you have a PAP smear test?” The responses were then categorized as Never (coded as 0) or ever had pelvic examination (coded as 1), and No (coded as 0) and Yes (coded as 1) for pap smear test. A secondary outcome of interest is whether a woman had pelvic examination within the last 5 years or not. Women who had pelvic examination within the last 5 years were categorized as Yes (coded as 1) and those who had it more than 5 years ago were categorized as No (coded as 0).

Explanatory variables
The study considered factors such as age, ethnicity, marital status, father’s education, religion, health state report, healthcare involvement and difficulty with self-care. The literature on factors influencing health outcomes and healthcare seeking behaviours, especially in developing countries informed the inclusion of these variables [1, 10, 17, 21, 23].

Statistical analysis
Binary logistic regression analyses were employed to identify factors associated with pelvic examination and Pap smear test. Analysis was conducted on 2711 study participants with complete measurements on pelvic examination status and potential risk factors considered in the study. A further subgroup analysis was conducted on those who ever had pelvic examination only. The group was categorised
into those who had the examination within ≤5 years and those who had it > 5 years ago. Finally, a binary logistic regression model was applied on 242 individuals with complete measurements on Pap smear test while adjusting for potential risk factors.

We applied the Hosmer-Lemeshow [18] test to establish the fits of the multivariable models. To examine multicollinearity, the variance inflation factor (VIF) was applied. VIF value < 10 was considered acceptable [16]. STATA Version 14 [26] was used for data analyses. A p-value < 0.20 on a bivariate logistic regression was used to select candidate set of covariates for multivariable logistic regression. We declare statistical significance at P-value < 0.05.

Ethical requirements
The SAGE survey was approved by the World Health Organization’s Ethical Review Board (reference number RPC149) and the University of Ghana College of Health Sciences, Ethical and Protocol Review Committee. Written informed consent was obtained from all study respondents.

Results
A total of 225 of the women ever had pelvic examination out of which 66 of them had Pap smear test. Seventy-four (74) of those in the age group 50–59 ever had pelvic examination and 14 of those aged 50–59 and 60–69 ever had Pap smear test while 95 of those who were currently married ever had pelvic examination and 22 of them had Pap smear test. Among women who rated their health state today as good/very good, 159 of them ever had pelvic examination while 42 of them had Pap smear test. For women who rated themselves as having no difficulty with self-care, 200 of them ever had pelvic examination while 55 of them had Pap smear test (Table 1).

Factors associated with pelvic examination
Factors associated with having pelvic examination in the univariable binary logistic regression include age, ethnic group, marital status, father’s educational level, and difficulty with self-care. In the multivariable binary logistic regression model, ethnic group, marital status, father’s educational level and difficulty with self-care were independently associated with undergoing pelvic examination. Those from the Ewe ethnic group had increased odds (OR = 1.91, 95% CI: 1.34, 2.72) of undergoing pelvic examination compared to women who had fathers with no formal education. Those who rated their difficulty with self-care as mild had decreased odds (OR = 0.57, 95% CI: 0.34, 0.97) of undergoing pelvic examination compared to those who rated themselves as having no such difficulty (Table 2).

Factors associated with Pap smear test
Factors associated with Pap smear test in the univariable binary logistic regression include age, marital status and healthcare involvement. In the multivariable binary logistic regression model, marital status, satisfaction with healthcare and healthcare involvement were independently associated with Pap smear test. Those who are currently married (OR = 0.12, 95% CI: 0.02, 0.89) and widowed (OR = 0.07, 95% CI: 0.01, 0.62) had reduced odds of receiving Pap smear test compared to those who are never married. Women who rated their satisfaction with health care as dissatisfied/very dissatisfied had higher odds (OR = 16.75, 95% CI: 2.85, 98.33) of receiving Pap smear test compared to those who rated their satisfaction with health care as satisfied/very satisfied. Those who rated their health care involvement as moderate (OR = 0.2, 95% CI: 0.07, 0.58) and bad/very bad (OR = 0.09, 95% CI: 0.04, 0.21) had decreased odds of receiving Pap smear test compared to the women who rated themselves as good/very good (Table 3).

