

Article



Factors Associated with the Uptake of Genetic Testing for Cancer Risks: A Pathway Analysis Using the Health Information National Trends Survey Data

Xiangning Dong¹, Jingxian Huang¹, Yanze Yi¹, Lanwei Zhang¹, Tenglong Li² and Ying Chen^{2,*}

- ¹ Department of Biological Sciences, School of Science, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, Suzhou 215000, China
- ² Wisdom Lake Academy of Pharmacy, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, Suzhou 215000, China
- * Correspondence: ying.chen01@xjtlu.edu.cn

Abstract: Our study aimed to identify pathways from the source of information to the uptake of cancer genetic testing, with consideration of intermediate variables including perceptional, attitudinal and psychosocial factors. We used the Health Information National Trends Survey (2020 database) and constructed a structural equation model for pathway analysis (using SPSS version 24). Variables for socio-demographic, lifestyle and health information were also collected and used for confounding adjustment. A total of 2941 participants were analyzed (68.5%, non-Hispanic white; 59.7%, females; 58 years, median age; and 142 (4.8%) had undertaken genetic testing for cancer risk previously). Our pathway analysis found that only information from particular sources (i.e., healthcare providers and genetic counsellors) had positive and significant effects on people's perceptions of cancer regarding its prevention, detection and treatment (standardized β range, 0.15–0.31, all *p*-values < 0.01). Following the paths, these perceptional variables (cancer prevention, detection and treatment) showed considerable positive impacts on the uptake of genetic testing (standardized β (95% CIs): 0.25 (0.20, 0.30), 0.28 (0.23, 0.33) and 0.12 (0.06, 0.17), respectively). Pathways involving attitudinal and psychosocial factors showed much smaller or insignificant effects on the uptake of genetic testing. Our study brings several novel perspectives to the behavior model and may underpin certain issues regarding cancer risk genetic testing.

Keywords: pathway analysis; cancer risk; health behavior; genetic testing uptake; information source; perception of cancer; attitude towards cancer; psychosocial factor; HINTS; cross-sectional study

1. Introduction

According to the International Agency for Research on Cancer, cancer ranks as the second largest cause of premature mortality worldwide, and in 2020 alone it cost approximately 10 million lives [1]. It imposes tremendous physical and mental burdens on patients and their families [2–6]. Early diagnosis and treatment have become the main strategy for cancer management at both the individual and population level, as it is shown to lead to potential better outcomes or a possible cure [7–10]. With the progress of genomic research, especially the Human Genome Project [11,12], genetic testing has become a popular screening method for hereditary cancer syndromes, which can lead to recommendations for earlier screening or prophylactic surgery [13–19]. It is particularly helpful for those with a personal and family history of cancer. Genetic testing, along with other information, facilitates decision making in cancer risk evaluation and prediction [20–23]. Those who have low risks of developing cancer could also benefit from a proper education built upon evidence acquired from their genetic testing [24,25].

When introducing genetic testing into healthcare practice, the understanding of the relevant knowledge by the public, as well as psychosocial and attitudinal responses, are the driving forces for its adoption and uptake [26–28]. Using structural equation modelling,



Citation: Dong, X.; Huang, J.; Yi, Y.; Zhang, L.; Li, T.; Chen, Y. Factors Associated with the Uptake of Genetic Testing for Cancer Risks: A Pathway Analysis Using the Health Information National Trends Survey Data. *Life* **2022**, *12*, 2024. https:// doi.org/10.3390/life12122024

Academic Editors: Christian Lehmann and Ke-Vin Chang

Received: 29 October 2022 Accepted: 1 December 2022 Published: 4 December 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/). Wade and colleagues provided evidence that certain health-related behaviors, such as worry and perception, may function as mediators in the association pathways between socio-demographic characteristics (e.g., age, level of education and race/ethnicity) and testing intention [29]. Some common health-related behaviors, such as cognitive attitude, uncertainty avoidance and perception of risk, studied in the 'Planned Behavior Theory', 'Protection Motivation Theory' and 'Health Trust Model', were reported to be significant predictors of testing intention [30–32]. Meanwhile, psychosocial factors, such as avoidance of cancer risk information, were found to be negatively associated with cancer prevention behavior (e.g., screening for colon cancer) [33]. Psychological characteristics were also reported to have an important impact on the decision making process to undergo genetic testing [34–37].

Previous research suggested information exposure to media coverage could shape the public's perception on genetic testing [38]. Advertising of particular genetic testing services was associated with elevated awareness and interest in genetic testing [39,40]. However, it may not necessarily result in an actual increase in the uptake rate [41,42]. Information from certain sources, for example the webpages of a genetic testing company, was found to have insufficient content for their consumers to make reasonable decisions [43]. Nevertheless, according to Keller et al., an expressed intention and attitude towards genetic testing does not reliably predict actual uptake activity [44].

Previous studies investigated several individual associations or pathways regarding the relationship between intention and uptake of genetic testing with their predictor factors, such as attitude and perception, psychological characteristics, and information sources [29–37,41,42,45,46]. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is still no research that integrates all the aforementioned factors in one study.

We hypothesize that information from particular media coverage would affect people's perception of genetic testing. Together with other attitudinal and psychosocial factors, this would influence the uptake of genetic testing for high-risk cancer assessment. In this paper, we aim to use structural equation modelling (SEM) to explore the pathways from media sources to perceptional variables, and subsequently from perceptional, attitudinal and psychosocial variables to the uptake of high-risk cancer genetic testing. We believe the findings from our research would address certain issues regarding the uptake of genetic testing for cancer risks.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Population

We used data from the Health Information National Trends Survey (HINTS 5, Cycle 4), which was conducted between February and June 2020. The HINTS project is hosted by the National Cancer Institute (NCI), and has actively been collecting surveys from nationally representative samples in the USA since 2003 (https://hints.cancer.gov/, accessed on 18 November 2022). The surveys target non-institutionalized adults aged 18 and above. They are intended as a comprehensive assessment of the access and use of health information, as well as the public's attitudes about cancer in terms of the following aspects: risk perception, vital prevention, early detection, diagnosis, and treatment.

The 4th cycle of HINTS 5 employed an equal-probability sampling method for household selection, and the Next Birthday Method for respondent selection from each household. The questionnaires were written in English or Spanish and distributed by mail. The survey in total targeted 10,531 individuals, with a response rate of 36.7% resulting in 3865 respondents who returned their answered questionnaires. The study sample used in our analysis (n = 2941), was a result of the selection procedure illustrated in Figure 1. Survey participants were asked whether they had heard of any types of genetic testing in the questionnaire, with those who responded 'I have not heard of any of these types of genetic testing' excluded first (n = 683). Respondents with over a 50% missing rate on study variables (as defined in the following section) or with missing values on the uptake of genetic testing were excluded second (n = 241).



Figure 1. Flow diagram of the population included in this study.

2.2. Study Variable

Variables (along with the corresponding survey questions) used in this study for the conceptual planning and pathway construction are described in Figure 2. Important factors, such as media exposure (an information source about cancer genetic testing), perception, attitude, psychosocial factors, and the uptake of genetic testing were included. Additionally, variables on socio-demographics (including age, gender, BMI, race/ethnicity, marital status, education level, employment status, annual income, health insurance coverage, residential location (urban vs. rural), lifestyle (including cigarette smoking, alcohol drinking, and exercise activity) and health information (including general health score and personal and family cancer history) were also collected and used for mitigating potential confounding effects.



Figure 2. The conceptual framework and study variables, with arrows indicating the direction of possible effects.

2.3. Statistical Analysis

The average proportion of missing data among studied variables was 4.7%. We employed the R package 'rpart' (Recursive Partitioning and Regression Trees, version 4.1.15, by Bell Laboratories, New Jersey, NJ, USA), a decision-tree based method, to impute those missing values on media exposure, perceptional variables, attitudinal variables, psychosocial factors, socio-demographics (including age, gender, BMI, race/ethnicity, marital status, education level, employment status, annual income, and health insurance coverage), and lifestyle (including cigarette smoking, alcohol drinking, and exercise activity).

We used Fisher's Exact test to initially select the variables for media exposure and perception, which were significantly different between those who had undergone genetic testing and who had not. We also screened the socio-demographic variables and health indicators using a similar method and selected statistically significant variables for confounding adjustment. We then constructed SEM for pathway analysis. SEM is a multivariate statistical framework used to model complex relationships between directly and indirectly observed (latent) variables. The model-fitting was performed by IBM SPSS (version 24), which works with a combination of multiple single SEMs to implement pathway analysis. We used single headed arrows to build pathways from influential to affected variables. The conceptual pathways between the studied variables are exhibited in Figure 2. Generalized least squares estimates were used to estimate each parameter, including the covariances between variables, the standard errors of the covariances, the critical ratios, and the twotailed *p*-values. The 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) for all parameters were calculated using the bootstrapping method. Standardized regression coefficients (β) were reported, obtained by using data after standardization. Data standardization was calculated by first subtracting the mean of a variable from its raw value and then dividing it by its standard deviation.

A *p*-value of 0.05, two-tailed, was set as the threshold for statistical significance. Statistical analyses were conducted in R if not mentioned elsewhere.

3. Results

More than half of the study participants were non-Hispanic white (68.5%) and female (59.7%). The median age was 58 years (interquartile range 42–68 years). A summary of collected variables in socio-demographics, lifestyle factors, and health information is provided in Table 1. Approximately 5% (142/2941) of the study participants reported that they had undergone cancer genetic testing previously. Participants who were female, covered with health insurance, employed, and with a reported personal and family history of cancer, were found to be more likely to undertake genetic testing for cancer risks (Table 1).

Mass media were the most common sources of information about genetic testing reported by our study participants. Television (62.6%) and internet (49.1%) were listed as the top two sources of information, followed by papers (newspapers 15.2% and magazines 17.8%) and radio (16.4%) (Table 2). Social communications were also important sources: 32.7% of the participants had received information from social media; 37.0% from family members; and 28.4% from friends (Table 2). Information from health professionals was the least commonly reported source: 19.4% of the participants had obtained it from healthcare providers and 3.6% from genetic counsellors (Table 2). However, analyses showed that only exposure to information from healthcare providers (those who had genetic testing vs. those who had not, 59.9% vs. 17.3%, *p* < 0.01) and genetic counsellors (27.5% vs. 2.4%, *p* < 0.01) was positively associated with the uptake of genetic testing (Table 2). As the most common source of information, television was found to be negatively associated with the uptake of genetic testing (those who had not, 51.4% vs. 63.2%, *p* < 0.01, Table 2).

