



OPEN ACCESS

10.1136/eb-2012-101216

Department 7811,
Rigshospitalet, The Nordic
Cochrane Centre, Copenhagen,
Denmark

Correspondence to
Dr Karsten Juhl Jørgensen:
Department 7811,
Rigshospitalet, The Nordic
Cochrane Centre, Blegdamsvej 9,
Copenhagen DK-2100, Denmark;
kj@cochrane.dk

Citations of scientific results and conflicts of interest: the case of mammography screening

Kristine Rasmussen, Karsten Juhl Jørgensen, Peter C Gøtzsche

Abstract

Introduction In 2001, a Cochrane review of mammography screening questioned whether screening reduces breast cancer mortality, and a more comprehensive review in *Lancet*, also in 2001, reported considerable overdiagnosis and overtreatment. This led to a heated debate and a recent review of the evidence by UK experts intended to be independent.

Objective To explore if general medical and specialty journals differed in accepting the results and methods of three Cochrane reviews on mammography screening.

Methods We identified articles citing the *Lancet* review from 2001 or updated versions of the Cochrane review (last search 20 April 2012). We explored which results were quoted, whether the methods and results were accepted (explicit agreement or quoted without caveats), differences between general and specialty journals, and change over time.

Results We included 171 articles. The results for overdiagnosis were not quoted in 87% (148/171) of included articles and the results for breast cancer mortality were not quoted in 53% (91/171) of articles. 11% (7/63) of articles in general medical journals accepted the results for overdiagnosis compared with 3% (3/108) in specialty journals ($p=0.05$). 14% (9/63) of articles in general medical journals accepted the methods of the review compared with 1% (1/108) in specialty journals ($p=0.001$). Specialty journals were more likely to explicitly reject the estimated effect on breast cancer mortality 26% (28/108), compared with 8% (5/63) in general medical journals, $p=0.02$.

Conclusions Articles in specialty journals were more likely to explicitly reject results from the Cochrane reviews, and less likely to accept the results and methods, than articles in general medical journals. Several specialty journals are published by interest groups and some authors have vested interests in mammography screening.

Introduction

In October 2001, the Nordic Cochrane Centre published a Cochrane review of mammography screening, which questioned whether screening reduces breast cancer mortality.¹ Within the same month, the Centre published a more comprehensive review in *Lancet* that also reported on the harms of screening and found considerable overdiagnosis and overtreatment (a 30% increase in the number of mastectomies and tumourectomies).² This resulted in a heated debate, which is still ongoing.³ The Cochrane review was updated in 2006,⁴ to include overdiagnosis, and again in 2009.⁵

Recently, several studies have questioned whether screening is as beneficial as originally claimed,⁶⁻⁸ and confirmed that overdiagnosis is a major harm of breast

cancer screening.⁹⁻¹¹ The US Preventive Services Task Force published updated screening recommendations in November 2009 and asserted that the benefit is smaller than previously thought and that the harms include overdiagnosis and overtreatment, but it did not quantify these harms.¹² The task force changed its previous recommendations and now recommends that women aged 40-49 years discuss with their physician whether breast screening is right for them, and it further recommends biennial screening instead of annual screening for all age groups.¹² These recommendations were repeated in the 2011 Canadian guidelines for breast screening.¹³

Screening is likely to miss aggressive cancers because they grow fast, leaving little time to detect them in their preclinical phases.⁶ Further, the basic assumption that finding and treating early-stage disease will prevent late stage or metastatic disease may not be correct, as breast cancer screening has not reduced the occurrence of large breast cancers¹⁴ or late-stage breast cancers,¹¹ despite the large and sustained increases in early invasive cancers and ductal carcinoma in situ with screening.

A systematic review from 2009 showed that the rate of overdiagnosis in organised breast screening programmes was 52%, which means that one in three cancers diagnosed in a screened population is overdiagnosed.⁹ It is quite likely that many screen-detected cancers would have regressed spontaneously in the absence of screening.^{15 16}

We explored how the first comprehensive systematic review on mammography screening ever performed, the one from 2001 published in *Lancet*,² and the subsequent systematic Cochrane reviews from 2006⁴ and 2009⁵ have been cited from 2001 to April 2012. We investigated whether there were differences between general medical journals and specialty journals regarding which results were mentioned and how overdiagnosis, overtreatment, breast cancer mortality, total mortality, and the methods of the reviews were described. Vested interests on behalf of both journals and contributing authors may be more pronounced in specialty journals, and this may influence views on specific interventions, such as mammography screening.

Methods

We searched for articles quoting one of the three versions of the review^{2 4 5} (date of last search 20 April 2012). We used the 'source titles function' in the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) Web of Knowledge to count the number of times each review had been cited in individual journals. We only included journals in which four or more articles had cited one of the three versions of the review. This criterion led to the exclusion of specialty journals of little relevance for our study, for example, *Nephrology* and *Research in*



Open Access
Scan to access more
free content



► <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/eb-2013-101344>

Gerontological Nursing. Articles written by authors affiliated with the Nordic Cochrane Centre were also excluded.

