

References

1. WHO Regional Office for Africa (2008). Guide for documenting and sharing "best practices" in health programmes. Available from: https://www.afro.who.int/sites/default/files/2017-06/Guide_for_documenting_and_Sharing_Best_Practice_-_english_0.pdf.
2. Zhang L, Carvalho AL, Mosquera I, Wen T, Lucas E, Sauvaget C, et al. (2022). An international consensus on the essential and desirable criteria for an 'organized' cancer screening programme. *BMC Med.* 20(1):101. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-022-02291-7> PMID:35317783
3. Government of Western Australia (2020). Clinical audit policy. Available from: <https://www.wacountry.health.wa.gov.au/~media/WACHS/Documents/About-us/Policies/Clinical-Audit-Policy.pdf?thn=0#:~:text=Australian%20Commission%20on%20Safety%20and,taking%20action%20to%20bring%20practice>.
4. Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership (2020). Best practice in clinical audit. Available from: <https://www.hqip.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/FINAL-Best-Practice-in-Clinical-Audit-2020.pdf>.
5. Limb C, Fowler A, Gundogan B, Koshy K, Agha R (2017). How to conduct a clinical audit and quality improvement project. *Int J Surg Oncol (N Y)*. 2(6):e24. <https://doi.org/10.1097/IJ9.000000000000024> PMID:29177218
6. National Institute for Clinical Excellence (2002). Principles for best practice in clinical audit. Oxford, UK: Radcliffe Medical Press. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/media/default/About/what-we-do/Into-practice/principles-for-best-practice-in-clinical-audit.pdf>.
7. World Health Organization (2022). Audit. Available from: <https://www.who.int/about/accountability/audit>.
8. Wang J, Elfström KM, Andrae B, Nordqvist Kleppe S, Ploner A, Lei J, et al. (2020). Cervical cancer case-control audit: results from routine evaluation of a nationwide cervical screening program. *Int J Cancer.* 146(5):1230–40. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.32416> PMID:31107987
9. Wright CC, Whittington D (1992). Quality assurance: an introduction for health care professionals. Edinburgh, UK: Churchill Livingstone.
10. Esposito P, Dal Canton A (2014). Clinical audit, a valuable tool to improve quality of care: general methodology and applications in nephrology. *World J Nephrol.* 3(4):249–55. <https://doi.org/10.5527/wjn.v3.i4.249> PMID:25374819
11. Benjamin A (2008). Audit: how to do it in practice. *BMJ.* 336(7655):1241–5. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39527.628322.AD> PMID:18511799
12. University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust (2017). A brief introduction to the clinical audit cycle. Available from: https://www.uhbristol.nhs.uk/media/2978735/2_introduction_to_the_clinical_audit_cycle_v4.pdf.
13. Sasieni P, Cuzick J (2001). Routine audit is an ethical requirement of screening. *BMJ.* 322(7295):1179. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.322.7295.1179> PMID:11379578
14. Andrae B, Kemetti L, Sparén P, Silfverdal L, Strander B, Ryd W, et al. (2008). Screening-preventable cervical cancer risks: evidence from a nationwide audit in Sweden. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 100(9):622–9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djn099> PMID:18445828
15. Public Health England (2019). Cervical screening: invasive cervical cancer audit 2013 to 2016: audit report. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cervical-screening-invasive-cervical-cancer-audit-2013-to-2016/audit-report>.
16. Public Health England (2019). Cervical screening: invasive cervical cancer audit 2013 to 2016: audit methods. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cervical-screening-invasive-cervical-cancer-audit-2013-to-2016/audit-methods>.
17. Siddegowda RB, Divya Rani MN, Nataraajan M, Biligi DS (2016). Inter-observer variation in reporting of Pap smears. *Natl J Lab Med.* 5(3):PO22–25. Available from: [https://njlmm.net/articles/PDF/2135/20002_F\(P\)_PF1\(VsuGH\)_PFA\(GH\)_PF2\(VsuGH\).pdf](https://njlmm.net/articles/PDF/2135/20002_F(P)_PF1(VsuGH)_PFA(GH)_PF2(VsuGH).pdf).