	Characteristics	Did Genetic Testing (n = 142)	Did Not (n = 2799)	Total (n = 2941)	<i>p</i> Value
Male30 (21.1)115 (12.2)118 (40.3).000Permale112 (25)468 (28.4)175 (97)Barber10 (7.0)408 (14.6)416 (14.2)416 (14.2)35-4032 (22.5)454 (10.6)450 (10.7)400 (10.7)35-4130 (12.1)402 (22.6)456 (22.7)400 (10.7)35-4230 (12.1)30 (11.1)356 (11.1)360 (11.1)35-4331 (21.1)37 (12.1)400 (10.7)400 (10.7)37 and above31 (21.1)30 (11.1)400 (20.7)400 (20.7)10.1041 (13.0)80 (13.0)90 (25.0)10.00 (54.0)10.1041 (13.0)90 (25.0)10.00 (54.0)400 (20.7)10.1041 (13.0)49 (12.7)400 (25.0)400 (25.0)10.10 (10.10)41 (12.7)49 (12.7)400 (25.0)400 (25.0)10.10 (10.10)41 (12.7)49 (12.7)400 (12.7)400 (12.7)10.10 (10.10)41 (12.7)49 (12.7)400 (12.7)400 (12.7)10.10 (10.10)41 (12.7)49 (12.7)410 (12.7)400 (12.7)10.10 (10.10)41 (12.7)49 (12.7)410 (12.7)400 (12.7)10.10 (10.10)41 (12.7)410 (12.7)410 (12.7)410 (12.7)10.10 (10.10)41 (12.7)410 (12.7)410 (12.7)410 (12.7)10.10 (10.10)41 (12.7)410 (12.7)410 (12.7)410 (12.7)10.10 (10.10)41 (12.7)410 (12.7)410 (12.7)410 (12.7)10.10 (10.10)410	Gender, n (%)				
Founds 112 (28) 145 (35.8) 177 (67.9) 35-40 2422.2) 448 (14.2) 0.085 35-44 56 (4) 56 (4) 98 (12.9) 0.085 57.44 30 (21.1) 0.49 (22.1) 0.49 (22.1) 0.49 (22.1) 67.34 30 (21.1) 0.49 (22.1) 0.49 (22.1) 0.49 (22.1) MBL alageny ref. (1) 1.5 (5.5) 32 (11.1) 0.49 (22.1) 0.49 (22.1) Marked Living (1) 1.6 (5.5) 32 (12.1) 1.5 (5.5) 0.00 (0.5.4) Normal 1.6 (5.5) 1.6 (19.55.0) 0.07 (19.1) 0.00 (0.5.4) Marked Living (0.984er 7.4 (2.1) 1.5 (5.5) 1.6 (19.5.5.0) 0.07 (19.1) Marked Living (0.984er 1.0 (2.0) 2.0 (2.5) 1.6 (19.5.5.0) 0.07 (19.1) Marked Living (0.984er 1.0 (2.0) 2.0 (2.5) 2.0 (2.6) 0.00 (19.1) State (1.5) 1.2 (2.4) 1.3 (2.5) 2.0 (2.6) 0.00 (19.1) Marked Living (0.984er 1.0 (2.0) 2.0 (2.6) 2.0 (2.6) 0.00 (2.6)	Male	30 (21.1)	1154 (41.2)	1184 (40.3)	< 0.01
App. Entrop. n (%) Horization Horization <th< td=""><td>Female</td><td>112 (78.9)</td><td>1645 (58.8)</td><td>1757 (59.7)</td><td></td></th<>	Female	112 (78.9)	1645 (58.8)	1757 (59.7)	
15-30 10 (0) 86 (150) 10 (150) 0.085 55-44 56 (294) 10 (25.) 69 (2.2) 0.085 55-44 30 (21.1) 10 (22.1) 46 (22.1) 0.085 55-44 30 (21.1) 10 (22.1) 46 (22.1) 0.085 55-44 30 (21.1) 10 (15.1) 32 (11.1) 0.001 BMI chargery, (15) 10 (25.1) 10 (25.1) 0.001 (25.1) 0.001 Normal 44 (21.0) 94 (22.7) 958 (22.0) 0.001 Overweight 44 (21.0) 94 (25.7) 958 (22.0) 0.071 Maral status, (15) 44 (21.0) 94 (27.0) 11 (7.0) 0.011 Marad status, (15) 10 (27.0) 10 (27.2) 81 (27.0) 0.961 Status (16, 10, 10 (16.1) 12 (46.1) 12 (17.0) 0.961 Status (16.1) 10 (27.0) 256 (67.9) 0.961 Status (16.1) 10 (27.0) 256 (67.9) 0.961 Status (16.1) 10 (27.0) 256 (27.0) 0.920 <td< td=""><td>Age group, n (%)</td><td>10 (5.0)</td><td>400 (14 ()</td><td>410 (14 0)</td><td></td></td<>	Age group, n (%)	10 (5.0)	400 (14 ()	410 (14 0)	
B-4 Set (Eq.) Set (Eq.) Set (Eq.) Set (Eq.) Set (Eq.) 75 and above 14 (9.9) 31 (20.1) 46 (42.1) 37 87 and above 14 (9.9) 31 (20.1) 36 (41.0) 393 (20.1) 333 87 and above 31 (20.5) 853 (20.4) 393 (20.1) 0.41 Overweigh 44 (10.1) 994 (22.7) 958 (22.6) 0.41 Overweigh 44 (21.0) 994 (22.7) 958 (22.6) 0.671 Marala status, n (2) 741 (22.1) 154 (57.5) 0.671 Single/Never married 18 (27.0) 493 (17.6) 11 (17.0) 0.961 Single/Never married 18 (27.0) 303 (3.3) 97 (3.3) 0.961 Single/Never married 16 (27.0) 303 (3.3) 97 (18.5) 0.920 Single/Never married 16 (27.0) 303 (3.3) 97 (18.5) 0.920 Single/Never married 17 (20.0) 303 (23.0) 97 (18.5) 0.920 Single/Never married 17 (20.0) 303 (23.0) 97 (18.5) 0.	18-34	10 (7.0)	408 (14.6)	418 (14.2)	0.085
-6-7 •0 (21) -0 (21) -0 (21) 75 and alow 1 (4) -0 (1) -0 (1) BMI entropy, n (*)	35-49 50,64	32 (22.5) 56 (39.4)	548 (19.6)	580 (19.7) 968 (22.9)	0.085
25 and above (b) 12 (11.1) 22 (11.1) Water (b) 3 (21) 37 (13) 40 (1.4) Normal 3 (25.9) 82 (20.4) 93 (30.7) 9.40 Ober (c) 99 (25.6) 99 (25.6) 99 (25.6) 99 (25.6) Ober (c) 99 (25.6) 110 (27.6) 99 (25.6) 0.67 Marted (Living together 7 (25.7) 7 (10 (27.2) 111 (27.6) 99 (25.6) Single (Newer married) 16 (12.7) 40 (17.6) 91 (17.6) 91 (17.6) Metropolition 10 (7.0) 20 (17.2) 21 (17.2) 0.661 Single (Newer married) 10 (7.0) 20 (17.2) 21 (17.2) 0.661 Nom Hispanic (Nith) 10 (7.0) 20 (17.2) 21 (17.2) 0.661 Nom Hispanic (Nith) 10 (7.0) 20 (17.2) 21 (17.2) 0.620 Nom Hispanic (Nith) 10 (7.0) 20 (17.2) 21 (17.2) 0.620 Nom Hispanic (Nith) 10 (7.1) 30 (12.2) 377 (12.2) 0.653 Non Hispanic (Nith) 12 (1.4) 42 (15.5) 42 (15.7) 0.653 Non Hispanic (Nith)	50-64 65-74	30 (21 1)	912 (32.6) 619 (22.1)	649 (22.1)	
BMT enclose Enclose Enclose Underweight 3 (2.1) 37 (1.3) 40 (1.4) 0.340 Normal 41 (3.10) 94 (3.27) 953 (3.26) 0.340 Marinal (Jing begther) 74 (2.1) 155 (55.2) 161 (95.6) 0.071 Marinal (Jing begther) 74 (2.1) 155 (55.2) 161 (95.6) 0.071 Diversed/Separated 50 (35.2) 761 (27.2) 811 (7.6) 0.761 Diversed/Separated 50 (35.2) 761 (27.2) 811 (7.6) 0.761 Marinal (Jing begther) 76 (27.2) 811 (7.6) 0.761 0.761 Maring (Jing begther) 107 (9 201 (7.2) 211 (7.2) 0.961 Single/Never maried 107 (9 201 (7.2) 211 (7.2) 0.961 Single/Never maried 107 (9 201 (9 211 (1.2) 0.971 Single/Never maried 107 (1.2) 93 (0.3) 97 (0.3) 0.920 Maring (Jing (75 and above	14 (9.9)	312 (11.1)	326 (11.1)	
Underweight 5 (2.1) 37 (1.3) 40 (1.4) Normal 5 (5.9) 452 (0.4) 493 (3.07) 0.340 Overweight 44 (3.10) 94 (32.7) 988 (2.6) 0.071 Overweight 40 (3.1) 94 (32.7) 988 (2.6) 0.071 Divected/Spential 50 (3.2) 76 (2.2) 811 (25.6) 0.071 Divected/Spential 50 (3.2) 76 (2.2) 811 (25.6) 0.071 Single/Never matried 18 (12.7) 49 (17.6) 256 (87.9) 0.961 Micropolitan 10 (70.4) 191 (68.4) 211 (72.1) 0.961 Race, n(7) 10 (07.4) 191 (68.4) 211 (72.1) 0.961 Race, n(7) 10 (07.4) 191 (68.4) 211 (68.5) 0.220 Race, n(7) 12 (4.6) 133 (4.5) 0.220 121 (41.1) 3.03 (12.9) 0.31 (5.7) Ideation, n(7.6) 12 (4.6) 133 (4.5) 0.220 121 (42.8) 130 (4.5) 0.220 Ideation, n(7.6) 12 (4.6) 144 (4.6) 12 (4.6) <td>BMI category, n (%)</td> <td>11 (00)</td> <td>012 (111)</td> <td>020 (1111)</td> <td></td>	BMI category, n (%)	11 (00)	012 (111)	020 (1111)	
Normal S1 (35.9) S12 (20.4) 916 (32.7) 92.8 (30.7) 0.340 Observing (1) 44 (31.0) 946 (32.7) 1040 (35.4) 1040 (35.4) Married (1)// tip top ther 50 (35.2) 76.8 (22.7) 811 (27.6) 107 Bing (2)/Nevr married 10 (35.2) 76.4 (27.2) 811 (27.6) 106 Married (1)// tip top ther 10 (7.0 92.0 (27.2) 211 (7.2) 0.96 Single / Nevr married 10 (7.0 46 (1.6.) 97 (3.3) 97 (3.3) Rara 10 (7.0 97 (1.6.) 47 (1.6) 0.92 Non-Hispanic White 10 (7.0.4) 137 (4.6.) 137 (4.5) 0.92 Non-Hispanic White 10 (7.0.4) 132 (4.6.) 137 (4.5) 137 (4.5) 137 (4.5) 137 (4.5) 137 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5) 138 (4.5)	Underweight	3 (2.1)	37 (1.3)	40 (1.4)	
Overwight44 (31.0)94 (32.7)958 (32.6)Marila istuu, r (%)413.0966 (35.6)1140 (25.7)0.071Marila istuu, r (%)18 (12.7)154 (65.2)151 (17.2)0.071Single/Never maried18 (12.7)493 (17.2)131 (17.4)0.071Micropolian10 (7.0)201 (7.2)211 (7.2)0.961Micropolian10 (7.0)201 (7.2)211 (7.2)0.961Rate, n (%)4 (1.0)201 (7.2)211 (7.2)0.961Nort-Hispanic White100 (70.4)194 (68.4)201 (8.6)0.020Nort-Hispanic Black210 (14.1)397 (14.2)477 (14.8)0.020Nort-Hispanic Black12 (4.5)122 (4.4)134 (4.6)134 (4.6)High School12 (8.5)122 (4.4)134 (4.6)134 (4.6)High School12 (8.5)126 (4.6)484 (2.7)0.055Some College45 (31.7)849 (0.2)893 (0.0.4)0.021Bachelor35 (24.6)576 (22.6)101 (21.8)421 (23.6)Unemployed4 (2.8)159 (57.7)163 (5.5)0.020Some College4 (2.6)249 (1.6)383 (0.6)0.021Unemployed11 (7.7)231 (1.0)0.451421 (2.8)Unemployed4 (2.8)159 (57.7)163 (5.6)0.021Unemployed11 (7.7)231 (1.0)344 (1.6)441 (1.8)Unemployed11 (7.7)231 (1.0)344 (1.7)141 (1.2)US 50.000 to CUSD 50.0016 (1.3) <td>Normal</td> <td>51 (35.9)</td> <td>852 (30.4)</td> <td>903 (30.7)</td> <td>0.340</td>	Normal	51 (35.9)	852 (30.4)	903 (30.7)	0.340
Obesity 44 (31.0) 996 (35.6) 1049 (55.9) 0.071 Marilal skins, (%) 152 (32.1) 156 (52.2) 151 (17.6) 0.071 Single/Nover married 152 (32.1) 159 (57.0) 111 (7.6) 0.071 Lacation, 1 (%) 127 (89.4) 2456 (67.9) 2556 (67.9) 0.61 Metropolitan 10 (7.0) 201 (7.2) 211 (7.2) 0.61 Small lown 42.23 93 (37.3) 77 (12.0) 0.61 Non-Hispanic black 10 (7.0) 46 (16.9) 27 (12.0) 0.62 Non-Hispanic black 12 (12.1) 363 (12.9) 377 (12.0) 0.63 Non-Hispanic other 12 (5.1) 128 (46.1) 144 (45.5) 462 (15.7) 0.053 Stance College 45 (37.7) 483 (45.2) 150 (45.2) 150 (45.2) 0.053 Stance College 45 (37.7) 484 (15.5) 462 (15.7) 0.053 Stance College 45 (37.7) 484 (15.5) 45 (15.7) 0.020 Bachelor 20 (14.1) 442 (15.5) 150 (1	Overweight	44 (31.0)	914 (32.7)	958 (32.6)	
Married 1.View flogenther 9.4 (3.2.1) 1545 (5.5.2) 1619 (7.6.1) 0.07 Married 1.View flogenther 9.4 (3.2.1) 761 (27.2.1) 9.11 (17.4) 11 (27.4) Loardina, n.(7) 101 (7.0.1) 201 (7.2.1) 211 (7.2.1) 0.061 Micropolitan 107 (7.0.1) 201 (7.2.1) 211 (7.2.1) 0.061 Small town 4 (2.8.1) 93 (3.3.1) 97 (3.3) 0.920 Married 1.View 1.007 40 (1.6.1) 47 (1.6.1) 0.920 Race, n.(%) 91 (4.8.1) 214 (4.8.1) 0.920 More Hispanic Black 17 (1.2.0) 300 (12.9.1) 37 (12.8) 0.920 Hispanic Black 12 (8.5) 122 (4.4) 134 (4.6) 134 (4.5) Education, n.(%) 1 442 (15.8.1) 462 (15.7.7) 0.053 Some College 35 (24.1) 45 (20.0.1) 81 (20.0.1) 124 (4.1) Hispanic Black 35 (24.0) 156 (57.1) 153 (5.1) 0.020 Proce Hispanic Black 35 (24.0) 160 (20.0.1) 0.021 Towen	Obesity	44 (31.0)	996 (35.6)	1040 (35.4)	
Marray Living together 4 (3.1) [Jabs (3.2) (b) (3.1) (b) (3.1) Diverse (Japper Trick) 50 (3.2) 76 (2.2) 511 (2.7) 511 (2.7) Location, n (%) 127 (84) 2450 (67.9) 258 (67.9)	Marital status, n (%)				0.051
	Married / Living together	74 (52.1)	1545 (55.2)	1619 (55.0)	0.071
	Single /Never married	50 (35.2) 18 (12 7)	/61 (27.2)	611 (27.6) 511 (17.4)	
Metropolition127 (89.4)2489 (87.9)258 (87.9)Micropoliton10 (7.0)211 (7.2)211 (7.2)0.961Small town4 (2.8)99 (3.3)97 (3.3)97 (3.3)Rural10 (7.0)49 (1.6)77 (1.8)77 (1.8)Non-Hispanic White100 (7.0.4)1914 (68.4)2014 (65.5)92 (1.8)Non-Hispanic Black20 (14.1)397 (14.2)937 (12.3)937 (12.3)Non-Hispanic Other5 (3.5)128 (4.6)131 (4.5)93 (1.5)Rural(7.10.0)300 (12.9)377 (12.3)93 (1.5)93 (1.5)Non-Hispanic Other2 (1.6)44 (1.5)44 (1.5)94 (1.5)93 (1.5)Some College45 (3.17)449 (1.5)84 (2.57)0.053Some College30 (2.1.1)813 (2.9.0)843 (2.8.7)94 (1.6)Poet-Bacculareate30 (2.1.1)813 (2.9.0)843 (2.8.7)94 (1.6)Cecupation, n (%)1516 (54.2)159 (2.5.1)0.020Retired36 (2.6.8)855 (0.5.1)83 (0.0.4)94 (1.6)Other2 (1.6.9)2 (1.6.9)2 (1.6.9)2 (1.6.9)Itamis, n (%)11 (7.7)341 (1.7)342 (1.6.6)948 (1.6.6)USD 20,000 to USD 53,00011 (7.7)344 (1.6)484 (1.6.6)484 (1.6.6)USD 20,000 to USD 53,00011 (7.7)343 (1.6.1)303 (1.6.2)100 (1.1.1)USD 53,000 to USD 53,00011 (7.7)344 (1.6.1)130 (1.6.2)100 (1.1.1)USD 53,000 to USD 53,00011	Location n (%)	18 (12.7)	493 (17.0)	511 (17.4)	