We could not include the 2001 Cochrane review¹ because it was not indexed by the ISI Web of Knowledge. Furthermore, even if it had been indexed, we would have excluded it. This version of the review¹ is not comparable to the other three versions,²⁻⁵ as the editors of the Cochrane Breast Cancer Group had refused to publish these data on overdiagnosis and overtreatment.

A journal was classified as a general medical journal if it did not preferentially publish papers from a particular medical specialty. A journal was classified as a specialty journal if it preferentially published articles from a particular medical specialty or topic.

When we rated how the papers cited the review, we looked for statements applicable to the following categories:

- ▶ Overdiagnosis
- ▶ Overtreatment
- ▶ Breast cancer mortality
- ▶ Total mortality
- ▶ Methods used in the review

We rated the quoting articles' general opinions about the results and methods of the review using the labels—accept, neutral, reject, unclear, or not applicable, using the following definitions:

Accept: the authors explicitly agreed with the results or methods, or quoted the numerical results without comments.

Neutral: the results or methods were mentioned and the author presented arguments both for and against them.

Reject: the authors explicitly stated that the results or methods were flawed, wrong, or false, or only presented arguments against them. Only reporting a result from a favourable subgroup analysis was also classified as rejected.

Unclear: the results or methods were mentioned, but it was not possible to tell if the authors agreed with them or not, or the results were only mentioned qualitatively. If several conflicting opinions were presented, it would also be classified as unclear.

Not applicable: the review was quoted for something else than its results or methods.

The articles quoting the review were assessed in relation to the five categories (overdiagnosis, overtreatment, breast cancer mortality, total mortality and methods) separately, and no overall assessment of the articles' general opinion about the review was made.

Texts classified as not applicable regarding any of the five categories were reread to determine and note which topics were discussed.

Two researchers (KR, Andreas Brønden Petersen, see Acknowledgements) assessed the text independently. Disagreements were settled by discussion.

In order to ensure blinded data extraction, an assistant (Mads Clausen, see Acknowledgements) not involved with data extraction identified the text sections citing one of the three review versions and copied them into a Microsoft Word document. Only this text was copied, and the two data extractors were therefore unaware of

the author and journal names, time of publication and the title of the article. The fonts of the copied text were converted into Times New Roman, saved in a new document and the text labelled with a random number using the 'Rand function' in Microsoft Excel. The key to matching the text with the articles was not available to data extractors until the assessments had been completed. The person responsible for copying the text made sure it did not contain any information that might reveal which of the three versions of the review had been cited. When there was more than one reference within the copied text, the reference to the review was highlighted to make it clear which statements referred to the review.

All article types, as well as letters to the editor, were included and were classified as research papers, systematic reviews, editorials, letters, guidelines and narratives.

p Values were calculated using Fisher's exact test (two-tailed p values (<http://www.swogstat.org/stat/public/fisher.htm>)).

Results

In total, 523 articles cited one of the three versions of the review: 360 cited the 2001 *Lancet* review,² 123 the 2006 Cochrane review⁴ and 40 the 2009 Cochrane review.⁵ Three articles cited both the 2001 and the 2006 versions of the review; for these, we only used information related to the 2001 citation.

Including only journals that had published at least four articles, which cited one or more of the three versions of the review, the search identified 151, 27 and 15 articles, respectively (193 in total, or 37% of the total of 523 articles). A flow chart is shown in figure 1.

We excluded 22 additional articles, two because there was no reference to the review in the text, even though the review was listed as a reference,^{17 18} and 20 (10, 5 and 5 citing the 2001, 2006 and 2009 versions, respectively) because they had one or more authors affiliated with the Nordic Cochrane Centre.

Thus, 171 articles were included for assessment. In total, 63 articles (37%) were from general medical journals and 108 (63%) from specialty journals. A total of 80 (47%) were from European journals and 91 (53%) from North American journals. No journals from other regions contained at least four articles citing the review.

The general medical journals included were *Lancet* (21 articles), *BMJ* (13 articles), *Annals of Internal Medicine* (13 articles), *Journal of the American Medical Association* (7 articles), *New England Journal of Medicine* (5 articles) and *International Journal of Epidemiology* (4 articles). The specialty journals included *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* (13 articles), *Cancer* (13 articles), *American Journal of Roentgenology* (7 articles) and 15 others (see box 1). Most of the included articles were either research papers (n=63, 37%) or narrative articles (n=44, 26%; table 1).