18. Spence AR, Goggin P, Franco EL (2007). Process of care failures in invasive cervical cancer: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prev Med.* 45(2–3):93–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2007.06.007> PMID:17651792
19. Ronco G, Dillner J, Elfström KM, Tunesi S, Snijders PJF, Arbyn M, et al.; International HPV Screening Working Group (2014). Efficacy of HPV-based screening for prevention of invasive cervical cancer: follow-up of four European randomised controlled trials. *Lancet.* 383(9916):524–32. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)62218-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62218-7) PMID:24192252
20. Bchtawi AK, Saritas S, Schledermann D, Christensen RP, Jochumsen KM (2019). Screening history and FIGO-stages among Danish women with cervical cancer in 2012–2014: a register-based study. *Sci Rep.* 9(1):1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-56833-w> PMID:30626917
21. Kirschnner B, Poll S, Rygaard C, Wählin A, Junge J (2011). Screening history in women with cervical cancer in a Danish population-based screening program. *Gynecol Oncol.* 120(1):68–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygyno.2010.09.021> PMID:21035171
22. Rygaard C (2016). The Danish quality database for cervical cancer screening. *Clin Epidemiol.* 8:655–60. <https://doi.org/10.2147/CLEP.S99509> PMID:27826216
23. Lönnberg S, Anttila A, Kotaniemi-Talonen L, Kujari H, Melkko J, Granroth G, et al. (2010). Low proportion of false-negative smears in the Finnish program for cervical cancer screening. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 19(2):381–7. <https://doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-09-1038> PMID:20142239
24. Bulk S, Rozendaal L, Zielinski GD, Berkhof J, Daalmeijer NC, Snijders PJ, et al. (2008). High-risk human papillomavirus is present in cytologically false-negative smears: an analysis of "normal" smears preceding CIN2/3. *J Clin Pathol.* 61(3):385–9. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jcp.2006.045948> PMID:17675539
25. Macios A, Didkowska J, Wojciechowska U, Komerska K, Glińska P, Kamiński MF, et al. (2021). Risk factors of cervical cancer after a negative cytological diagnosis in Polish cervical cancer screening programme. *Cancer Med.* 10(10):3449–60. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.3857> PMID:33934537
26. Komerska K, Macios A, Glińska P, Olszewski W, Didkowska J, Wojciechowska U, et al. (2021). Why are Polish women diagnosed with invasive cervical cancer after negative cytology in the organized screening programme – a pilot reevaluation of negative Pap smears preceding diagnoses of interval cancers. *Pol J Pathol.* 72(3):261–6. <https://doi.org/10.5114/pjp.2021.112832> PMID:35048639
27. Edvardsson H, Wang J, Andrae B, Sparén P, Strander B, Dillner J (2021). Nationwide rereview of normal cervical cytologies before high-grade cervical lesions or before invasive cervical cancer. *Acta Cytol.* 65(5):377–84. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000515912> PMID:34077926
28. Hider P, Dempster-Rivett K, Williman J, Dempster-Rivett M, Sadler L, McLeod M, et al. (2018). A review of cervical cancer occurrences in New Zealand 2008–2012. *N Z Med J.* 131(1472):53–63. PMID:29565936
29. Lönnberg S, Baasland I, Romundstad PR (2016). Audit of screening histories and effectiveness of screening (Abstract OC 14-06, EUROGIN 2016 International Multidisciplinary Congress). Available from: <https://secure.key4events.com/key4register/AbstractList.aspx?e=477&preview=1&aig=-1&ai=10299>.
30. Arbyn M, Anttila A, Jordan J, Ronco G, Schenck U, Segnan N, et al. (2010). European guidelines for quality assurance in cervical cancer screening – summary document. *Ann Oncol.* 21(3):448–58. <https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdp471> PMID:20176693

31. Jin AZ, Louange EC, Chow KY, Fock CW (2013). Evaluation of the national cervical cancer screening programme in Singapore. *Singapore Med J*. 54(2):96–101. <https://doi.org/10.11622/smedj.2013032> PMID:23462834
32. Malila N, Leinonen M, Kotaniemi-Talonen L, Laurila P, Tarkkanen J, Hakama M (2013). The HPV test has similar sensitivity but more overdiagnosis than the Pap test – a randomised health services study on cervical cancer screening in Finland. *Int J Cancer*. 132(9):2141–7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.27850> PMID:22987601
33. Rebolj M, van Ballegooijen M, van Kernenade F, Looman C, Boer R, Habbema JDF (2008). No increased risk for cervical cancer after a broader definition of a negative Pap smear. *Int J Cancer*. 123(11):2632–5. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.23803> PMID:18767046
34. Barratt A, Mannes P, Irwig L, Trevena L, Craig J, Rychetnik L (2002). Cancer screening. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 56(12):899–902. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.56.12.899> PMID:12461108
35. Hakama M, Pokhrel A, Malila N, Hakulinen T (2015). Sensitivity, effect and overdiagnosis in screening for cancers with detectable pre-invasive phase. *Int J Cancer*. 136(4):928–35. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.29053> PMID:24975995