Discussion
In this analysis, 8.3% of women in Ghana have ever had a pelvic examination compared to the 12% prevalence in wave 1 of the same survey. The study further revealed that only 2.4% of women in Ghana have ever had a Pap smear compared to a prevalence of 3.1% in wave 1. It is possible that some of the women who had pelvic examination done could have been screened for cervical cancer using the visual inspection of the cervix
with acetic acid (VIA) in which case the proportion of women screened for cervical cancer will have been greater than 2.4%. The WHO SAGE study, however, did not inquire about VIA. Most women will have a pelvic examination done for other gynaecological reasons other than screening for cervical cancer. This explains the nearly three-fold difference in the proportion of those who had a pelvic examination and those who had a Pap smear test done. The low patronage for cervical cancer screening using Pap smear has been reported in previous publications in Ghana [2–4, 15]. This low patronage for cervical cancer screening is not peculiar to Ghana but has been reported in other developing countries [8, 20, 24]. In India, the country with the largest burden of cervical cancer worldwide, patronage was only 11.6% among nurses (health workers who are expected to know and have the right attitude towards screening for cervical cancer) [27]. This is in sharp contrast to what pertains in developed countries like the United States where over 80% of women sampled had had a Pap smear test in the preceding 3 years (www.progressreport.cancer.gov/detection/cervical_cancer).

Some of the reasons attributed to the low patronage in those studies included the lack of a national cervical cancer screening programme, the effect of education [4] and the lack of financial resources [8]. The rate in health care involvement as well as level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with health care can both be causes as well as consequences of having had a pelvic examination (and by extension Pap smear test) and these should not be overlooked in finding answers to the low patronage being reported.

There is still no national policy or programme regarding cervical cancer screening in Ghana and that could be contributing to the persisting low patronage of cervical cancer screening in Ghana.

In this analysis, however, factors that were found to be associated with patronage of Pap smear were; marital status, level of satisfaction with healthcare and level of involvement with healthcare. Marital status was found to be a predictor for having a Pap smear test. Women who

| Age of respondent (years) | Pelvic examination status | Had pap smear test |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
|                           | Never                     | Less than a year or more | No | Yes |
| 18–29                     | 190                       | 13                  | 8   | 10  |
| 30–39                     | 185                       | 30                  | 24  | 10  |
| 40–49                     | 215                       | 31                  | 25  | 7   |
| 50–59                     | 745                       | 74                  | 63  | 14  |
| 60–69                     | 551                       | 47                  | 36  | 14  |
| 70 or more                | 607                       | 30                  | 23  | 11  |

Marital status

- Never married
- Currently married
- Cohabiting
- Separated/divorced
- Widowed

| Father’s education | Pelvic examination status | Had pap smear test |
|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| No formal education | 1843                     | 143                | 120 | 38  |
| Primary or less    | 306                       | 20                 | 17  | 5   |
| Secondary or higher| 344                       | 62                 | 42  | 23  |

Ethnic group

- Akan
- Ewe
- Ga-Adangbe
- Guan
- Northern dialect

| Religion | Pelvic examination status | Had pap smear test |
|----------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| No religion | 58                        | 1                  |
| Christianity | 1930                     | 184                |
| Islam     | 407                       | 36                 |
| African traditional | 84                     | 3                  |
| Others a  | 14                        | 1                  |

Health state today

- Good/very good
- Moderate
- Bad/very bad

| Satisfaction with health care | Pelvic examination status | Had pap smear test |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Satisfied/very satisfied      | 158                       | 53                 |
| Indifferent                   | 16                        | 9                  |
| Dissatisfied/very dissatisfied| 3                         | 4                  |

Rate health care involvement

- Good/very good
- Moderate
- Bad/very bad

| Difficulty with self-care | Pelvic examination status | Had pap smear test |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| None                      | 1964                      | 200                | 164 | 55  |
| Mild                      | 378                       | 17                 | 11  | 7   |
| Moderate                  | 114                       | 6                  | 3   | 3   |
| Severe/extreme            | 36                        | 1                  | 0   | 1   |

Table 1 Background characteristics of women by pelvic examination and pap smear test status (Continued)

| Characteristics         | Pelvic examination status | Had pap smear test |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Difficulty with self-care |                           |                    |
| aBuddhism, Chinese traditional religion, Hinduism. |
were currently married ($p = 0.04$) and those who had lost their spouses ($p = 0.02$) were found to be less likely to undergo screening for cervical cancer. People in stable marital relationships or those who have lost their spouses may not consider themselves to be at risk of cervical cancer since they are less likely to have multiple sexual partners or be sexually active, all of which increase one’s risk of acquiring cervical cancer.