The text of 32 of the 171 included articles (19%) was rated as not applicable for all the five categories (overdiagnosis, overtreatment, breast cancer mortality, total mortality and methods). In total, 15 of these 32 articles discussed the controversy when the first review was published, without specifically mentioning any of the categories. Other subjects discussed were screening of




Figure 1 Flow diagram of article exclusion.

women under the age of 50 (two articles), and benefits of breast cancer screening other than those in our categories (two articles; see online supplementary appendix 1 for a full list of topics).

The review's conclusions regarding overdiagnosis were not quoted in 87% (149/171) of the included articles and the results for breast cancer mortality were not quoted in 53% (91/171) of the included articles.

General medical journals were more likely to accept the results or methods of systematic reviews than specialty journals, for example, overdiagnosis was classified as accepted in 11% (7/63) of articles in general medical journals, but in only 3% (3/108) of the articles in specialty journals ($p=0.05$), and the methods were accepted in

14% (9/63) of articles in general medical journals, but only in 1% (1/108) of articles in specialty journals ($p=0.001$). Specialty journals were also more likely to reject the results for breast cancer mortality, namely for 26% (28/108) of articles compared with 8% (5/63; $p=0.02$) in general medical journals. The differences between general medical and specialty journals in relation to rejecting the categories overdiagnosis, overtreatment, total mortality and methods were small (table 2).

The European and North American journals were equally likely to reject or accept the review's methods or results (data not shown).

The number of citations of the three versions of the review differed a lot over time (see table 3). Some years had very few citations, the lowest being 2012 and 2006 where the review was cited only 1 and 6 times, respectively. The highest number of citations was in 2002 (42 citations). There were no clear trends over time regarding the number of articles accepting or rejecting the methods and conclusions of the reviews, although the breast cancer mortality results may have received greater acceptance in recent years, for example, in 2002, there was no acceptance of the breast cancer mortality results (0 of 42), whereas 19% (3/16) explicitly accepted them in 2010 ($p=0.02$; data not shown).

The 2001 version of the review had more categories rejected and fewer categories accepted than the 2006 and 2009 versions, for example, 30% (3/10) accepted the results for breast cancer mortality presented in the 2009 version of the review, compared with 0 (0/140) in the 2001 version ($p=0.0002$; see table 4).

Discussion

Although we deliberately reduced the sample size by requiring at least four citations for each included journal, we had enough articles that quoted the review for our comparisons.

Specialty journals were more likely to reject the estimate of the effect of screening on breast cancer mortality than the six general medical journals we included.

Box 1 The specialty journals included in this study

- ▶ Specialty journals included
- ▶ Journal of the National Cancer Institute (13)
- ▶ Cancer (13)
- ▶ European Journal of Cancer (7)
- ▶ British Journal of Cancer (7)
- ▶ American Journal of Roentgenology (7)
- ▶ Cancer Causes and Control (6)
- ▶ Annals of Oncology (6)
- ▶ European Journal of Surgical Oncology (6)
- ▶ Journal of Medical Screening (5)
- ▶ Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers and Prevention (5)
- ▶ CA: a Cancer Journal for Clinicians (5)
- ▶ Journal of Clinical Oncology (5)
- ▶ Radiologic Clinics of North America (5)
- ▶ Oncologist (4)
- ▶ Breast Cancer Research and Treatment (4)
- ▶ Breast (4)
- ▶ Radiology (3)
- ▶ Journal of Surgical Oncology (3)

Table 1 The article types included in this study

	Article type					
	Research	Letter	Editorial	Guideline	Narrative	Review
General EU	8	17	1	0	12	1
General NA	8	5	4	1	5	2
Special EU	27	4	4	0	6	0
Special NA	20	4	14	2	21	5
Total	63	30	23	3	44	8

EU, European; NA, North American.

Articles in general medical journals were also more approving of four of the five individual categories we assessed (overdiagnosis, overtreatment, total mortality and methods) than the specialty journals were and the difference was statistically significant for all the categories, except for breast cancer mortality.

We have previously found that scientific articles on breast screening tend to emphasise the major benefits of mammography screening over its major harms and that overdiagnosis was more often downplayed or rejected in articles written by authors affiliated with screening by specialty or funding, compared with authors unrelated with screening.¹⁹ Recommendations in guidelines for breast screening are also influenced by the authors' medical specialty.²⁰

The difference we found between the general medical and specialty journals could be explained by conflicts of interest, which are likely to be more prevalent in specialty journals owned by political interest groups such as the American Cancer Society or by medical societies with members whose income may depend on the intervention. All the six general medical journals, but only 22% (4/18) of the specialty journals follow the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors' (ICMJE) Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals.²¹ Even though journals have conflict of interest reporting policies, the conflicts of interest reported are not always reliable.²²

All the general medical journals included are members of the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME); however, this is only the case for 22% (4/18) of the specialty journals included. WAME aims to improve the editorial standards and, among other things, to ensure a balanced debate on controversial issues.²³ Being a member of WAME helps with transparency in terms of their guidelines for conflicts of interest, but it also reminds editors to ensure that their journals are covering both sides of a debate.