	Metropolitan	127 (89.4)	2459 (87.9)	2586 (87.9)	
Small lown 4 (2.8) 95 (3.3) 97 (3.3) Rural 10(7) 46 (1.6) 47 (1.6) Race, n (%) Non-Hispanic White 100 (7.14) 1914 (68.4) 2014 (68.5) Non-Hispanic White 20 (14.1) 377 (14.2) 377 (12.8) Non-Hispanic other 5 (3.5) 128 (4.6) 133 (4.5) Education, n (%) 99 (0.2) 991 (0.3) 60 (0.3) Some Collega 45 (3.17) 449 (0.2) 991 (0.3) 60 (0.3) Bachelor 30 (2.1) 813 (29.0) 843 (28.7) 90 (0.2) Post-Baccalaurate 35 (24.6) 159 (57.7) 163 (5.5) 90 (0.2) Compation, n (%) 20 (1.6) 237 (1.0) 24 (1.6) 24 (1.6) Unemployed 4 (2.8) 159 (5.6,1) 30 (3.4) 20 (0.6) Other 24 (1.6.9) 260 (6.6) 233 (1.0) 24 (1.6) Unemployed 4 (2.8) 159 (5.0) 803 (0.3) 24 (1.6) Other	Micropolitan	10 (7.0)	201 (7.2)	211 (7.2)	0.961
Rural 10.07 46 (1.6) 47 (1.6) Non-Hispanic White 100 (7.1.4) 194 (68.4) 42014 (68.5) Non-Hispanic Black 20 (1.1.1) 370 (12.9) 377 (12.8) 920 Hispanic 17 (12.0) 360 (12.9) 377 (12.8) 920 Hispanic Other 13 (2.5) 128 (4.6) 133 (4.6) 133 (4.6) Less than High School 2 (14.1) 481 (15.2) 461 (15.7) 0.63 Backelor 30 (2.1.1) 481 (15.2) 461 (15.7) 0.63 Backelor 30 (2.1.1) 481 (15.2) 461 (15.7) 0.63 Backelor 30 (2.1.1) 481 (15.2) 461 (15.8) 0.63 Occupation, (%) 115 (5.7) 163 (5.5) 0.020 Retired 38 (2.6.8) 455 (3.5.7) 163 (5.5) 0.020 Retired 38 (2.6.8) 455 (3.5.7) 163 (5.6.5) 0.020 Retired 38 (2.6.8) 455 (3.5.7) 163 (3.6.1) 25 (0.6.1) 130 (0.6.1) 25 (0.6.1) 130 (0.6.1)	Small town	4 (2.8)	93 (3.3)	97 (3.3)	
Race, 1(%) Non-Hispanic White 100 (70.4) 1914 (68.4) 2014 (65.5) Non-Hispanic White 20 (14.1) 397 (14.2) 417 (14.2) 0.920 Non-Hispanic Black 20 (14.1) 397 (14.2) 377 (12.8) 0.820 Non-Hispanic other 5 128 (4.6) 133 (4.5) 420 Education, r0%) 128 (5.5) 122 (4.4) 134 (4.6)	Rural	1 (0.7)	46 (1.6)	47 (1.6)	
Non-Hispanic White100 (70.4)1914 (68.4)2014 (68.5)Non-Hispanic Black20 (14.1)397 (14.2)377 (12.8)Hispanic17 (12.0)360 (12.9)377 (12.8)Education, n (%)128 (4.6)133 (4.5)Less than High School20 (14.1)484 (15.5)462 (15.7)High School20 (14.1)484 (15.3)483 (28.7)Bachelor30 (21.1)813 (29.0)843 (28.7)Post-Baccalaureate35 (24.6)576 (20.6)611 (20.8)Coccupation, n (%)159 (5.7)163 (5.5)0.020Retried38 (26.8)855 (30.5)893 (30.4)Unemployed42 (16.9)249 (6.6)231 (10.0)Horden Cocupation, n (%) </td <td>Race, n (%)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Race, n (%)				
Nor-Hispanic Black20 (41)397 (42)417 (42)0.920Hispanic17 (120)360 (12.9)377 (12.8)Nor-Hispanic other5 (3.5)128 (4.6)133 (4.5)Education, r(8)Less than High School12 (8.5)122 (4.4)134 (4.6)Hisph School20 (14.1)484 (15.5)422 (15.7)Same College45 (31.7)844 (30.2)881 (30.3)Bathelor30 (21.1)813 (22.0)841 (23.7)Post-Baccalacents (**)576 (20.0)611 (20.8)Employed76 (53.5)1516 (54.2)929 (54.1)Unemployed42 (2.8)159 (57.7)163 (5.5)Other24 (16.9)249 (9.6)233 (10.0)Income, r(%)29 (9.6)233 (10.0)Less than USD 20,00024 (16.9)443 (15.8)447 (15.9)USD 20,000 to -USD 35,00016 (11.3)328 (11.7)344 (11.7)USD 20,000 to -USD 50,00016 (11.3)328 (11.7)344 (11.7)USD 50,000 to -USD 50,00016 (11.3)326 (15.7)10.8USD 50,000 to -USD 50,00016 (11.3)265 (95.2)2806 (95.4)0.021No70 (0.4)139 (42.1)130 (45.2)10.1Singer, r(%)129 (2.6)129 (2.6)129 (2.6)Current (*)10 (0.7)134 (4.8)135 (4.6)135 (4.6)Singer, r(%)129 (3.6)0.221 (7.5)0.241 (7.5)No57 (3.6)127 (59.1)129 (54.1)221 (75.9)	Non-Hispanic White	100 (70.4)	1914 (68.4)	2014 (68.5)	
Hispanic Non-Hispanic other ispanic other17 (12,1)360 (12,9)377 (12,8)Education, n (%)	Non-Hispanic Black	20 (14.1)	397 (14.2)	417 (14.2)	0.920
Non-Hispane other5 (3.5)128 (4.6)138 (4.5)Education, (7b)II <t< td=""><td>Hispanic</td><td>17 (12.0)</td><td>360 (12.9)</td><td>377 (12.8)</td><td></td></t<>	Hispanic	17 (12.0)	360 (12.9)	377 (12.8)	
Education, $n(\pi)$ 12 (4.4)134 (4.6)0.053High School20 (14.1)442 (15.8)462 (15.7)0.053Same College43 (31.7)841 (0.2)841 (0.2.7)Bachelor30 (21.1)813 (29.0)841 (28.7)Post-Baccalaureate35 (24.6)57 (20.6)611 (20.8)Corpation, $n(\pi)$	Non-Hispanic other	5 (3.5)	128 (4.6)	133 (4.5)	
Les than Lapit School16 (Sr)124 (Vers)16 (Vers)16 (Vers)High School20 (14.1)442 (157)843 (20.5)891 (0.5)Some College45 (51.7)843 (20.6)843 (28.7)Post-Baccalaureate30 (21.1)813 (20.0)843 (28.7)Cocupation, r(%)	Education, n (%)	12 (8 5)	122(4 4)	124 (4.6)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	High School	20(141)	442 (15.8)	462 (15 7)	0.053
Bacharron 30 (21.1) 813 (29.0) 843 (28.7) Post-Bacalaurate 35 (24.6) 376 (20.6) 611 (20.8) Occupation, $1(\%)$	Some College	45 (31 7)	849 (30 2)	891 (30.3)	0.000
Post-Baccalaureate35 (24.6)576 (20.6)611 (20.8)Corcupation, n (%)76 (33.5)1516 (54.2)1592 (54.1)Unemployed4 (2.8)159 (57)163 (55)0.020Netrind28 (26.8)855 (00.5)893 (30.4)0.020Income, n (%)41 (1.6)42 (1.6)299 (9.6)293 (10.0)Income, n (%)11 (7.7)301 (10.8)312 (10.6)0.843USD 2.0.000 to <usd 50,000<="" td="">16 (11.3)328 (11.7)344 (11.7)USD 50,000 to <usd 50,000<="" td="">24 (16.9)446 (16.6)488 (16.6)USD 50,000 to <usd 75,000="" more<="" or="" td="">67 (47.2)1263 (45.1)1330 (45.2)Insurance, n(%)7134 (4.8)133 (4.5)135 (4.6)Since, n (%)10 (7.7)310 (11.1)325 (11.1)0.925Current15 (10.6)310 (11.1)325 (11.1)0.925No10 (67.4)90 (64.3)128 (4.6)136 (4.2)Moderate drink, n (%)7727 (24.7)727 (24.7)Ves90 (63.4)179 (64.3)1889 (64.2)Ves90 (63.4)179 (64.3)188 (64.2)No36 (25.4)584 (20.9)2321 (78.9)0.241No87 (61.3)1125 (61.6)112 (38.4)0.999No87 (61.3)1125 (61.6)1812 (61.6)Ves pood44 (31.0)1062 (37.9)1106 (37.6)0.250No87 (61.3)102 (13.3)61 (12.3)No87 (61.3)102 (13.6)0.250General health sc</usd></usd></usd>	Bachelor	30 (21.1)	813 (29.0)	843 (28.7)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Post-Baccalaureate	35 (24.6)	576 (20.6)	611 (20.8)	
Employed 76 (53.5) 1516 (54.2) 1592 (54.1) Unemployed 4 (2.8) 159 (57) 163 (5.5) 0.020 Retired 38 (26.8) 855 (00.5) 893 (00.4) 0.020 Income, n (%) - - - - Less than USD 20,000 14 (16.7) 301 (10.8) 312 (10.6) 0.843 USD 20,000 16 (11.3) 328 (11.7) 344 (11.7) - USD 50,000 to USD 50,000 16 (11.3) 328 (12.7) 348 (16.6) - USD 50,000 to USD 50,000 42 (16.9) 464 (16.6) 488 (16.6) - USD 50,000 to USD 50,000 10 (7.7) 134 (4.8) 135 (4.6) - Insurance, n(%) - - - - Ves 10.7) 134 (4.8) 135 (4.6) - - Sinoke, n (%) - - - - - Vers 106 (74.6) 2215 (79.1) 2221 (78.9) 0.241 No 36 (25.4) 1725 (64.3) 61 (12.3)	Occupation, n (%)	× ,		× ,	
Unemployed4 (2.8)159 (5.7)163 (5.5)0.020Retired38 (26.8)855 (30.5)893 (30.4)0Other24 (16.9)269 (9.6)293 (10.0)Income, (%)312 (10.6)0.843USD 20,000 to -USD 35,00011 (7.7)30 (10.8)312 (10.6)0.843USD 55,000 to -USD 35,00016 (11.3)328 (11.7)344 (11.7)0USD 55,000 to -USD 35,00016 (11.3)328 (11.7)330 (45.2)-USD 50,000 to -USD 37,00024 (16.9)464 (16.6)448 (16.6)448 (16.6)USD 75,000 or More67 (47.2)1263 (45.1)133 (45.2)-Insurance, n (%)135 (46)-Termer10 (7.7)134 (48)135 (46)-No10 (0.7)134 (48)135 (46)-Current15 (10.6)310 (11.1)325 (11.1)0.925Former37 (26.1)690 (24.7)727 (24.7)-Never90 (63.4)1799 (64.3)1889 (64.2)-No36 (25.4)56 (35.7)124 (36.6)Sufficient exercise per week, n (%)Yes55 (38.7)107 (38.4)1129 (38.4)0.999-No6 (63.2)125 (61.6)112 (36.6)Sufficient exercise per week, n (%)-125 (61.6)112 (36.6)-No6 (63.2)125 (61.6)112 (36.6)Good57 (61.3) </td <td>Employed</td> <td>76 (53.5)</td> <td>1516 (54.2)</td> <td>1592 (54.1)</td> <td></td>	Employed	76 (53.5)	1516 (54.2)	1592 (54.1)	
Retired38 (26.8)855 (0.5)893 (30.4)Other24 (16.9)269 (9.6)293 (10.0)Income, n (%)Less than USD 20,00024 (16.9)443 (15.8)447 (15.9)USD 20,000 to <usd 35,000<="" td="">16 (11.3)328 (11.7)344 (11.7)USD 50,000 to <usd 75,000<="" td="">24 (16.9)446 (16.6)448 (16.6)USD 50,000 to <usd 75,000<="" td="">24 (16.9)464 (16.6)448 (16.6)USD 50,000 to <usd 75,000<="" td="">24 (16.9)464 (16.6)488 (16.6)USD 75,000 or More67 (47.2)1263 (45.1)1330 (45.2)Insurance, n (%)310 (11.1)335 (11.1)0.925Somoke, n (%)1007314 (4.8)135 (4.6)310 (11.1)325 (11.1)0.925Former37 (26.1)690 (24.7)727 (24.7)0.241Nover90 (63.4)1799 (64.3)1889 (64.2)100 (10.1)0.925Moderate drink, n (%)312 (17.8)0.2410.999Sufficient exercise per week, n (%)36 (12.9)620 (21.1)600 (21.7)0.241No36 (25.4)58 (20.9)620 (21.1)600 (21.7)0.250No37 (61.3)1007 (38.4)1129 (38.4)0.9990.50No37 (61.3)1007 (38.4)1129 (38.4)0.9990.50No37 (61.3)1002 (37.9)1106 (37.6)0.2500.250No57 (40.1)1008 (36.0)116 (37.6)0.250No9 (6.3)50 (21.1)65 (22.</usd></usd></usd></usd>	Unemployed	4 (2.8)	159 (5.7)	163 (5.5)	0.020
Other24 (16.9)269 (9.6)293 (10.0)Income, n°(%)III <td< td=""><td>Retired</td><td>38 (26.8)</td><td>855 (30.5)</td><td>893 (30.4)</td><td></td></td<>	Retired	38 (26.8)	855 (30.5)	893 (30.4)	
Income, n (%)Less than USD 20,00024 (16.9)443 (15.8)467 (15.9)USD 20,000 to <usd 35,000<="" td="">11 (7.7)301 (10.8)312 (10.6)0.843USD 55,000 to <usd 55,000<="" td="">24 (16.9)464 (16.6)488 (16.6)10.10USD 55,000 to <usd 75,000<="" td="">24 (16.9)464 (16.6)488 (16.6)10.10USD 55,000 to <usd 75,000<="" td="">24 (16.9)464 (16.6)488 (16.6)10.10USD 55,000 to <usd 75,000<="" td="">24 (16.9)464 (16.6)488 (16.6)10.10USD 75,000 to <usd 75,000="" 75,000<="" <usd="" td="" to="">141 (19.3)2665 (95.2)2806 (95.4)0.021Insurance, nt%)</usd></usd></usd></usd></usd></usd>	Other	24 (16.9)	269 (9.6)	293 (10.0)	
Less that CSD 20000 USD 20000 to <usd 53,000<br=""></usd> USD 20000 to <usd 50,000<="" th="">14 (157) (16.3)440 (15.3) (10.8)312 (10.6) (10.8)0.843USD 20000 to <usd 50,000<br=""></usd>USD 50,000 to <usd 75,000<="" td="">24 (16.9) (16.9)464 (16.6) (48.8) (16.6)488 (16.6)1000USD 75,000 to <usd 75,000<br=""></usd>VSD 75,000 to <usd 75,000<="" td="">74 (19.9) (16.9)2665 (95.2) (10.7)2806 (95.4) (133 (45.2)0.021Insurance, n (%) Y10 (0.7)13 (4.8)0.9251000No10 (0.7)13 (4.8)0.9251000Smoke, n (%) Current15 (10.6)310 (11.1)325 (11.1)0.925Former37 (26.1)660 (24.7)727 (24.7)0.925Never90 (63.4)1799 (64.3)1889 (64.2)1000Moderate drink, n (%) V106 (74.6)2215 (79.1)2321 (78.9)0.241No36 (25.4)243 (20.9)620 (21.1)10001000Sufficient exercise per week, n (%)1129 (38.4)1129 (38.4)0.999Sufficient exercise per week, n (%)1122 (36.4)0.92501000 (37.6)0.250Good57 (40.1)1006 (36.0)1005 (36.2)10001000Good57 (40.1)1002 (37.9)1100 (37.6)0.2501000Good57 (40.1)1008 (36.0)1005 (36.2)10001000Fairi17 (12.0)327 (11.7)344 (11.7)10001000Poor6 (4.2)59 (2.1)65 (2.2)10001000Fairi17 (12.0)<td>Income, n (%)</td><td>24 (16.0)</td><td>442 (15.8)</td><td>467 (15 0)</td><td></td></usd></usd></usd>	Income, n (%)	24 (16.0)	442 (15.8)	467 (15 0)	