### Table 2 Factors associated with pelvic examination status from binary logistic regression ($n = 2711$)

| Characteristics                  | Unadjusted model |                | Adjusted model |                |
|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                  | UOR (95% CI)     | $P$-value      | AOR (95% CI)   | $P$-value      |
| **Age of respondent (years)**    |                  |                |                |                |
| 18–29                            | ref              |                | ref            |                |
| 30–39                            | 2.37 (1.2, 4.69) | 0.013          | 1.79 (0.85, 3.77) | 0.122          |
| 40–49                            | 2.11 (1.07, 4.14) | 0.031          | 1.35 (0.63, 2.87) | 0.441          |
| 50–59                            | 1.45 (0.79, 2.67) | 0.231          | 0.98 (0.48, 1.98) | 0.95           |
| 60–69                            | 1.25 (0.66, 2.35) | 0.497          | 0.75 (0.35, 1.59) | 0.455          |
| 70 or more                       | 0.72 (0.37, 1.41) | 0.342          | 0.46 (0.21, 1.04) | 0.064          |
| **Ethnic group**                 |                  |                |                |                |
| Akan                             | ref              |                | ref            |                |
| Ewe                              | 2.59 (1.68, 4)   | < 0.001        | 2.65 (1.68, 4.17) | < 0.001        |
| Ga-Adangbe                       | 0.82 (0.52, 1.29) | 0.38          | 0.88 (0.55, 1.4) | 0.598          |
| Guan                             | 1.97 (1.08, 3.58) | 0.027         | 2.18 (1.15, 4.13) | 0.017          |
| Northern dialect                 | 0.74 (0.51, 1.07) | 0.11          | 0.87 (0.59, 1.28) | 0.468          |
| **Marital status**               |                  |                |                |                |
| Never married                    | ref              |                | ref            |                |
| Currently married                | 1.68 (0.88, 3.19) | 0.113         | 2.22 (1.07, 4.6) | 0.031          |
| Cohabitating                     | 1.96 (0.59, 6.46) | 0.27         | 1.7 (0.49, 5.92) | 0.405          |
| Separated/divorced               | 2.53 (1.28, 5.02) | 0.008         | 3.57 (1.64, 7.75) | 0.001          |
| Widowed                          | 1.63 (0.85, 3.14) | 0.14         | 3.43 (1.58, 7.43) | 0.002          |
| **Father’s educational level**   |                  |                |                |                |
| No formal education              | ref              |                | ref            |                |
| Primary or less                  | 0.84 (0.52, 1.37) | 0.487         | 0.72 (0.43, 1.19) | 0.195          |
| Secondary or higher              | 2.32 (1.69, 3.2)  | < 0.001       | 1.91 (1.34, 2.72) | < 0.001        |
| **Religion**                     |                  |                |                |                |
| No religion                      | ref              |                | ref            |                |
| Christian                        | 5.53 (0.76, 40.15) | 0.091       |                |                |
| Islam                            | 5.13 (0.69, 38.13) | 0.11         |                |                |
| African traditional              | 2.07 (0.21, 20.41) | 0.533       |                |                |
| Others$^a$                       | 4.14 (0.24, 70.38) | 0.325       |                |                |
| **Rate your health today**       |                  |                |                |                |
| Good/very good                   | ref              |                | ref            |                |
| Moderate                         | 0.84 (0.61, 1.16) | 0.285       | 1.01 (0.71, 1.44) | 0.947          |
| Bad/very bad                     | 0.61 (0.34, 1.09) | 0.095       | 0.84 (0.45, 1.59) | 0.599          |
| **Difficulty with self-care**    |                  |                |                |                |
| None                             | ref              |                | ref            |                |
| Mild                             | 0.44 (0.27, 0.73) | 0.002       | 0.57 (0.34, 0.97) | 0.037          |
| Moderate                         | 0.52 (0.22, 1.19) | 0.121       | 0.71 (0.3, 1.7) | 0.441          |
| Severe/extreme                   | 0.27 (0.04, 2)    | 0.201       | 0.36 (0.05, 2.8) | 0.328          |

UOR Unadjusted odds ratio, AOR Adjusted odds ratio, CI Confidence interval, ref. Reference category, $^a$(e.g. Buddhism, Chinese traditional religion, Hinduism).
Surprisingly, women who were dissatisfied with the healthcare they received upon previous contact with the health care delivery system were found to have significantly higher odds of undergoing Pap smear compared to those who were satisfied with the health care they received. Being dissatisfied with healthcare service received could make an individual seek a second or even a third opinion and be willing to be subjected to varied screening/diagnostic tests. This may be a possible reason for their increased odds.