Development over time

The results and conclusions on breast cancer mortality and overdiagnosis were more often accepted in 2010 than in any other year (data not shown). This may reflect that the criticism of breast screening is becoming more widespread. The ongoing independent review of the National Health Service (NHS) Breast Screening Programme announced by Mike Richards, the UK National Clinical Director for Cancer and End of Life Care, Department of Health, in October 2011 is a further indication of this development.²⁴ Also, the US Preventive Services Task Force changed its recommendations for

breast screening in 2009.¹² Though our data did not show strong time trends, we believe that these developments demonstrate a growing acceptance of the results and conclusions of our systematic review. In support of this, the 2009 version of the Cochrane review has received more approval than disapproval, for example, 30% (3/10) accepted the results for breast cancer mortality presented in the 2009 version of the review, compared with 0 (0/140) in the 2001 version.^{25–31} The US Preventive Services Task Force was heavily criticised after the publication of its new recommendations in 2009,^{29–32} but the criticism came from people with vested interests, and the independent Canadian Task Force supported the conclusions of the US Preventive Services Task Force and the 2009 Cochrane review⁵ in 2011.¹³

The 2001 review published in *Lancet* was by far the most cited of the three reviews. It was 5 years older than the Cochrane review from 2006, but the vast majority of the citations came within the first year of publication. It was unique at the time, as it questioned whether mammography screening was effective, based on a thorough quality assessment of all the randomised controlled trials, and also was the first systematic review to quantify overdiagnosis.

Limitations

A minor part of the included articles (19%, 32/171) did not refer to any of our five specified outcomes. In nearly half of the cases (47%), this was due to the article referring only to the debate that followed the first review,³³ and not its results or methods. The texts also dealt with topics such as false positives or screening women under the age of 50 years. The articles also simply stated that mammography screening was beneficial without further specification. The most frequently used classification for each of our specified categories was not applicable. This was the case for articles in both the general medical and specialty journals, and for articles in the European and North American journals. The text typically dealt with only one or two of our categories, for example, overdiagnosis, and did not mention overtreatment or any other categories.

None of the articles rejected overdiagnosis (0 of 171 articles), which could be because they did not mention the issue at all. This was the case in 76% of scientific articles on breast screening in a previous study by Jørgensen *et al.*¹⁹

Our definition of rejection was that the author should explicitly state that the review's estimate was flawed, wrong or false, or that they should in some way argue against it. With this strict definition, we did not

Table 2 General medical journals compared with specialty journals. Column percentages in brackets

	Overdiagnosis				Overtreatment				Breast cancer mortality				Total mortality				Methods				
	General		Special		General		Special		General		Special		General		Special		General		Special		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Accept	7	(11%)	3	(3%)	7	(11%)	1	(1%)	4	(6%)	2	(2%)	6	(10%)	0	0	9	(14%)	1	(1%)	0.00
Neutral	1	(2%)	0	0	2	(3%)	0	0	4	(6%)	3	(3%)	1	(2%)	0	0	3	(5%)	1	(1%)	0.37
Reject	0	0	0	0	1	(2%)	4	(4%)	5	(8%)	28	(26%)	3	(5%)	6	(6%)	10	(16%)	19	(17%)	1.00
Unclear	2	(3%)	10	(9%)	4	(6%)	11	(10%)	12	(19%)	23	(21%)	9	(14%)	19	(18%)	10	(16%)	13	(12%)	0.68
Not applicable	53	(84%)	95	(88%)	49	(78%)	92	(85%)	38	(60%)	53	(49%)	44	(70%)	83	(77%)	31	(49%)	74	(69%)	0.72

Two-tailed p values are used.

capture authors who have consistently stated over the years in other articles than those we included that they do not believe that overdiagnosis is a problem, and we also did not present their views on the subject.

Numerous articles were classified as unclear for one or more of our categories. The texts in question did not allow an interpretation in any direction and we did not rate the articles as accepting or rejecting the review's results and methods unless it was perfectly clear what the authors meant. This reflects that authors often do not present clear opinions of the intervention which they discuss. An additional explanation for the many articles found to be unclear could be that we did not assess the entire article, and arguments could have been presented elsewhere in the text.

Letters were included in this study, which could explain why some of the articles were classified as not applicable in all the five categories. The specialists who read and respond to letters in their own journals might be more likely to react negatively towards the review because of conflicts of interest.¹⁹ Specialists with a connection to mammography screening also reply to articles in general medical journals when they concern mammography screening. Therefore, it is quite likely that there is a greater difference between the specialists involved with the screening programmes and the doctors not involved in breast cancer screening, in terms of accepting and rejecting the results and methods, than we have found in this study.