bit D 20,000 to CUD 50,00011 (7.7)301 (100)312 (100)0.040USD 35,000 to CUD 50,00024 (16.9)464 (16.6)488 (16.6)USD 75,000 or More67 (47.2)1263 (45.1)1330 (45.2)Insurance, n (%) </td <td>LISD 20,000 to <usd 35,000<="" td=""><td>24(10.9) 11(77)</td><td>445 (15.6) 301 (10.8)</td><td>407 (13.9)</td><td>0.843</td></usd></td>	LISD 20,000 to <usd 35,000<="" td=""><td>24(10.9) 11(77)</td><td>445 (15.6) 301 (10.8)</td><td>407 (13.9)</td><td>0.843</td></usd>	24(10.9) 11(77)	445 (15.6) 301 (10.8)	407 (13.9)	0.843
USD 50,000 to <usd 75,000<br=""></usd> USD 75,000 or More24 (16.9) 24 (16.9)464 (16.6) 464 (16.6)488 (16.6) 488 (16.6)USD 75,000 or More67 (47.2)123 (45.1)133 (45.2)Insurace, n (%)	USD 35,000 to <usd 50,000<="" td=""><td>16(11.3)</td><td>328 (11 7)</td><td>344 (11.7)</td><td>0.045</td></usd>	16(11.3)	328 (11 7)	344 (11.7)	0.045
USD 75,000 or More USD 75,000 or More Insurance, n (%) $67 (47.2)$ $1263 (45.1)$ $1330 (45.2)$ Insurance, n (%) 0.021 Yes $141 (99.3)$ $2665 (95.2)$ $2806 (95.4)$ 0.021 No $1 (0.7)$ $134 (4.8)$ $135 (4.6)$ Smoke, n (%) 0.021 0.025 Current $15 (10.6)$ $310 (11.1)$ $325 (11.1)$ 0.925 Former $37 (26.1)$ $690 (24.7)$ $727 (24.7)$ 0.925 Never $90 (63.4)$ $1799 (64.3)$ $188 (0.2)$ 0.021 Moderate drink, n (%) $2215 (79.1)$ $2321 (78.9)$ 0.241 No $36 (25.4)$ $584 (20.9)$ $620 (21.1)$ 0.999 Sufficient exercise per week, n (%) $1725 (61.6)$ $1812 (61.6)$ 0.999 No $87 (61.3)$ $1725 (61.6)$ $1812 (61.6)$ 0.250 General health score, n (%) $1725 (61.6)$ $1812 (61.6)$ 0.250 Excellent $18 (12.7)$ $343 (12.3)$ $361 (12.3)$ 0.250 Fair $17 (12.0)$ $327 (11.7)$ $344 (11.7)$ 0.250 Food $42 (3.10)$ $1008 (36.0)$ $1065 (36.2)$ 0.250 Fair $17 (12.0)$ $327 (11.7)$ $344 (11.7)$ 0.250 Poor 64.2 $59 (21.1)$ $61 (2.2)$ 0.250 Fair $17 (12.0)$ $327 (11.7)$ $344 (11.7)$ 0.01 No to use $7 (4.9)$ $196 (7.0)$ $203 (6.9)$ 0.01 Very good $44 (8.7)$ $209 (75.0)$ $2225 (75.7)$ <td>USD 50,000 to <usd 75,000<="" td=""><td>24 (16.9)</td><td>464 (16.6)</td><td>488 (16.6)</td><td></td></usd></td>	USD 50,000 to <usd 75,000<="" td=""><td>24 (16.9)</td><td>464 (16.6)</td><td>488 (16.6)</td><td></td></usd>	24 (16.9)	464 (16.6)	488 (16.6)	
Insurance, n (%) Constrained Yes 141 (99.3) 2665 (95.2) 2806 (95.4) 0.021 No 1 (0.7) 134 (4.8) 135 (4.6) Smoke, n (%) Current 15 (10.6) 310 (11.1) 325 (11.1) 0.925 Former 37 (26.1) 690 (24.7) 727 (24.7) Never 90 (63.4) 1799 (64.3) 1889 (64.2) Moderate drink, n (%) 215 (79.1) 2321 (78.9) 0.241 Yes 106 (74.6) 2215 (79.1) 2321 (78.9) 0.241 No 36 (25.4) 3584 (20.9) 620 (21.1) Sufficient exercise per week, n (%) 1129 (38.4) 0.999 No 36 (13.2) 1074 (38.4) 1129 (38.4) 0.999 No 87 (40.1) 1008 (36.0) 1062 (37.9) 106 (37.6) 0.250 General health score, n (%) Item in the intervet i	USD 75,000 or More	67 (47.2)	1263 (45.1)	1330 (45.2)	
Yes141 (99.3)2665 (95.2)2806 (95.4)0.021No1 (0.7)134 (4.8)135 (4.6)Smoke, n (%)Current15 (10.6)310 (11.1)325 (11.1)0.925Former37 (26.1)690 (24.7)727 (24.7)Never90 (63.4)1799 (64.3)1889 (64.2)Moderate drink, n (%) </td <td>Insurance, n (%)</td> <td>× ,</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Insurance, n (%)	× ,			
No1 (0.7)134 (4.8)135 (4.6)Smoke, n (%)	Yes	141 (99.3)	2665 (95.2)	2806 (95.4)	0.021
Smoke, n (%)0.925Current15 (10.6)310 (11.1)325 (11.1)0.925Former37 (26.1)690 (24.7)727 (24.7)0Never90 (63.4)1799 (64.3)1889 (64.2)0Moderate drink, n (%)727 (24.7)727 (24.7)0Yes106 (74.6)2215 (79.1)3221 (78.9)0.241No36 (25.4)584 (20.9)620 (21.1)0Sufficient exercise per week, n (%)727 (48.4)0.9990Yes55 (38.7)1074 (38.4)1129 (38.4)0.999No87 (61.3)1725 (61.6)1812 (61.6)0General health score, n (%)1361 (12.3)361 (12.3)Very good44 (31.0)1062 (37.9)1106 (37.6)0.250Good57 (40.1)1008 (36.0)1065 (36.2)1Fair17 (12.0)327 (11.7)344 (11.7)1Poor6 (4.2)59 (2.1)65 (2.2)1Fairly cancer history, n (%)12099 (75.0)2225 (75.7)<0.01	No	1 (0.7)	134 (4.8)	135 (4.6)	
Current15 (10.6)310 (11.1)325 (11.1)0.925Former37 (26.1)690 (24.7)727 (24.7)Never90 (63.4)1799 (64.3)1889 (64.2)Moderate drink, n (%) u u u Yes106 (74.6)2215 (79.1)2321 (78.9)0.241No36 (25.4)584 (20.9)620 (21.1)Sufficient exercise per week, n (%) u u u Yes55 (38.7)1074 (38.4)1129 (38.4)0.999No87 (61.3)1275 (61.6)1812 (61.6)General health score, n (%) u u u u Excellent18 (12.7)343 (12.3)361 (12.3)0.250Good57 (40.1)1008 (36.6)10065 (36.2) u Fair17 (12.0)327 (11.7)344 (11.7) v Poor6 (4.2)59 (2.1)65 (2.2) u Family cancer history, n (%) u u u u Yes126 (88.7)2099 (75.0)2225 (75.7)<0.01	Smoke, n (%)				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Current	15 (10.6)	310 (11.1)	325 (11.1)	0.925
Never 106 (94.3) 1069 (94.2) Moderate drink, n (%) 799 (94.3) 1069 (94.2) Yes 106 (74.6) 2215 (79.1) 2321 (78.9) 0.241 No 36 (25.4) 584 (20.9) 620 (21.1) 106 Sufficient exercise per week, n (%) 7 7 7 7 7 Yes 55 (38.7) 1074 (38.4) 1129 (38.4) 0.999 No 87 (61.3) 1725 (61.6) 1812 (61.6) 1812 (61.6) General health score, n (%) 7 7 361 (12.3) 7 Very good 44 (31.0) 1062 (37.9) 1106 (37.6) 0.250 Good 57 (40.1) 1008 (36.0) 1065 (36.2) 106 Fair 17 (12.0) 327 (11.7) 344 (11.7) 7 Poor 6 (4.2) 59 (2.1) 65 (2.2) 106 Fair 17 (12.0) 327 (11.7) 344 (11.7) 7 Poor 6 (4.2) 59 (2.1) 65 (2.2) 0.01 No 9 (6.3)	Former	37 (26.1)	690 (24.7) 1700 (64.2)	127 (24.7)	
Yes 106 (74.6) 2215 (79.1) 2321 (78.9) 0.241 No 36 (25.4) 584 (20.9) 620 (21.1) Sufficient exercise per week, n (%) Yes 55 (38.7) 1074 (38.4) 1129 (38.4) 0.999 No 87 (61.3) 1725 (61.6) 1812 (61.6) General health score, n (%) Excellent 18 (12.7) 343 (12.3) 361 (12.3) 0.250 Good 57 (40.1) 1008 (36.0) 1106 (37.6) 0.250 Good 57 (40.1) 1008 (36.0) 1065 (36.2) Fair 17 (12.0) 327 (11.7) 344 (11.7) Poor 6 (4.2) 59 (2.1) 65 (36.2) 0.250	Moderate drink n (%)	90 (63.4)	1799 (64.3)	1889 (64.2)	
No36 (25.4)264 (20.9)2620 (21.1)Sufficient exercise per week, n (%) $$	Yes	106 (74 6)	2215 (79.1)	2321 (78 9)	0 241
Sufficient exercise per week, n (%)Yes55 (38.7) 1074 (38.4) 1129 (38.4) 0.999 No87 (61.3) 1725 (61.6) 1812 (61.6)General health score, n (%) 122 (31.6) 1812 (31.6)Excellent18 (12.7) 343 (12.3) 361 (12.3)Very good44 (31.0) 1062 (37.9) 1106 (37.6) 0.250 Good57 (40.1) 1008 (36.0) 1065 (36.2) 760 Fair17 (12.0) 327 (11.7) 344 (11.7) 760 Poor6 (4.2)59 (2.1) 65 (2.2) 7760 Family cancer history, n (%) 74.9 196 (7.0) 2225 (75.7) <0.01 No9 (6.3) 504 (18.0) 513 (17.4) 74.9 Ever had cancer, n (%) 74.9 196 (7.0) 203 (6.9) 2468 (83.9)No92 (64.8) 2376 (84.9) 2468 (83.9) <70.01	No	36 (25.4)	584 (20.9)	620 (21.1)	0.211
Yes55 (38.7)1074 (38.4)1129 (38.4)0.999No87 (61.3)1725 (61.6)1812 (61.6)General health score, n (%) $=$ $=$ Excellent18 (12.7)343 (12.3)361 (12.3)Very good44 (31.0)1062 (37.9)1106 (37.6)0.250Good57 (40.1)1008 (36.0)1065 (36.2)Fair17 (12.0)327 (11.7)344 (11.7)Poor6 (4.2)59 (2.1)65 (2.2)Family cancer history, n (%) $=$ $=$ Yes126 (88.7)2099 (75.0)2225 (75.7)No9 (6.3)504 (18.0)513 (17.4)Not sure7 (4.9)196 (7.0)203 (6.9)Ever had cancer, n (%) $=$ $=$ Yes50 (35.2)423 (15.1)473 (16.1)No92 (64.8)2376 (84.9)2468 (83.9)	Sufficient exercise per week, n (%)	× /		× /	
No87 (61.3)1725 (61.6)1812 (61.6)General health score, n (%) $Very$ good18 (12.7)343 (12.3)361 (12.3)Very good44 (31.0)1062 (37.9)1106 (37.6)0.250Good57 (40.1)1008 (36.0)1065 (36.2) $Very$ good44 (11.7)Fair17 (12.0)327 (11.7)344 (11.7) $Very$ good $Very$ (64.2)59 (2.1) $S6$ (2.2)Family cancer history, n (%) $Very$ $Very$ (6.3)504 (18.0)513 (17.4) $Very$ No9 (6.3)504 (18.0)513 (17.4) $Very$ $Very$ Not sure $Very$ $Very$ $Very$ $Very$ $Very$ $Very$ Yes50 (35.2)423 (15.1)473 (16.1) $Very$ $Very$ No92 (64.8)2376 (84.9)2468 (83.9) $Very$	Yes	55 (38.7)	1074 (38.4)	1129 (38.4)	0.999
General health score, n (%) I8 (12.7) 343 (12.3) 361 (12.3) Excellent 18 (12.7) 343 (12.3) 361 (12.3) Very good 44 (31.0) 1062 (37.9) 1106 (36.6) 0.250 Good 57 (40.1) 1008 (36.0) 1065 (36.2) Fair 17 (12.0) 327 (11.7) 344 (11.7) Poor 6 (4.2) 59 (2.1) 65 (2.2) Family cancer history, n (%) 7 2099 (75.0) 2225 (75.7) <0.01	No	87 (61.3)	1725 (61.6)	1812 (61.6)	
Excellent18 (12.7) $343 (12.3)$ $361 (12.3)$ Very good44 (31.0) $1062 (37.9)$ $1106 (37.6)$ 0.250 Good57 (40.1) $1008 (36.0)$ $1065 (36.2)$ Fair17 (12.0) $327 (11.7)$ $344 (11.7)$ Poor6 (4.2)59 (2.1)65 (2.2)Family cancer history, n (%)72099 (75.0)2225 (75.7)Yes126 (88.7)2099 (75.0)2225 (75.7)No9 (6.3)504 (18.0)513 (17.4)Not sure7 (4.9)196 (7.0)203 (6.9)Ever had cancer, n (%)77423 (15.1)473 (16.1)No92 (64.8)2376 (84.9)2468 (83.9)	General health score, n (%)				
Very good $44 (31.0)$ $1062 (37.9)$ $1106 (37.6)$ 0.250 Good $57 (40.1)$ $1008 (36.0)$ $1066 (37.6)$ 0.250 Fair $17 (12.0)$ $327 (11.7)$ $344 (11.7)$ Poor $6 (4.2)$ $59 (2.1)$ $65 (2.2)$ Family cancer history, n (%) V V V Yes $126 (88.7)$ $2099 (75.0)$ $2225 (75.7)$ No $9 (6.3)$ $504 (18.0)$ $513 (17.4)$ No sure $7 (4.9)$ $196 (7.0)$ $203 (6.9)$ Ever had cancer, n (%) V V V Yes $50 (35.2)$ $423 (15.1)$ $473 (16.1)$ No $92 (64.8)$ $2376 (84.9)$ $2468 (83.9)$	Excellent	18 (12.7)	343 (12.3)	361 (12.3)	
Good 57 (40.1) 1008 (36.0) 1005 (36.2) Fair 17 (12.0) 327 (11.7) 344 (11.7) Poor 6 (4.2) 59 (2.1) 65 (2.2) Family cancer history, n (%)	Very good	44 (31.0)	1062 (37.9)	1106 (37.6)	0.250
Poor 6 (4.2) 59 (2.1) 544 (11.7) Poor 6 (4.2) 59 (2.1) 65 (2.2) Family cancer history, n (%) 7 2099 (75.0) 2225 (75.7) <0.01	Good	57 (40.1) 17 (12.0)	1008 (36.0)	1065(36.2) 344(11.7)	
Family cancer history, n (%) 126 (88.7) 2099 (75.0) 2225 (75.7) <0.01 No 9 (6.3) 504 (18.0) 513 (17.4) Not sure 7 (4.9) 196 (7.0) 203 (6.9) Ever had cancer, n (%) Yes 50 (35.2) 423 (15.1) 473 (16.1) <0.01	Poor	6(4.2)	59 (2 1)	65 (2 2)	
Yes 126 (88.7) 2099 (75.0) 2225 (75.7) <0.01 No 9 (6.3) 504 (18.0) 513 (17.4) Not sure 7 (4.9) 196 (7.0) 203 (6.9) Ever had cancer, n (%) Yes 50 (35.2) 423 (15.1) 473 (16.1) <0.01	Family cancer history n (%)	0(1.2)	J (2.1)	00 (2.2)	
No 9 (6.3) 504 (18.0) 513 (17.4) Not sure 7 (4.9) 196 (7.0) 203 (6.9) Ever had cancer, n (%) 7 423 (15.1) 473 (16.1) <0.01	Yes	126 (88.7)	2099 (75.0)	2225 (75.7)	<0.01
Not sure 7 (4.9) 196 (7.0) 203 (6.9) Ever had cancer, n (%) 7 423 (15.1) 473 (16.1) <0.01	No	9 (6.3)	504 (18.0)	513 (17.4)	
Ever had cancer, n (%) 50 (35.2) 423 (15.1) 473 (16.1) <0.01 No 92 (64.8) 2376 (84.9) 2468 (83.9)	Not sure	7 (4.9)	196 (7.0)	203 (6.9)	
Yes 50 (35.2) 423 (15.1) 473 (16.1) <0.01 No 92 (64.8) 2376 (84.9) 2468 (83.9)	Ever had cancer, n (%)	. ,			
No 92 (64.8) 2376 (84.9) 2468 (83.9)	Yes	50 (35.2)	423 (15.1)	473 (16.1)	< 0.01
	No	92 (64.8)	2376 (84.9)	2468 (83.9)	