Not being very concerned about one’s healthcare (those who rated their involvement in healthcare as moderate or bad) was found to significantly decrease the odds ($p < 0.001$) of undergoing a Pap smear test. This observation came as no surprise as people who are very concerned about their health and healthcare will stop at nothing (including screening for cervical cancer, among others) to convince themselves of their health status at any point in time.

**Conclusion**

Even though cervical cancer is preventable through early detection of precancerous lesions using Pap smear test, the patronage of this screening test is still very low in Ghana. Factors influencing the low patronage in Ghana include the lack of a national policy on cervical cancer screening, the marital status of women, their level of involvement, and their perceptions of their health status today.

### Table 3
Factors associated with pelvic examination within the past 5 years to the survey from binary logistic regression (n = 224)

| Characteristics          | Unadjusted model |              | Adjusted model |              |
|--------------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
|                          | UOR (95% CI)     | $P$-value    | AOR (95% CI)   | $P$-value    |
| **Age of respondent (years)** |                  |              |                |              |
| 18–29                    | ref              |              | ref            |              |
| 30–39                    | 1.18 (0.19, 7.43) | 0.859        | 2.46 (0.28, 21.74) | 0.417        |
| 40–49                    | 0.13 (0.02, 0.7)  | 0.017        | 0.22 (0.03, 1.96) | 0.176        |
| 50–59                    | 0.02 (0, 0.1)    | < 0.001      | 0.03 (0, 0.25)  | 0.001        |
| 60–69                    | 0.02 (0, 0.1)    | < 0.001      | 0.03 (0, 0.33)  | 0.004        |
| 70 or more               | 0.03 (0, 0.18)   | < 0.001      | 0.08 (0.01, 0.89) | 0.04        |
| **Ethnic group**         |                  |              |                |              |
| Akan                     | ref              |              | ref            |              |
| Ewe                      | 1.12 (0.45, 2.79) | 0.807        |                |              |
| Ga-Adangbe               | 1.93 (0.76, 4.91) | 0.166        |                |              |
| Guan                     | 1.29 (0.37, 4.44) | 0.688        |                |              |
| Northern dialect         | 2.19 (1.03, 4.65) | 0.041*       |                |              |
| **Marital status**       |                  |              |                |              |
| Never married            | ref              |              | ref            |              |
| Currently married        | 0.14 (0.03, 0.66) | 0.014        | 1.25 (0.11, 14.16) | 0.856        |
| Cohabiting               | 0.67 (0.04, 10.25) | 0.771        | 0.37 (0.02, 8.85) | 0.543        |
| Separated/divorced       | 0.06 (0.01, 0.32) | 0.001        | 0.57 (0.04, 7.45) | 0.67         |
| Widowed                  | 0.03 (0.01, 0.15) | < 0.001      | 0.36 (0.03, 4.77) | 0.438        |
| **Father’s educational level** |              |              |                |              |
| No formal education      | ref              |              | ref            |              |
| Primary or less          | 2.62 (1, 6.86)   | 0.049        | 1.37 (0.36, 5.29) | 0.644        |
| Secondary or higher      | 1.76 (0.92, 3.37) | 0.086        | 1.35 (0.51, 3.56) | 0.54         |
| **Rate your health today** |              |              |                |              |
| Good/very good           | ref              |              | ref            |              |
| Moderate                 | 0.41 (0.19, 0.9) | 0.026        | 1.03 (0.36, 2.95) | 0.955        |
| Bad/very bad             | 0.6 (0.16, 2.27) | 0.452        | 0.93 (0.12, 7.32) | 0.943        |
| **Rate health care involvement** |              |              |                |              |
| Good/very good           | ref              |              | ref            |              |
| Moderate                 | 0.47 (0.2, 1.14) | 0.096        | 0.57 (0.17, 1.92) | 0.361        |
| Bad/very bad             | 0.39 (0.2, 0.73) | 0.004        | 0.32 (0.12, 0.84) | 0.021        |