36. Shieh Y, Eklund M, Sawaya GF, Black WC, Kramer BS, Esserman LJ (2016). Population-based screening for cancer: hope and hype. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol*. 13(9):550–65. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrclinonc.2016.50> PMID:27071351
37. Fitzpatrick P, Mooney T, Byrne H, Healy O, Russell N, O'Reilly S (2022). Interval cancer audit and disclosure in cervical screening programmes: an international survey. *J Med Screen*. 29(2):104–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09691413211062344> PMID:34894859
38. Hortlund M, Mühr LSA, Lagheden C, Hjerpe A, Dillner J (2021). Audit of laboratory sensitivity of human papillomavirus and cytology testing in a cervical screening program. *Int J Cancer*. 149(12):2083–90. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.33769> PMID:34418082
39. Májek O, Anttila A, Arbyn M, van Veen EB, Engesaeter B, Lönnberg S (2019). The legal framework for European cervical cancer screening programmes. *Eur J Public Health*. 29(2):345–50. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/cky200> PMID:30265313
40. Faden RR, Beauchamp TL (1986). *A history and theory of informed consent*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
41. World Medical Association (2013). World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *JAMA*. 310(20):2191–4. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2013.281053> PMID:24141714
42. Kirby MD (1983). Informed consent: what does it mean? *J Med Ethics*. 9(2):69–75. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.9.2.69> PMID:6876100
43. Ravlo M, Lieng M, Khan Bukholm IR, Haase Moen M, Vanky E (2020). Claims for compensation for women with cervical cancer in Norway: a retrospective, descriptive study of a 12-year period. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 99(11):1546–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aogs.13930> PMID:32491192
44. Morrissey v Health Service Executive, Quest Diagnostics Incorporated and Med-lab Pathology Limited (2020). Available from: <https://ie.vlex.com/vid/morrissey-v-health-service-842440192>.
45. Penney, Palmer and Cannon v East Kent Health Authority (2000). *LS Law Med* 41.
46. European Court of Human Rights (Fifth Section) Vasileva v. Bulgaria (Application no. 23796/10) (2016). Available from: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre#%7B%22itemid%22:%5B%22001-161413%22%5D%7D>.
47. Stoler MH, Schiffman M; Atypical Squamous Cells of Undetermined Significance-Low-grade Squamous Intraepithelial Lesion Triage Study (ALTS) Group (2001). Interobserver reproducibility of cervical cytologic and histologic interpretations: realistic estimates from the ASCUS-L SIL Triage Study. *JAMA*. 285(11):1500–5. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.285.11.1500> PMID:11255427
48. World Medical Association Declaration of Geneva. Adopted by the 2nd General Assembly of the World Medical Association, Geneva, Switzerland, September 1948 and most recently amended by the 68th WMA General Assembly, Chicago, United States, October 2017. Available from: <https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-geneva/>.
49. United Nations Article 12, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). Available from: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>.
50. United Nations Personal Data Protection and Privacy (2018). Available from: <https://unsceb.org/privacy-principles>.
51. WHO Regional Office for Europe (2021). The protection of personal data in health information systems – principles and processes for public health. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/341374>.
52. European Union (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation). Available from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj>.
53. European Data Protection Board (2020). Guidelines 05/2020 on consent under Regulation 2016/679. Available from: https://edpb.europa.eu/our-work-tools/our-documents/guidelines/guidelines-052020-consent-under-regulation-2016679_en.
54. National Office of Clinical Audit, Ireland (2019). GDPR guidance for clinical audit, version 2. Available from: https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/noca-uploads/general/NOCA_GDPR_Guidance_for_Clinical_Audit_version_2_Updated_June_2019.pdf.
55. European Data Protection Board (2022). Guidelines 01/2022 on data subject rights – Right of access. Available from: https://edpb.europa.eu/our-work-tools/our-documents/guidelines/guidelines-012022-data-subject-rights-right-access_en.
56. Fitzpatrick P, Mooney T, Byrne H, Healy O, Russell N, O'Reilly S (2022). Interval cancer audit and disclosure in cervical screening programmes: an international survey. *J Med Screen*. 29(2):104–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09691413211062344> PMID:34894859
57. Mullally U (2018). Ireland's cervical cancer scandal is nothing less than a national calamity. Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/may/03/ireland-cervical-cancer-scandal-vicky-phelan>.
58. Scally G (2022). Review of the implementation of recommendations of the scoping inquiry into the CervicalCheck Screening Programme (Implementation Review Report). Available from: <http://scallyreview.ie/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Review-of-the-Implementation-of-Recommendations-of-the-Scoping-Inquiry-into-the-CervicalCheck-Screening-Programme.pdf>.