Conclusion

Articles in specialty journals were less approving of the results and methods of the systematic review of breast screening than those in general medical journals. This may be explained by conflicts of interest, as several specialty journals were published by groups with vested interests in breast screening, and several articles had authors with vested interests.

Acknowledgements We would like to thank Andreas Brønden Petersen and Mads Clausen for assisting us in preparing the text and extracting data.

Table 3 Number of citations of one of the three reviews per year

Year	Number of citations per year
2001	8
2002	42
2003	28
2004	22
2005	13
2006	6
2007	9
2008	10
2009	10
2010	15
2011	7
2012	1

Table 4 Comparison of the three versions of the review in terms of accepting or rejecting the five categories

	Overdiagnosis			Overtreatment			Breast cancer mortality			Total mortality			Methods		
	2001	2006	P	2001	2006	P	2001	2006	P	2001	2006	P	2001	2006	P
Comparing 2001–2006	4 (3%)	4 (19%)	0.02	5 (4%)	2 (10%)	0.25	0	3 (14%)	0.00	4 (3%)	0	1.00	8 (6%)	1 (5%)	1.00
Accepted	0	0	1.00	4 (3%)	0	1.00	29 (21%)	2 (10%)	0.38	9 (6%)	0	0.60	29 (21%)	0	0.05
Rejected	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00
Comparing 2001–2009	4 (3%)	3 (30%)	0.01	5 (4%)	2 (20%)	0.09	0	3 (30%)	0.00	4 (3%)	2 (20%)	0.07	8 (6%)	1 (10%)	0.48
Accepted	0	0	1.00	4 (3%)	1 (10%)	0.31	29 (21%)	2 (20%)	1.00	9 (6%)	0	1.00	29 (21%)	0	0.37
Rejected	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00
Comparing 2006–2009	4 (19%)	3 (30%)	0.67	2 (10%)	2 (20%)	0.59	3 (14%)	3 (30%)	0.64	0	2 (20%)	0.13	1 (5%)	1 (10%)	1.00
Accepted	0	0	1.00	0	1 (10%)	0.34	2 (10%)	2 (20%)	0.59	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00
Rejected	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00	0	0	1.00

Percentages in brackets are calculated from the total number of articles cited in that version of the review. The total number of articles cited in the 2001 version: 140. The total number of articles cited in the 2006 version: 22. The total number of articles cited in the 2009 version: 10. Two tailed p values are shown.

Contributors KR participated in the design of the study, carried out data analysis, performed statistical analysis and drafted the manuscript. KJJ and PCG both participated in the design of the study and helped to draft the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests None.

Open Access This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 3.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>

References

- Olsen O, Gøtzsche PC. Screening for breast cancer with mammography. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2001;CD001877.
- Olsen O, Gøtzsche PC. Cochrane review on screening for breast cancer with mammography. *Lancet* 2001;358:1340–2.
- Gøtzsche PC. *Mammography screening: truth, lies and controversy*. London: Radcliffe Publishing, 2012.
- Gøtzsche PC, Nielsen M. Screening for breast cancer with mammography. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2006;CD001877.
- Gøtzsche PC, Nielsen M. Screening for breast cancer with mammography. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009;CD001877.
- Esserman L, Shieh Y, Thompson I. Rethinking screening for breast cancer and prostate cancer. *JAMA* 2009;302:1685–92.
- Jørgensen KJ, Zahl PH, Gøtzsche PC. Breast cancer mortality in organised mammography screening in Denmark: comparative study. *BMJ* 2010;340:c1241.
- Autier P, Boniol M, Gavin A, et al. Breast cancer mortality in neighbouring European countries with different levels of screening but similar access to treatment: trend analysis of WHO mortality database. *BMJ* 2011;343:d4411.
- Jørgensen KJ, Gøtzsche PC. Overdiagnosis in publicly organised mammography screening programmes: systematic review of incidence trends. *BMJ* 2009;339:b2587.
- Morrell S, Barratt A, Irwing L, et al. Estimates of overdiagnosis of invasive breast cancer associated with screening mammography. *Cancer Causes Control* 2010;21:275–82.
- Kalager M, Adami HO, Bretthauer M, et al. Overdiagnosis of invasive breast cancer due to mammography screening: results from the Norwegian screening program. *Ann Intern Med* 2012;156:491–9.
- Nelson HD, Tynne K, Naik A, et al. Screening for breast cancer: an update for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. *Ann Intern Med* 2009;151:727–37.
- Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care/Tonelli M, Gorber SC, et al. Recommendations on screening for breast cancer in average-risk women aged 40–74 years. *CMAJ* 2011;183:1991–2001.
- Autier P, Boniol M, Middleton R, et al. Advanced breast cancer incidence following population-based mammographic screening. *Ann Oncol* 2011;22:1726–35.
- Zahl PH, Maehlen J, Welch HG. The natural history of invasive breast cancers detected by screening mammography. *Arch Intern Med* 2008;168:2311–16.
- Zahl PH, Gøtzsche PC, Mæhlen J. Natural history of breast cancers detected in the Swedish mammography screening programme: a cohort study. *Lancet Oncol* 2011;12:1118–24.
- Añorbe E, Aisa P. Screening mammography. *Radiology* 2003;227:903–4.