UOR Unadjusted odds ratio, AOR Adjusted odds ratio, CI Confidence interval, ref. Reference category.
Table 4 Factors associated with pap smear test status from binary logistic regression (n = 242)

| Characteristics                        | Unadjusted model |          |          | Adjusted model |          |          |
|----------------------------------------|------------------|----------|----------|----------------|----------|----------|
|                                        | UOR (95% CI)     | P-value  | AOR (95% CI) | P-value       | AOR (95% CI) | P-value  |
| Age of respondent (years)              |                  |          |          |                |          |          |
| 18–29 ref                              |                  |          |          |                |          |          |
| 30–39                                  | 0.33 (0.1, 1.09) | 0.07     | 0.56 (0.11, 3.01) | 0.5       |
| 40–49                                  | 0.22 (0.06, 0.78) | 0.019    | 0.64 (0.11, 3.91) | 0.63      |
| 50–59                                  | 0.18 (0.06, 0.53) | 0.002    | 0.45 (0.09, 2.35) | 0.35      |
| 60–69                                  | 0.31 (0.1, 0.95) | 0.04     | 0.88 (0.16, 5.03) | 0.89      |
| 70 or more                             | 0.38 (0.12, 1.24) | 0.109    | 1.48 (0.22, 9.95) | 0.69      |
| Ethnic group                           |                  |          |          |                |          |          |
| Akan ref                               |                  |          |          |                |          |          |
| Ewe                                    | 0.68 (0.27, 1.7) | 0.405    |          |                |          |          |
| Ga-Adangbe                             | 0.6 (0.23, 1.6)  | 0.311    |          |                |          |          |
| Guan                                   | 0.36 (0.08, 1.66) | 0.188    |          |                |          |          |
| Northern dialect                       | 0.97 (0.46, 2.06) | 0.939    |          |                |          |          |
| Marital status                         |                  |          |          |                |          |          |
| Never married                          | ref              |          |          | ref            |          |          |
| Currently married                      | 0.05 (0.01, 0.26) | < 0.001  | 0.12 (0.02, 0.89) | 0.04      |
| Cohabiting                             | 0.13 (0.01, 1.39) | 0.092    | 0.31 (0.02, 5.09) | 0.41      |
| Separated/divorced                     | 0.1 (0.02, 0.52)  | 0.006    | 0.17 (0.02, 1.41) | 0.1       |
| Widowed                                | 0.05 (0.01, 0.27) | < 0.001  | 0.07 (0.01, 0.62) | 0.02      |
| Father’s educational level             |                  |          |          |                |          |          |
| No formal education                    | ref              |          |          | ref            |          |          |
| Primary or less                        | 0.93 (0.32, 2.69) | 0.892    | 0.4 (0.13, 1.28) | 0.12      |
| Secondary or higher                    | 1.73 (0.92, 3.23) | 0.086    | 1.18 (0.51, 2.7) | 0.7       |
| Rate your health today                 |                  |          |          |                |          |          |
| Good/very good                         | ref              |          |          | ref            |          |          |
| Moderate                               | 1.56 (0.81, 2.99) | 0.181    |          |                |          |          |
| Bad/very bad                           | 1.56 (0.5, 4.82)  | 0.44     |          |                |          |          |
| Satisfaction with health care          |                  |          |          |                |          |          |
| Satisfied/very satisfied               | ref              |          |          | ref            |          |          |
| Indifferent                            | 1.68 (0.7, 4.02)  | 0.246    | 2.91 (0.91, 9.33) | 0.07      |
| Dissatisfied/very dissatisfied         | 3.97 (0.86, 18.34) | 0.077    | 16.75 (2.85, 98.33) | < 0.001  |
| Rate health care involvement           |                  |          |          |                |          |          |
| Good/very good                         | ref              |          |          | ref            |          |          |
| Moderate                               | 0.32 (0.14, 0.76) | 0.01     | 0.2 (0.07, 0.58) | < 0.001  |
| Bad/very bad                           | 0.12 (0.06, 0.25) | < 0.001  | 0.09 (0.04, 0.21) | < 0.001  |
| Difficulty with self-care              |                  |          |          |                |          |          |
| None                                   | ref              |          |          |                |          |          |
| Mild                                   | 1.9 (0.7, 5.14)  | 0.207    |          |                |          |          |
| Moderate                               | 2.98 (0.58, 15.21) | 0.189    |          |                |          |          |

UOR Unadjusted odds ratio, AOR Adjusted odds ratio, CI Confidence interval, ref Reference category.

satisfaction with healthcare as well as their level of involvement with healthcare. Developing and implementing a clear national policy on cervical cancer screening coupled with a structured national health educational intervention programme by the Ministry of Health/Ghana Health Service is worth considering. This could,
improve knowledge and reduce the missed opportunities associated with cervical cancer screening in Ghana. Secondly, an improvement in the overall healthcare delivery system will encourage more women to patronize these services as more of them are likely to be satisfied with improved services. Women should also be empowered and encouraged to take responsibility for their health in general and cervical cancer screening in particular.