Table 1. Population characteristics of all study participants and participants stratified by uptake of genetic testing.

Characteristics	Did Genetic Testing (n = 142)	Did Not (n = 2799)	Total (n = 2941)	<i>p</i> Value
Information source				
Newspaper, n (%)				
Yes	29 (20.4)	417 (14.9)	446 (15.2)	0.095
No	113 (79.6)	2382 (85.1)	2495 (84.8)	
Magazine, n (%)				
Yes	31 (21.8)	493 (17.6)	524 (17.8)	0.242
No	111 (78.2)	2306 (82.4)	2417 (82.2)	
Radio, n (%)				
Yes	17 (12.0)	464 (16.6)	481 (16.4)	0.183
No	125 (88.0)	2335 (83.4)	2460 (83.6)	
Healthcare provider, n (%)				
Yes	85 (59.9)	485 (17.3)	570 (19.4)	< 0.01
No	57 (40.1)	2314 (82.7)	2371 (80.6)	
Genetic counsellor, n (%)				
Yes	39 (27.5)	66 (2.4)	105 (3.6)	< 0.01
No	103 (72.5)	2733 (97.6)	2836 (96.4)	
Family member, n (%)				
Yes	55 (38.7)	1032 (36.9)	1087 (37.0)	0.712
No	87 (61.3)	1767 (63.1)	1854 (63.0)	
Friend, n (%)				
Yes	38 (26.8)	797 (28.5)	835 (28.4)	0.729
No	104 (73.2)	2002 (71.5)	2106 (71.6)	
Social media, n (%)				
Yes	42 (29.6)	921 (32.9)	963 (32.7)	0.464
No	100 (70.4)	1878 (67.1)	1978 (67.3)	
Television, n (%)				
Yes	73 (51.4)	1769 (63.2)	1842 (62.6)	< 0.01
No	69 (48.6)	1030 (36.8)	1099 (37.4)	
Internet, n (%)				
Yes	74 (52.1)	1369 (48.9)	1443 (49.1)	0.510
No	68 (47.9)	1430 (51.1)	1498 (50.9)	