59. Jansen EEL, Zielonke N, Gini A, Anttila A, Segnan N, Vokó Z, et al.; EU-TOPIA consortium (2020). Effect of organised cervical cancer screening on cervical cancer mortality in Europe: a systematic review. *Eur J Cancer*. 127:207–223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2019.12.013> PMID:31980322
60. World Health Organization (2020). A cervical cancer-free future: first-ever global commitment to eliminate a cancer. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news/item/17-11-2020-a-cervical-cancer-free-future-first-ever-global-commitment-to-eliminate-a-cancer>.
61. Bogale AL, Teklehaymanot T, Haidar Ali J, Kassie GM (2021). Knowledge, attitude and practice of cervical cancer screening among women infected with HIV in Africa: systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 16(4):e0249960. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249960> PMID:33831128
62. Shalihin MSE, Ramee NA, Azhar A, Zaki AAFM, Nor AM, Aris MAM (2021). Knowledge, attitude and practice of public on breast cancer screening: a systematic review. *Borneo J Med Sci*. 15(3):13–24. Available from: <https://jurnal.ums.edu.my/ojums/index.php/bjms/article/view/2839>.
63. Al-Musa HM, Awadalla NJ, Mahfouz AA (2019). Male partners' knowledge, attitudes, and perception of women's breast cancer in Abha, southwestern Saudi Arabia. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 16(17):3089. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16173089> PMID:31450695
64. Waller J, Osborne K, Wardle J (2015). Enthusiasm for cancer screening in Great Britain: a general population survey. *Br J Cancer*. 112(3):562–6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/bjc.2014.643> PMID:25535731

65. Schwartz LM, Woloshin S, Fowler FJ Jr, Welch HG (2004). Enthusiasm for cancer screening in the United States. *JAMA*. 291(1):71–8. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.291.1.71> PMID:14709578
66. Kalliala I, Athanasiou A, Veroniki AA, Salanti G, Efthimiou O, Raftis N, et al. (2020). Incidence and mortality from cervical cancer and other malignancies after treatment of cervical intraepithelial neoplasia: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature. *Ann Oncol*. 31(2):213–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2019.11.004> PMID:31959338
67. Chorley AJ, Marlow LAV, Forster AS, Had-drell JB, Waller J (2017). Experiences of cervical screening and barriers to participation in the context of an organised programme: a systematic review and thematic synthesis. *Psychooncology*. 26(2):161–72. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.4126> PMID:27072589
68. Basu P, Sarkar S, Mukherjee S, Ghoshal M, Mittal S, Biswas S, et al. (2006). Women's perceptions and social barriers determine compliance to cervical screening: results from a population based study in India. *Cancer Detect Prev*. 30(4):369–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cdp.2006.07.004> PMID:16963194
69. Hahn EE, Munoz-Plaza C, Altman DE, Hsu C, Cannizzaro NT, Ngo-Metzger Q, et al. (2021). De-implementation and substitution of clinical care processes: stakeholder perspectives on the transition to primary human papillomavirus (HPV) testing for cervical cancer screening. *Implement Sci Commun*. 2(1):108. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-021-00211-z> PMID:34556189
70. Cantor SB, Fahs MC, Mandelblatt JS, Myers ER, Sanders GD (2003). Decision science and cervical cancer. *Cancer*. 98(9 Suppl):2003–8. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.11680> PMID:14603536
71. Tishelman C, Lundgren EL, Skald A, Törnberg S, Larsson BW (2002). Quality of care from a patient perspective in population-based cervical cancer screening. *Acta Oncol*. 41(3):253–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02841860260088791> PMID:12195744
72. Betancourt JR, Carrillo JE, Green AR (1999). Hypertension in multicultural and minority populations: linking communication to compliance. *Curr Hypertens Rep*. 1(6):482–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03215777> PMID:10981110
73. Al-Khudairy L, Grove A, Ayorinde A, Ghosh I, Kudrna L, Tyldesley-Marshall N, et al. (2022). Working towards an international consensus on core standards for screening information: executive summary. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/screening-information-working-towards-an-international-consensus/working-towards-an-international-consensus-on-core-standards-for-screening-information-executive-summary>.