Abbreviations
SAGE: Study on AGing and adult health; VA: Visual inspection with acetic acid; VIF: Variance inflation factor; WHO: World Health Organization

Acknowledgements
We are grateful to all respondents and interviewers who made the SAGE survey in Ghana possible. The University of Ghana’s Department of Community Health contributed training facilities, data entry support, and storage of materials. The Ministry of Health, Ghana, is supportive of SAGE. The Ghana Statistical Service provided the sampling information for the sampling frame and updates.

Authors’ contributions
BNLC-T and JMKA developed the concept. JMKA analyzed the data. JMKA and BNLC-T wrote the first draft manuscript. JMKA, BNLC-T, GM, RB and AEY contributed to the writing and reviewing of the various sections of the manuscript. All the Authors reviewed the final version of the manuscript before submission. The authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding
Authors received no specific funding for this work. However, the main survey received financial support from the US National Institute on Aging through Interagency Agreements (OGHA 04034785; YA1323-08-CN-0020; Y1-AG-1005-01) with the World Health Organization and a Research Project Grant (R01 AG034479-64401A1). WHO contributed financial and human resources to SAGE. The funding body did not play any role in the design of the study, collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Availability of data and materials
Data and materials freely available upon making official request to WHO-SAGE Team through the WHO website at http://www.who.int/healthinfo/sage/cohorts/en/.

Ethics approval and consent to participate
SAGE was approved by the World Health Organization’s Ethical Review Board (reference number RPC149) and the Ethical and Protocol Review Committee, College of Health Sciences, University of Ghana, Accra, Ghana. Written informed consent was obtained from all study respondents.

Consent for publication
Not applicable.

Competing interests
The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author details
1Department of Community Health, School of Public Health, College of Health Sciences, University of Ghana, Accra, Ghana. 2Department of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, College of Health Sciences, University of Ghana, Accra, Ghana.

Received: 30 April 2019 Accepted: 28 February 2020
Published online: 05 March 2020