Table 2. Information sources about genetic testing in all study participants and participants stratified by uptake of genetic testing.

With regards to the perceived importance of genetic information, the majority of participants approved of the importance for cancer prevention ('a lot' and 'somewhat important' categories combined, 80.4%), detection (85.7%), and treatment (79.5%). Participants who had a higher perceived importance of genetic information for cancer prevention, detection, and treatment, were more likely to report an uptake of genetic testing than those who had a lower perceived importance (Table 3).

Table 3. Perceptions of genetic testing in all study participants and participants stratified by uptake of genetic testing.

Characteristics	Did Genetic Testing (n = 142)	Did Not (n = 2799)	Total (n = 2941)	p Value
Perception				
Preventing cancer, n (%)				
A lot	91 (64.1)	1285 (45.9)	1376 (46.8)	
Somewhat	38 (26.8)	949 (33.9)	987 (33.6)	< 0.001
A little	9 (6.3)	395 (14.1)	404 (13.7)	
Not at all	4 (2.8)	170 (6.1)	174 (5.9)	
Detecting cancer, n (%)				
A lot	105 (73.9)	1515 (54.1)	1620 (55.1)	
Somewhat	32 (22.5)	868 (31.0)	900 (30.6)	< 0.001
A little	3 (2.1)	297 (10.6)	300 (10.2)	
Not at all	2 (1.4)	119 (4.3)	121 (4.1)	
Treating cancer, n (%)				
A lot	88 (62.0)	1334 (47.7)	1422 (48.4)	
Somewhat	32 (22.5)	884 (31.6)	916 (31.1)	< 0.001
A little	9 (6.3)	394 (14.1)	403 (13.7)	
Not at all	13 (9.2)	187 (6.7)	200 (6.8)	

Figure 3 summarizes the pathway model of influential variables for the uptake of genetic testing, where only statistically significant variables are included. Among the paths that led to the uptake of genetic testing, perception variables (cancer prevention, detection, and treatment) showed a considerable positive impact (standardized β (95% CIs): 0.25 (0.20, 0.30), 0.28 (0.23, 0.33) and 0.12 (0.06, 0.17), respectively), whereas the influence from psychosocial variables (cancer worries and information avoidance) were

much smaller with either a positive or negative effect (standardized β (95% CIs): 0.06 (0.02, 0.09) and -0.06 (-0.09, -0.03), respectively). Perception variables were all strongly affected by information provided by health professionals (i.e., healthcare providers and genetic counsellors, Figure 3). Among the four attitudinal variables, only 'behavior change' had a significant negative effect on information avoidance (standardized β (95% CIs): -0.22 (-0.26, -0.17)), while also exhibiting a weak positive effect on cancer worries (standardized β (95% CIs): 0.05 (0, 0.09)). Additionally, an attitude towards 'everything causes cancer' had a significantly positive relationship with cancer worries (standardized β (95% CIs): 0.11 (0.07, 0.16)). Television was not significantly involved in the pathway model.



Figure 3. Pathway model for the uptake of cancer genetic testing (arrows indicate the conceptual route from influential to affected factors in particular pathways; values indicate the magnitude and direction of the effect of particular pathways; stars demonstrate the level of statistical significance: * p < 0.05 and ** p < 0.01). Results are adjusted for gender, occupation, insurance, family cancer history, personal cancer history, age group, race, education, and marital status).

4. Discussion

This study has reported the public's perspectives on the genetic testing for cancer risks. One particular novelty is that we have integrated information sources into the behavioral model for predicting the uptake of cancer risk genetic testing. This study advocates for a better understanding of the factors associated with the uptake of cancer risk genetic testing using a pathway analysis, which may underpin certain issues on the topic and may encourage a better atmosphere for public participation in this healthcare practice.