18. Edwards QT, Li AX, Pike MC, *et al.* Ethnic differences in the use of regular mammography: the multiethnic cohort. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2009;115:163–70.
19. Jørgensen KJ, Klahn A, Gøtzsche PC. Are benefits and harms in mammography screening given equal attention in scientific articles? A cross-sectional study. *BMC Med* 2007;5:12.
20. Norris SL, Burda BU, Holmer HK, *et al.* Author's specialty and conflicts of interest contribute to conflicting guidelines for screening mammography. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2012;65:725–33.
21. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, 2012. <http://www.icmje.org/journals.html#1> (accessed 24 Apr 2013).
22. Riva C, Biollaz J, Foucras P, *et al.* Effect of population-based screening on breast cancer mortality. *Lancet* 2012;379:1296.
23. World Association of Medical Editors, 2013. <http://www.wame.org/about> (accessed 24 Apr 2013).
24. Richards M. An independent review is under way. *BMJ* 2011;343:d6843.
25. Woloshin S, Schwartz LM. The benefits and harms of mammography screening: understanding the trade-offs. *JAMA* 2010;303:164–5.
26. Nelson HD, Naik A, Humphrey L, *et al.* The background review for the USPSTF recommendation on screening for breast cancer. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;152:538–9.
27. Dickersin K, Tovey D, Wilcken N, *et al.* The background review for the USPSTF recommendation on screening for breast cancer. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;152:537.
28. Sherman ME, Howatt W, Blows FM, *et al.* Molecular pathology in epidemiologic studies: a primer on key considerations. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2010;19:966–72.
29. The *Annals of Internal Medicine* Editors. When evidence collides with anecdote, politics, and emotion: breast cancer screening. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;152:531–2.
30. McCartney M. Selling health to the public. *BMJ* 2010;341:c6639.
31. Lyraztopoulos G, Barbiere JM, Rachet B, *et al.* Changes over time in socioeconomic inequalities in breast and rectal cancer survival in England and Wales during a 32-year period (1973–2004): the potential role of health care. *Ann Oncol* 2011;22:1661–6.
32. Stein R. Federal panel recommends reducing number of mammograms. *The Washington Post* 17 November, 2009.
33. Horton R. Screening mammography—an overview revisited. *Lancet* 2001;358:1284–5.

Not applicable in all of the outcomes	
Topic of paragraph	% (n)
Controversy	47%(15)
A trial not including one of the Cochrane reviews	3% (1)
Ubiquitous literature	3% (1)
Informed choice	3% (1)
Lung cancer screening	3% (1)
Numbers needed to treat	3% (1)
Incidence and survival	3% (1)
Screening <50 year olds	6% (2)
Critique of mammography screening	3% (1)
Mammography screening RCTs	3% (1)
Uncertainty of estimates from RCTs	3% (1)
Table on trial selection	3% (1)
Benefits of Breast cancer screening	6% (2)
False positives	3% (1)
Inclusion of trials in different studies	3% (1)
Screening frequency	3% (1)

Appendix 1: The topic of the 32 paragraphs classified as 'not applicable' in all of the 5 outcomes (*overdiagnosis, overtreatment, breast cancer mortality, total mortality and*

Appendix 2: Reference list of included articles.

