Table Supporting the Comment on Harper et al.

The table presents information underlying the discussion in the *Journal Review* comment on:

Harper S, Lynch J, Meersman SC, et al. Trends in area-socioeconomic disparities in breast cancer screening, mortality, and survival among women ages 50 years and over (1987-2005). Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2009;18(1):121-131.

Table A below include information on socioeconomic and racial differences in the three cancer-related matters in the referenced article where disadvantaged groups experienced worse rates (higher adverse outcome rates/lower favorable outcome rates) than advantaged groups. In the case of the socioeconomic groups, the groups with the best and worst rates coincide with the lowest and highest socioeconomic indicator (by percent of neighborhood in poverty or household income quartile). Figures are taken from Tables 1 and 2 of Harper et a. The fields in the table are explained below:

Grouping Subject of comparison (SES = socioeconomic; RE= race/ethnic)

Issue Subject matter (Mammography = mammography/no mammography; Late diagnosis = late-stage diagnosis or its

opposite; 5-year survival = 5-year mortality/survival for persons diagnosed with breast cancer

DisadvGrp Group against whom the advantaged group (highest SES, whites) is compared

BAR Adverse outcome rate for group with better rate (highest SES; whites)

WAR Adverse outcome rate for group with worse rate (lowest SES; blacks, Hispanics)

BFR 1-[BAR] WFR 1-[WAR

RelAdv Relative differences in adverse outcomes derived with worse rate as numerator (([WAR]/[BAR])-1)

RelFav Relative difference in favorable outcomes with worse rate as numerator (1-([BFR]/[BFR])

AbsDf Absolute difference between rates (in terms of percentage points)

EES Estimated difference between means of hypothesized normal distributions (in terms of percentage of a standard

deviation)

Table A Measures of Differences between Rates of Advantaged									
able A Measures of Differences between Rates of Advantaged and Disadvantaged Groups in Study by Harper et al.									

Grouping	Issue	DisadvGrp	Period	BAR	WAR	BFR	WFR	RelAd	RelFav	AbsDf	EES
SES	Mammography	Lowest EES	1987	63.70%	82.80%	36.30%	17.20%	29.98%	52.62%	19.10	0.6
SES	Mammography	Lowest EES	2004	22.60%	44.80%	77.40%	55.20%	98.23%	28.68%	22.20	0.62
SES	Late diagnosis	Lowest EES	1987	40.90%	47.80%	59.10%	52.20%	16.87%	11.68%	6.90	0.18
SES	Late diagnosis	Lowest EES	2004	34.80%	39.60%	65.20%	60.40%	13.79%	7.36%	4.80	0.14
SES	5-year mortality	Lowest EES	1987	15.30%	20.60%	84.70%	79.40%	34.64%	6.26%	5.30	0.22
SES	5-year mortality	Lowest EES	2004	10.90%	15.40%	89.10%	84.60%	41.28%	5.05%	4.50	0.22
RE	Mammography	Black	1992	43.40%	46.10%	56.60%	53.90%	6.22%	4.77%	2.70	0.07
RE	Mammography	Black	2004	29.70%	32.70%	70.30%	67.30%	10.10%	4.27%	3.00	0.09
RE	Mammography	Hispanic	1992	43.40%	53.30%	56.60%	46.70%	22.81%	17.49%	9.90	0.26
RE	Mammography	Hispanic	2004	29.70%	37.10%	70.30%	62.90%	24.92%	10.53%	7.40	0.22
RE	Late diagnosis	Black	1992	34.90%	48.00%	65.10%	52.00%	37.54%	20.12%	13.10	0.34
RE	Late diagnosis	Black	2004	35.80%	44.10%	64.20%	55.90%	23.18%	12.93%	8.30	0.22
RE	Late diagnosis	Hispanic	1992	34.90%	40.70%	65.10%	59.30%	16.62%	8.91%	5.80	0.15
RE	Late diagnosis	Hispanic	2004	35.80%	42.50%	64.20%	57.50%	18.72%	10.44%	6.70	0.18
RE	5-year mortality	Black	1992	13.70%	25.50%	86.30%	74.50%	86.13%	13.67%	11.80	0.44
RE	5-year mortality	Black	2004	11.10%	21.00%	88.90%	79.00%	89.19%	11.14%	9.90	0.43
RE	5-year mortality	Hispanic	1992	13.70%	16.00%	86.30%	84.00%	16.79%	2.67%	2.30	0.11
RE	5-year mortality	Hispanic	2004	11.10%	13.10%	88.90%	86.90%	18.02%	2.25%	2.00	0.12