Information about cancer risk genetic testing from particular media types, as the original source of knowledge, was studied in our pathway analysis. This 'media-perceptionuptake' pathway model should be considered as a meaningful contribution to the existing behavior models on genetic testing engagement, since our results show that only information expressed by certain sources have a positive impact. Healthcare providers and genetic counsellors were the only two sources of information that positively influenced individuals' perceptions on cancer genetic testing in our analysis. However, the proportion of study participants receiving information about genetic testing from these two sources were small. In particular, only about 4% of participants received information from genetic counsellors (Table 2). It is thus important to proactively engage genetic counsellors in the education of cancer risk genetic testing [47]. However, gaps between the services that genetic counsellors can offer and the expectations for genetic testing products have been identified [48].

Direct to consumer genetic testing (DCGT) has become an emerging service that allows individuals to have their genetic background examined without having to consult an expert [49]. However, it was found that many DCGT offers do not meet a minimum set of quality criteria that is necessary for ensuring that adequate information and protection is given to customers against misleading interpretations of the need for, as well as the possible consequences of, genetic testing; most DCGT offers fail to provide proper information on the scientific evidence behind genetic testing services offered to customers (clinical validity and utility), and many of the companies offering genetic testing services via the internet do not include genetic counseling at all in their services [43]. In a follow-up study, approximately 15% of DCGT customers still contacted genetic counsellors, as they believed that such consultation would enhance their knowledge about the genetics and, in particular, the interpretations of their own testing results [50]. However, many surveyed genetic counsellors were reluctant to provide the genetic counseling service to the DCGT customers since they believed that such a service should be provided by the DCGT companies [43]. With the burden on genetic services, including the current topic of cancer risk genetic testing, there is an argument for the increased and adaptive use of genetic counsellors [51].

Our results also showed that television was the largest source of information for genetic testing (63%, Table 2). However, the effect of television on the perceived importance of genetic information was not statistically significant in our pathway model. According to Allen et al., exposure to television cancer advertisements rarely alleviates individual concerns about the risk of cancer or cancer prevention, as most advertisements focus on fear-based emotional appeal and cancer treatment rather than prevention [52]. In addition, we also observed little effect of internet, newspaper, magazine, radio, and social communications (social media, families and friends), as the source of information about genetic testing, on the uptake of cancer risk genetic testing. Our results suggest that the mass media itself, or the current presentation of knowledge on these platforms, may not be an effective method to sufficiently deliver information which could actually increase the uptake of genetic testing.

In the framework of pathway analysis, our results suggest that the studied attitudinal variables (i.e., 'everything causes cancer', 'prevention is not possible', 'too many recommendations to follow', and 'behavior change') are not directly associated with the uptake of cancer risk genetic testing. Instead, some variables (including 'everything causes cancer' and 'behavior change') are found to be associated with psychosocial variables, although some psychosocial variables are also found to be associated with the uptake of testing. This observation is generally consistent with the findings of a previous study which also used the HINTS database (of 2017) [53]. In a younger population group (aged 25–40 years old), however, attitudes towards undergoing genetic testing are identified as significant predictors of testing uptake [29]. Nevertheless, the attitudinal variables in our analysis are measurements more about general beliefs and attitudes towards cancer than exact attitudes towards genetic testing.

Results in our analysis suggest that some psychosocial variables (i.e., 'cancer worries' and 'information avoidance') are significantly involved in our pathway model influencing the uptake of genetic testing. However, a previous study, which also used the HINTS database but in a different cycle (2017), concluded that psychosocial variables were not associated with uptake [53]. In our study, a general concept of testing was used as it referred to all possible types of cancer-related genetic testing, whereas the previous study used a more specific concept where only testing for BRCA 1/2 and Lynch syndrome risks

was included [53]. The current study, using an existing survey, demonstrates that 'cancer worries' and 'information avoidance' are two independent factors influencing the uptake of genetic testing through different pathways (Figure 3). However, the actual situation may be far more complicated. For example, 'cancer worries' could be the basis for certain types of 'information avoidance', such as doctor avoidance [54]. These two factors could be intertwined and have an interactive impact on the uptake of genetic testing within the same group of individuals.

This study has several limitations. It is a survey-based study, therefore information used for analysis is self-reported and the data is cross-sectional in nature. The HINTS 2020 is adapted to perform this pathway analysis, so the analysis is limited to the scale and concept of the variables collected in the survey. HINTS aims to collect nationally representative samples within the USA. However, its response rate is relatively low, therefore selection bias may exist. We constructed a behavior model to demonstrate the 'media-perception-uptake' pathway for the general population, but not all genetic testing services should be recommended for such people. Analysis for those recognized as potentially high-risk individuals from initial screening (e.g., based on age, BMI, smoking, alcohol use, exposed to certain agents, having certain symptoms, etc.) is required.

In conclusion, using the HINTS 2020 database, our study demonstrated the effective pathways regarding the factors associated with the uptake of cancer genetic testing, while estimating the size of these effects (direct or indirect) from certain media exposures, perceptional variables, attitudinal variables, and psychosocial variables on the testing uptake. We suggest that information about genetic testing from only professional sources (such as healthcare providers and genetic counsellors) would positively influence individuals' perceptions on cancer genetic testing. Our pathway model also suggests that the perceived importance of genetic information on preventing, detecting, and treating cancer is the direct and strongest predictor for the uptake of genetic testing. Our study brings several novel perspectives to the behavior model and may underpin certain issues regarding the genetic testing for cancer risks. To confirm the results, studies with larger scales or more representative populations must be conducted, preferably in other countries besides the USA.

Author Contributions: Y.C. developed the preliminary idea. X.D., J.H., Y.Y. and L.Z. developed the methods and analyzed the data and wrote the initial draft of the manuscript. Y.C. and T.L. provided substantive comments and finalized the manuscript. All authors contributed to the study design and interpretation of the data, and all authors approved the final version of the manuscript submitted for publication. X.D., J.H., Y.Y. and L.Z. contributed equally to this paper. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding, whereas it was supported by Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship (XJTLU-SURF) Programme 2021 (ID 2021115).

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study due to that it is based on a publicly open access database containing only anonymous information.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Data and survey instruments are available on https://hints.cancer. gov/, accessed on 18 November 2022.

Acknowledgments: The authors thank the other colleagues at the Wisdom Lake Academy of Pharmacy, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University for their academic and administrative support. Y.C. would like to express his special appreciation for the arrival of his baby daughter, with whom the process of manuscript writing has become a particularly memorable and enjoyable moment.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Sung, H.; Ferlay, J.; Siegel, R.L.; Laversanne, M.; Soerjomataram, I.; Jemal, A.; Bray, F. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. *CA Cancer J. Clin.* 2021, 71, 209–249. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Global Burden of Disease Cancer Collaboration; Fitzmaurice, C.; Abate, D.; Abbasi, N.; Abbastabar, H.; Abd-Allah, F.; Abdel-Rahman, O.; Abdelalim, A.; Abdoli, A.; Abdollahpour, I.; et al. Global, Regional, and National Cancer Incidence, Mortality, Years of Life Lost, Years Lived with Disability, and Disability-Adjusted Life-Years for 29 Cancer Groups, 1990 to 2017: A Systematic Analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study. *JAMA Oncol.* 2019, 5, 1749–1768. [CrossRef]
- 3. Young, K.; Bowers, A.; Bradford, N. Families' Experiences of Child and Adolescent Brain Tumor: A Systematic Review and Synthesis of Qualitative Research. *Psychooncology* **2021**, *30*, 1643–1662. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 4. Kurtz, M.E.; Kurtz, J.C.; Given, C.W.; Given, B.A. Depression and Physical Health among Family Caregivers of Geriatric Patients with Cancer—A Longitudinal View. *Med. Sci. Monit.* **2004**, *10*, CR447–CR456. [PubMed]
- Kanter, C.; D'Agostino, N.M.; Daniels, M.; Stone, A.; Edelstein, K. Together and Apart: Providing Psychosocial Support for Patients and Families Living with Brain Tumors. *Support Care Cancer* 2014, 22, 43–52. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 6. Kristjanson, L.J.; Ashcroft, T. The Family's Cancer Journey: A Literature Review. Cancer Nurs. 1994, 17, 1–17. [CrossRef]
- Duggan, C.; Dvaladze, A.L.; Tsu, V.; Jeronimo, J.; Constant, T.K.H.; Romanoff, A.; Scheel, J.R.; Patel, S.; Gralow, J.R.; Anderson, B.O. Resource-Stratified Implementation of a Community-Based Breast Cancer Management Programme in Peru. *Lancet Oncol.* 2017, 18, e607–e617. [CrossRef]
- 8. Dare, A.J.; Knapp, G.C.; Romanoff, A.; Olasehinde, O.; Famurewa, O.C.; Komolafe, A.O.; Olatoke, S.; Katung, A.; Alatise, O.I.; Kingham, T.P. High-Burden Cancers in Middle-Income Countries: A Review of Prevention and Early Detection Strategies Targeting At-Risk Populations. *Cancer Prev. Res.* **2021**, *14*, 1061–1074. [CrossRef]
- Arbyn, M.; Ronco, G.; Anttila, A.; Meijer, C.J.L.M.; Poljak, M.; Ogilvie, G.; Koliopoulos, G.; Naucler, P.; Sankaranarayanan, R.; Peto, J. Evidence Regarding Human Papillomavirus Testing in Secondary Prevention of Cervical Cancer. *Vaccine* 2012, 30 (Suppl. S5), F88–F99. [CrossRef]
- 10. Lamartina, L.; Grani, G.; Durante, C.; Filetti, S.; Cooper, D.S. Screening for Differentiated Thyroid Cancer in Selected Populations. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol.* 2020, *8*, 81–88. [CrossRef]
- Khoury, M.J.; Gwinn, M.; Yoon, P.W.; Dowling, N.; Moore, C.A.; Bradley, L. The Continuum of Translation Research in Genomic Medicine: How Can We Accelerate the Appropriate Integration of Human Genome Discoveries into Health Care and Disease Prevention? *Genet. Med.* 2007, 9, 665–674. [CrossRef]
- Khoury, M.J.; Clauser, S.B.; Freedman, A.N.; Gillanders, E.M.; Glasgow, R.E.; Klein, W.M.P.; Schully, S.D. Population Sciences, Translational Research, and the Opportunities and Challenges for Genomics to Reduce the Burden of Cancer in the 21st Century. *Cancer Epidemiol. Biomark. Prev.* 2011, 20, 2105–2114. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Dong, S.M.; Traverso, G.; Johnson, C.; Geng, L.; Favis, R.; Boynton, K.; Hibi, K.; Goodman, S.N.; D'Allessio, M.; Paty, P.; et al. Detecting Colorectal Cancer in Stool with the Use of Multiple Genetic Targets. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 2001, 93, 858–865. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Miller-Wilson, L.-A.; Rutten, L.J.F.; Van Thomme, J.; Ozbay, A.B.; Limburg, P.J. Cross-Sectional Adherence with the Multi-Target Stool DNA Test for Colorectal Cancer Screening in a Large, Nationally Insured Cohort. *Int. J. Colorectal Dis.* 2021, *36*, 2471–2480. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 15. Jin, J.; Wu, X.; Yin, J.; Li, M.; Shen, J.; Li, J.; Zhao, Y.; Zhao, Q.; Wu, J.; Wen, Q.; et al. Identification of Genetic Mutations in Cancer: Challenge and Opportunity in the New Era of Targeted Therapy. *Front. Oncol.* **2019**, *9*, 263. [CrossRef]
- 16. Werner, H.M.J.; Mills, G.B.; Ram, P.T. Cancer Systems Biology: A Peek into the Future of Patient Care? *Nat. Rev. Clin. Oncol.* 2014, 11, 167–176. [CrossRef]
- 17. Kastrinos, F.; Samadder, N.J.; Burt, R.W. Use of Family History and Genetic Testing to Determine Risk of Colorectal Cancer. *Gastroenterology* **2020**, *158*, 389–403. [CrossRef]
- 18. Binefa, G.; Rodríguez-Moranta, F.; Teule, A.; Medina-Hayas, M. Colorectal Cancer: From Prevention to Personalized Medicine. *World J. Gastroenterol.* **2014**, *20*, 6786–6808. [CrossRef]
- 19. Brittain, H.K.; Scott, R.; Thomas, E. The Rise of the Genome and Personalised Medicine. Clin. Med. 2017, 17, 545–551. [CrossRef]
- 20. Marteau, T.M.; Lerman, C. Genetic Risk and Behavioural Change. BMJ 2001, 322, 1056–1059. [CrossRef]
- 21. Meiser, B. Psychological Impact of Genetic Testing for Cancer Susceptibility: An Update of the Literature. *Psychooncology* **2005**, *14*, 1060–1074. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 22. Vadaparampil, S.T.; Miree, C.A.; Wilson, C.; Jacobsen, P.B. Psychosocial and Behavioral Impact of Genetic Counseling and Testing. *Breast Dis.* 2006, 27, 97–108. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 23. Roberts, J.S. Assessing the Psychological Impact of Genetic Susceptibility Testing. *Hastings Cent. Rep.* **2019**, 49 (Suppl. S1), S38–S43. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 24. Metcalfe, A.; Werrett, J.; Burgess, L.; Chapman, C.; Clifford, C. Cancer Genetic Predisposition: Information Needs of Patients Irrespective of Risk Level. *Fam. Cancer* **2009**, *8*, 403–412. [CrossRef]
- 25. Reitz, F.; Barth, J.; Bengel, J. Predictive Value of Breast Cancer Cognitions and Attitudes toward Genetic Testing on Women's Interest in Genetic Testing for Breast Cancer Risk. *Psychosoc. Med.* **2004**, *1*, Doc03.