1. Altman DG. Poor-quality medical research - What can journals do? *JAMA* 2002;287:2765-7.
2. Armstrong K, Moye E, Williams S, Berlin JA, Reynolds EE. Screening mammography in women 40 to 49 years of age: A systematic review for the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med* 2007;146:516-26.
3. Autier P, Hery C, Haukka J, Boniol M, Byrnes G. Advanced breast cancer and breast cancer mortality in randomized controlled trials on mammography screening. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:5919-23.
4. Barratt A, Trevena L, Davey HM, McCaffery K. Use of decision aids to support informed choices about screening. *BMJ* 2004;329:507-10.
5. Barry MJ, Mulley AJ, Jr. Why are a high overdiagnosis probability and a long lead time for prostate cancer screening so important? *JNCI* 2009;101:362-3.
6. Begg CB. The mammography controversy. *Oncologist* 2002;7:174-6.
7. Berlin L. Breast cancer, mammography, and malpractice Litigation: The controversies continue. *Am J Roentgenol* 2003;180:1229.
8. Berry DA, Cronin KA, Plevritis SK, Fryback DG, Clarke L, Zelen M, et al. Effect of screening and adjuvant therapy on mortality from breast cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2005;353:1784-92.
9. Bjurstam N, Bjorneld L, Warwick J, Sala E, Duffy SW, Nystrom L, et al. The Gothenburg Breast Screening Trial. *Cancer* 2003;97:2387-96.
10. Bonneux L. Update on effects of screening mammography. *Lancet* 2002;360:337-8.
11. Bonneux L. Cardiovascular risk models. *BMJ* 2007;335:107-8.
12. Bordoni A, Probst-Hensch NM, Mazzucchelli L, Spitale A. Assessment of breast cancer opportunistic screening by clinical-pathological indicators: a population-based study. *Br J Cancer* 2009;101:1925-31.
13. Boyle P. Current situation of screening for cancer. *Ann Oncol* 2002;13:189-98.
14. Boyle P. Global summit on mammographic screening. *Ann Oncol* 2003;14:1159-60.
15. Boyle P. Mammographic breast cancer screening: after the dust has settled. *Breast* 2003;12:351-6.
16. Brant-Zawadzki M. CT screening: Why I do it. *Am J Roentgenol* 2002;179:319-26.
17. Brawley OW, Kramer BS. Cancer screening in theory and in practice. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:293-300.

18. Brody JG, Rudel RA, Michels KB, Moysich KB, Bernstein L, Attfield KR, et al. Environmental pollutants, diet, physical activity, body size, and breast cancer: where do we stand in research to identify opportunities for prevention? *Cancer* 2007;109(12 Suppl):2627-34.
19. Buiatti E, Barchielli A, Bartolacci S, Federico M, De Lisi V, Bucchi L, et al. The impact of organised screening programmes on the stage-specific incidence of breast cancer in some Italian areas. *Eur J Cancer* 2003;39:1776-82.
20. Buist DSM, Aiello EJ, Miglioretti DL, White E. Mammographic breast density, dense area, and breast area differences by phase in the menstrual cycle. *Cancer Epi Biom* 2006;15:2303-6.
21. Buist DSM, Porter PL, Lehman C, Taplin SH, White E. Factors contributing to mammography failure in women aged 40-49 years. *JNCI* 2004;96:1432-40.
22. Bulliard JL, Levi F. Women's perception of mammography screening. *Int J Epidemiol* 2004;33:903-4.
23. Bunnell CA, Winer EP. Lumping versus splitting: The splitters take this round. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20:3576-7.
24. Burke JP, Barry M, Kell MR. More on screening mammography. *N Engl J Med* 2011;364:281-2.
25. Burke JP, Power C, Gorey TF, Flanagan F, Kerin MJ, Kell MR. A comparative study of risk factors and prognostic features between symptomatic and screen detected breast cancer. *Eur J Surg Onc* 2008;34:149-53.
26. Charatan F. US panel finds insufficient evidence to support mammography. *BMJ* 2002;324:255.
27. Chlebowski RT, Anderson GL. The influence of time from menopause and mammography on hormone therapy-related breast cancer risk assessment. *JNCI* 2011;103:284-5.
28. Coebergh JW. Early breast cancer in Europe: progress and pitfalls in detection and management at the start of the new century. *Eur J Cancer* 2003;39:1645-7.
29. Crystal P, Strano SD, Shcharynski S, Koretz MJ. Using sonography to screen women with mammographically dense breasts. *Am J Roentgenol* 2003;181:177-82.
30. Das B, Feuer EJ, Mariotto A. Geographic association between mammography use and mortality reduction in the US. *Cancer Causes Contr* 2005;16:691-9.
31. Dawson SJ, Duffy SW, Blows FM, Driver KE, Provenzano E, LeQuesne J, et al. Molecular characteristics of screen-detected vs symptomatic breast cancers and their impact on survival. *Br J Cancer* 2009;101:1338-44.
32. Day NE. The NHS breast cancer screening programme. *Br J Cancer* 2003;89:1.
33. Dickersin K, Tovey D, Wilcken N, Ghersi D. The background review for the USPSTF recommendation on screening for breast cancer. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;152:537.