References
1. Abebe S, Sene A, Tibelt A. Factors associated with breast cancer screening awareness and practices of women in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. BMC Womens Health. 2019;19(1):4.
2. Adanu RM. Cervical cancer knowledge and screening in Accra, Ghana. J Womens Health Gend Based Med. 2002;11(6):487–8.
3. Adanu RM, Hill AG, Seffah JD, Darko R, Anarfi JK, Duda RB. Secular trends in menopausal age among Ghanaian women in Accra. J Obstet Gynaecol. 2006;26(6):550–4.
4. Adanu RMR, Seffah JD, Duda R, Darko R, Hill A, Anarfi J. Clinics and cervical cancer screening in Accra. Ghana Med J. 2010;44(2):59–63.
5. Agurto J, et al. Perceived barriers and benefits to cervical cancer screening in Latin America. Prev Med. 2004;39(1):91–98.
6. Anaman-Torgbor JA, King J, Correa-Velez I. Barriers and facilitators of cervical cancer screening practices among African immigrant women living in Brisbane. Australia. 2017. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2017.09.005.
7. Anorlu RI. Cervical cancer: the sub-Saharan African perspective. Reprod Health Matters. 2008;16(32):41–49.
8. Assoumou SZ, Mabika BM, Mbiguino AN, Moulalif M, Khartabi A, Ennaji MM. Awareness and knowledge regarding of cervical cancer, pap smear screening and human papillomavirus infection in Gabonese women. BMC Womens Health. 2015;15:37. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-015-0193-2.
9. Birhanu Z, et al. Health seeking behavior for cervical cancer in Ethiopia: a qualitative study. Int J Equity Health. 2012;11:83.
10. Boume PA, Charles CAD, Francis CG, South-Boume N, Peters R. Perception, attitude and practices of women towards pelvic examination and pap smear in Jamaica. N Am J Med Sci. 2012;2010(10):478–86.
11. Bruni L, et al. ICO information Centre on HPV and cancer (HPV information Centre). Human papillomavirus and related diseases in the world. In: Summary report 2015-03-24. ICO HPV information Centre, Instituto Catala d’Oncologia, 2015.
12. Chrifton K, Ware LJ, Menyanu E, Brittwum RB, Naado N, Pieterse C, et al. Leveraging ongoing research to evaluate the health impacts of South Africa’s salt reduction strategy: a prospective nested cohort within the WHO-SAGE multicountry, longitudinal study. BMJ Open. 2016;6(11):e013316.
13. de Sanjose S, et al. Human papillomavirus (HPV) and related cancers in the global alliance for vaccines and immunization (GAVI) countries. In: A WHO/ICO HPV information Centre report, in vaccine, vol. 2012: WHO/ICO; 2012.
14. Denny L, Quinn M, Sankaranarayanan R. Chapter 8: screening for cervical cancer in developing countries. Vaccine. 2006;24:53:71–7.
15. Duda RB, Kim WP, Darko R, Adanu RM, Seffah J, Anarfi JK, et al. Results of the Women’s health study of Accra: assessment of blood pressure in urban women. Int J Cardiol. 2007 Apr 12;117(1):115–22.
16. Fär JF, Anderson RE, Tatham RL, Black WC. Multivariate data analysis. 3rd edn. New York: Macmillan; 1995.
17. Hayek S, Enav T, Shohat T, Keinan-Boker L. Factors associated with breast cancer screening in a country with National Health Insurance: did we succeed in reducing healthcare disparities? J Women’s Health (Larchmt). 2017;26(2):159–68.
18. Hosmer DW, Lemeshow S. Goodness-of-fit tests for the multivariate logistic regression model. Comm Stat A. 1980;9:1043–69.
19. IARC. Cancer screening and early diagnosis. Publication. 2015 Retrieved 14th August, 2017, from International Agency for Cancer Research and WHO. http://www.iarc.fr/en/publications/books/iarc50/IARC_CH4.2.6_web.pdf.
20. Kangmennaang J, Thogarapalli N, Mkandawire P, Luginaah I. Investigating the disparities in cervical cancer screening among Namibian women. Gynecol Oncol. 2015;138:411–6.
21. Lee K, Lim HT, Park SM. Factors associated with use of breast cancer screening services by women aged 20-40 years in Korea: the third Korea National Health and nutrition examination survey 2005 (KNHANES III). BMC Cancer. 2010;10(1):144.
22. Lorena EN, Atieli HE, Oranyo RO, et al. Determinants of cervical screening services uptake among 18–49 year old women seeking services at the Jaramogi Oginga Odinga Teaching and Referral Hospital, Kisumu, Kenya. BMC Health Serv Res. 2014;14:335. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-14-335.
23. Orji CC, Kanu CN, Adelodun AI, Brown CM. Factors associated with breast cancer screening among African American women. Value Health. 2018;21:5136.
24. Rostch AF, Gaturuga A, Choi RY, Guthrie BL, Mackelprang RD, et al. Knowledge and acceptability of pap smear, self-sampling and HPV vaccination among adult women in Kenya. PLoS One. 2012;7(7):e40766. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0040766.
25. Sankaranarayanan R, et al. HPV screening for cervical cancer in rural India. N Engl J Med. 2009;360(14):1385e1394.
26. StaCorp. StaCorp statistical software: release 14. College Station: StaCorp LP; 2015.
27. Thippeveeranna C, Mohan SS, Singh LR, Singh NN. Knowledge, attitude and practice of the pap smear as a screening procedure among nurses in a tertiary Hospital in North Eastern India. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2013;14:849–52.
28. WHO. Fact sheet on cancer. Geneva: WHO; 2015. Document Number.
29. Williams M, Kuffour G, Ekuadzi E, Yeboah M, EliDuah M, Tuffour P. Assessment of psychological barriers to cervical cancer screening among women in Kumasi, Ghana using a mixed methods approach. Afr Health Sci. 2013;13(4):1054–61.
30. Wiredu E, Armah H. Cancer mortality patterns in Ghana; a 10-year review of autopsies and hospital mortality. BMC Public Health. 2006;6(159):159.

Publisher’s Note
Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.