- Agurs-Collins, T.; Ferrer, R.; Ottenbacher, A.; Waters, E.A.; O'Connell, M.E.; Hamilton, J.G. Public Awareness of Direct-to-Consumer Genetic Tests: Findings from the 2013 U.S. Health Information National Trends Survey. *J. Cancer Educ.* 2015, 30, 799–807. [CrossRef]
- Klein, W.M.P.; O'Connell, M.E.; Bloch, M.H.; Czajkowski, S.M.; Green, P.A.; Han, P.K.J.; Moser, R.P.; Nebeling, L.C.; Vanderpool, R.C. Behavioral Research in Cancer Prevention and Control: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 2022, 114, 179–186. [CrossRef]
- Quinlivan, J.A.; Battikhi, Z.; Petersen, R.W. What Factors Impact upon a Woman's Decision to Undertake Genetic Cancer Testing? Front. Oncol. 2014, 3, 325. [CrossRef]
- Wade, C.H.; Shiloh, S.; Woolford, S.W.; Roberts, J.S.; Alford, S.H.; Marteau, T.M.; Biesecker, B.B. Modelling Decisions to Undergo Genetic Testing for Susceptibility to Common Health Conditions: An Ancillary Study of the Multiplex Initiative. *Psychol. Health* 2012, 27, 430–444. [CrossRef]
- 30. Wolff, K.; Nordin, K.; Brun, W.; Berglund, G.; Kvale, G. Affective and Cognitive Attitudes, Uncertainty Avoidance and Intention to Obtain Genetic Testing: An Extension of the Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Psychol. Health* **2011**, *26*, 1143–1155. [CrossRef]
- Helmes, A.W. Application of the Protection Motivation Theory to Genetic Testing for Breast Cancer Risk. Prev. Med. 2002, 35, 453–462. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Bright, D.; Worley, M.; Porter, B.L. Patient Perceptions of Pharmacogenomic Testing in the Community Pharmacy Setting. *Res. Social. Adm. Pharm.* 2021, 17, 744–749. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Emanuel, A.S.; Kiviniemi, M.T.; Howell, J.L.; Hay, J.L.; Waters, E.A.; Orom, H.; Shepperd, J.A. Avoiding Cancer Risk Information. Soc. Sci. Med. 2015, 147, 113–120. [CrossRef]
- Godard, B.; Pratte, A.; Dumont, M.; Simard-Lebrun, A.; Simard, J. Factors Associated with an Individual's Decision to Withdraw from Genetic Testing for Breast and Ovarian Cancer Susceptibility: Implications for Counseling. *Genet. Test* 2007, 11, 45–54. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Meiser, B.; Collins, V.; Warren, R.; Gaff, C.; St John, D.J.B.; Young, M.-A.; Harrop, K.; Brown, J.; Halliday, J. Psychological Impact of Genetic Testing for Hereditary Non-Polyposis Colorectal Cancer. *Clin. Genet.* 2004, *66*, 502–511. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Gritz, E.R.; Peterson, S.K.; Vernon, S.W.; Marani, S.K.; Baile, W.F.; Watts, B.G.; Amos, C.I.; Frazier, M.L.; Lynch, P.M. Psychological Impact of Genetic Testing for Hereditary Nonpolyposis Colorectal Cancer. J. Clin. Oncol. 2005, 23, 1902–1910. [CrossRef]
- 37. Michie, S.; French, D.P.; Marteau, T.M. Predictive Genetic Testing: Mediators and Moderators of Anxiety. *Int. J. Behav. Med.* 2002, 9, 309–321. [CrossRef]
- Lynch, J.; Parrott, A.; Hopkin, R.J.; Myers, M. Media Coverage of Direct-to-Consumer Genetic Testing. J. Genet. Couns. 2011, 20, 486–494. [CrossRef]
- Lowery, J.T.; Byers, T.; Axell, L.; Ku, L.; Jacobellis, J. The Impact of Direct-to-Consumer Marketing of Cancer Genetic Testing on Women According to Their Genetic Risk. *Genet. Med.* 2008, 10, 888–894. [CrossRef]
- Myers, M.F.; Chang, M.-H.; Jorgensen, C.; Whitworth, W.; Kassim, S.; Litch, J.A.; Armstrong, L.; Bernhardt, B.; Faucett, W.A.; Irwin, D.; et al. Genetic Testing for Susceptibility to Breast and Ovarian Cancer: Evaluating the Impact of a Direct-to-Consumer Marketing Campaign on Physicians' Knowledge and Practices. *Genet. Med.* 2006, *8*, 361–370. [CrossRef]
- Goddard, K.A.B.; Moore, C.; Ottman, D.; Szegda, K.L.; Bradley, L.; Khoury, M.J. Awareness and Use of Direct-to-Consumer Nutrigenomic Tests, United States, 2006. *Genet. Med.* 2007, 9, 510–517. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Mouchawar, J.; Laurion, S.; Ritzwoller, D.P.; Ellis, J.; Kulchak-Rahm, A.; Hensley-Alford, S. Assessing Controversial Direct-to-Consumer Advertising for Hereditary Breast Cancer Testing: Reactions from Women and Their Physicians in a Managed Care Organization. *Am. J. Manag. Care* 2005, *11*, 601–608. [PubMed]
- Hennen, L.; Sauter, A.; Van Den Cruyce, E. Direct to Consumer Genetic Testing: Insights from an Internet Scan. New Genet. Soc. 2010, 29, 167–186. [CrossRef]
- Keller, M.; Jost, R.; Kadmon, M.; Wüllenweber, H.-P.; Haunstetter, C.M.; Willeke, F.; Jung, C.; Gebert, J.; Sutter, C.; Herfarth, C.; et al. Acceptance of and Attitude toward Genetic Testing for Hereditary Nonpolyposis Colorectal Cancer: A Comparison of Participants and Nonparticipants in Genetic Counseling. *Dis. Colon Rectum* 2004, 47, 153–162. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 45. Bellardita, L.; Colciago, R.R.; Frasca, S.; De Santis, M.C.; Gay, S.; Palorini, F.; La Rocca, E.; Valdagni, R.; Rancati, T.; Lozza, L. Breast cancer patient perspective on opportunities and challenges of a genetic test aimed to predict radio-induced side effects before treatment: Analysis of the Italian branch of the REQUITE project. *Radiol. Med.* 2021, 126, 1366–1373. [CrossRef]
- 46. Spencer, S.A.; Rodgers, C.; Coffey, V. Factors Influencing Breast Cancer Genetic Testing Among High Risk African American Women: A Systematic Review. *Internet J. Allied Health Sci. Pract.* **2019**, *17*, 1. [CrossRef]
- Harris, A.; Kelly, S.E.; Wyatt, S. Counseling Customers: Emerging Roles for Genetic Counselors in the Direct-to-Consumer Genetic Testing Market. J. Genet. Couns. 2013, 22, 277–288. [CrossRef]
- Koeller, D.R.; Uhlmann, W.R.; Carere, D.A.; Green, R.C.; Roberts, J.S. PGen Study Group Utilization of Genetic Counseling after Direct-to-Consumer Genetic Testing: Findings from the Impact of Personal Genomics (PGen) Study. J. Genet. Couns. 2017, 26, 1270–1279. [CrossRef]
- 49. Ruhl, G.L.; Hazel, J.W.; Clayton, E.W.; Malin, B.A. Public Attitudes Toward Direct to Consumer Genetic Testing. *AMIA Annu. Symp. Proc.* **2019**, 2019, 774–783.
- Darst, B.F.; Madlensky, L.; Schork, N.J.; Topol, E.J.; Bloss, C.S. Perceptions of Genetic Counseling Services in Direct-to-Consumer Personal Genomic Testing. *Clin. Genet.* 2013, 84, 335–339. [CrossRef]

- 51. The Role of the Genetic Counsellor: A Systematic Review of Research Evidence | European Journal of Human Genetics. Available online: https://www.nature.com/articles/ejhg2014116 (accessed on 14 October 2022).
- 52. Allen, C.G.; McBride, C.M.; Haardörfer, R.; Roberts, M.C. Associations Between Objective Television Exposure and Cancer Perceptions in a National Sample of Adults. *Cancer Control* **2019**, *26*, 1073274819846603. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Roberts, M.C.; Turbitt, E.; Klein, W.M.P. Psychosocial, Attitudinal, and Demographic Correlates of Cancer-Related Germline Genetic Testing in the 2017 Health Information National Trends Survey. J. Community Genet. 2019, 10, 453–459. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 54. Persoskie, A.; Ferrer, R.A.; Klein, W.M.P. Association of Cancer Worry and Perceived Risk with Doctor Avoidance: An Analysis of Information Avoidance in a Nationally Representative US Sample. *J. Behav. Med.* **2014**, *37*, 977–987. [CrossRef] [PubMed]