74. Evans WD, Blitstein J, Vallone D, Post S, Nielsen W (2015). Systematic review of health branding: growth of a promising practice. *Transl Behav Med*. 5(1):24–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13142-014-0272-1> PMID:25729450
75. Forbes LJ, Ramirez AJ; Expert group on Information about Breast Screening (2014). Offering informed choice about breast screening. *J Med Screen*. 21(4):194–200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969141314555350> PMID:25312639
76. Friederichs H, Birkenstein R, Becker JC, Marschall B, Weissenstein A (2020). Risk literacy assessment of general practitioners and medical students using the Berlin Numeracy Test. *BMC Fam Pract*. 21(1):143. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-020-01214-w> PMID:32664885
77. Fagerlin A, Zikmund-Fisher BJ, Ubel PA (2011). Helping patients decide: ten steps to better risk communication. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 103(19):1436–43. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djr318> PMID:21931068
78. Wegwarth O, Widschwendter M, Cibula D, Sundström K, Portuesi R, Lein I, et al.; FORE-CEE (4C) consortium (2018). What do European women know about their female cancer risks and cancer screening? A cross-sectional online intervention survey in five European countries. *BMJ Open*. 8(12):e023789. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-023789> PMID:30593552
79. Trevena LJ, Zikmund-Fisher BJ, Edwards A, Gaissmaier W, Galesic M, Han PKJ, et al. (2013). Presenting quantitative information about decision outcomes: a risk communication primer for patient decision aid developers. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 13(Suppl 2):S7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6947-13-S2-S7> PMID:24625237
80. van der Meij AE, Damman OC, Uiters E, Timmermans DR (2019). What benefits and harms are important for a decision about cervical screening? A study of the perspective of different subgroups of women. *Patient Prefer Adherence*. 13:1005–17. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S193522> PMID:31303748
81. Woloshin S, Schwartz LM, Black WC, Kramer BS (2012). Cancer screening campaigns – getting past uninformative persuasion. *N Engl J Med*. 367(18):1677–9. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1209407> PMID:23113476
82. Independent UK Panel on Breast Cancer Screening (2012). The benefits and harms of breast cancer screening: an independent review. *Lancet*. 380(9855):1778–86. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)61611-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61611-0) PMID:23117178
83. Atun RA, Kyrtasis I, Jelic G, Rados-Malicbegovic D, Guroi-Urganci I (2007). Diffusion of complex health innovations – implementation of primary health care reforms in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Health Policy Plan*. 22(1):28–39. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czl031> PMID:17237492
84. Deppen SA, Aldrich MC, Hartge P, Berg CD, Colditz GA, Petitti DB, et al. (2012). Cancer screening: the journey from epidemiology to policy. *Ann Epidemiol*. 22(6):439–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2012.03.004> PMID:22626002
85. Nowakowski A, Arbyn M, Turkot MH, Wieszczy P, Miłosz K, Kamiński MF, et al. (2020). A roadmap for a comprehensive control of cervical cancer in Poland: integration of available solutions into current practice in primary and secondary prevention. *Eur J Cancer Prev*. 29(2):157–64. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CEJ.0000000000000528> PMID:31517672
86. O'Keeffe M, Nickel B, Dakin T, Maher CG, Albarqouni L, McCaffery K, et al. (2021). Journalists' views on media coverage of medical tests and overdiagnosis: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open*. 11(6):e043991. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-043991> PMID:34078634
87. WHO Regional Office for Europe (2022). Vaccine crisis communication manual: step-by-step guidance for national immunization programmes. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/352029>.
88. du Pré A, Foster E (2015). Transactional communication. In: Ragan SL, Wittenberg E, Ferrell BR, Goldsmith J, Smith T, Glajchen M, et al., editors. *Textbook of palliative care communication*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 14–21. <https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780190201708.003.0003>
89. McCabe C, Timmins F (2013). *Communication skills for nursing practice*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Academic. <https://link.springer.com/book/9780230369207>
90. Wittenberg E, Goldsmith J, Ferrell B, Platt CS (2015). Enhancing communication related to symptom management through plain language. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 50(5):707–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain-symman.2015.06.007> PMID:26162506
91. Ali M (2018). Communication skills 3: non-verbal communication. *Nursing Times*. 114(2):41–2. Available from: <https://www.nursingtimes.net/clinical-archive/assessment-skills/communication-skills-3-non-verbal-communication-15-01-2018/>.
92. Laza-Vásquez C, Hernández-Leal MJ, Carles-Lavila M, Pérez-Lacasta MJ, Cruz-Esteve I, Rué M; on behalf of the Decido Group (2022). Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of a personalized breast cancer screening program: views of Spanish health professionals. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 19(3):1406. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19031406> PMID:35162427
93. Epstein RM, Street RL Jr (2007). Patient-centered communication in cancer care: promoting healing and reducing suffering (NIH Publication No. 07-6225). Bethesda (MD), USA: National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health. Available from: https://cancercontrol.cancer.gov/sites/default/files/2020-06/pcc_monograph.pdf.