34. Dillon MF, Hill ADK, Quinn CM, O'Doherty A, Crown J, Fleming FJ, et al. Surgical intervention in screen-detected patients versus symptomatic patients with breast cancer. *J Med Screen* 2004;11:211.
35. Dixon-Woods M, Baum M, Kurinczuk JJ. Screening for breast cancer with mammography. *Lancet* 2001;358:2166-7.
36. Djulbegovic B, Lyman GH. Screening mammography at 40-49 years: regret or no regret? *Lancet* 2006;368:2035-7.
37. Domenighetti G, D'Avanzo B, Egger M, Berrino F, Perneger T, Mosconi P, et al. Women's perception of the benefits of mammography screening: population-based survey in four countries. *Int J Epidemiol* 2003;32:816-21.
38. du Bois A. Mammographic screening: no reliable supporting evidence? *Lancet* 2002;360:719-20.
39. Duffy SW. Some current issues in breast cancer screening. *J Med Screen* 2005;12:128-33.
40. Duffy SW, Tabar L, Chen HH, Holmqvist M, Yen MF, Abdsalah S, et al. The impact of organized mammography service screening on breast carcinoma mortality in seven Swedish counties - A collaborative evaluation. *Cancer* 2002;95:458-69.
41. Duffy SW, Tabar L, Smith RA. The mammographic screening trials: Commentary on the recent work by Olsen and Gøtzsche. *J Surg Oncol* 2002;81:159-62.
42. Duffy SW, Tabar L, Smith RA. The mammographic screening trials: Commentary on the recent work by Olsen and Gøtzsche. *Cancer J Clin* 2002;52:68-71.
43. Duffy SW, Tabar L, Vitak B, Yen MF, Warwick J, Smith RA, et al. The Swedish Two-County Trial of mammographic screening: cluster randomisation and end point evaluation. *Ann Oncol* 2003;14:1196-8.
44. Editors T. When evidence collides with anecdote, politics, and emotion: breast cancer screening. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;152:531-2.
45. Eisinger F, Blay JY, Morere JF, Rixe O, Calazel-Benque A, Cals L, et al. Cancer screening in France: subjects' and physicians' attitudes. *Cancer Caus Contr* 2008;19:431-4.
46. Elmore J, Choe J. Breast cancer screening for women in their 40s: moving from controversy about data to helping individual women. *Ann Intern Med* 2007;146:529-31.
47. Elmore JG, Armstrong K, Lehman CD, Fletcher SW. Screening for breast cancer. *JAMA* 2005;293:1245-56.
48. Elmore JG, Reisch LM, Barton MB, Barlow WE, Rolnick S, Harris EL, et al. Efficacy of breast cancer screening in the community according to risk level. *JNCI* 2005;97:1035-43.
49. Engel J, Eckel R, Kerr J, Schmidt M, Furstenberger G, Richter R, et al. The process of metastatisation for breast cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 2003;39:1794-806.

50. Engel J, Kerr J, Hoelzel D. Comment letter on Ole Olsen, Peter C. Gøtzsche Lancet 2001. Breast 2002;358:1340–2.
51. Erbas B, Amos A, Fletcher A, Kavanagh AM, Gertig DM. Incidence of invasive breast cancer and ductal carcinoma in situ in a screening program by age: Should older women continue screening? Cancer Epi Biom 2004;13:1569-73.
52. Esserman L, Cowley H, Eberle C, Kirkpatrick A, Chang S, Berbaum K, et al. Improving the accuracy of mammography: Volume and outcome relationships. JNCI 2002;94:369-75.
53. Esserman L, Shieh Y, Thompson I. Rethinking screening for breast cancer and prostate cancer. JAMA 2009;302:1685-92.
54. Feig SA. Effect of service screening mammography on population mortality from breast carcinoma. Cancer 2002;95:451-7.
55. Finucane TE. Cost-effectiveness of mammography for older women. Ann Intern Med 2004;140:844.
56. Fletcher SW, Elmore JG. Mammographic screening for breast cancer. N Engl J Med 2003;348:1672-80.
57. Forouzanfar MH, Foreman KJ, Delossantos AM, Lozano R, Lopez AD, Murray CJ, et al. Breast and cervical cancer in 187 countries between 1980 and 2010: a systematic analysis. Lancet 2011;378:1461-84.
58. Fortunato L, Penteriani R, Farina M, Vitelli CE, Piro FR. Intraoperative ultrasound is an effective and preferable technique to localize non-palpable breast tumors. Eur J Surg Oncol 2008;34:1289-92.
59. Freedman DA, Petitti DB, Robins JM. On the efficacy of screening for breast cancer. Int J Epidemiol 2004;33:43-55.
60. Freedman DA, Petitti DB, Robins JM. Screening mammography: a decision analysis - Rejoinder. Int J Epidemiol 2004;33:69-73.
61. Freedman GM, Anderson PR, Goldstein LJ, Hanlon AL, Cianfrocca ME, Millenson MM, et al. Routine mammography is associated with earlier stage disease and greater eligibility for breast conservation in breast carcinoma patients age 40 years and older. Cancer 2003;98:918-25.
62. Freund KM, Dolan NC, Nelson HD. Update in women's health. Ann Intern Med 2003;138:119-27.
63. Ganz PA. Breast cancer 2002: Where do we stand? Cancer J Clin 2002;52:253-5.
64. Garcia RZ, Carvajal SC, Wilkinson AV, Thompson PA, Nodora JN, Komenaka IK, et al. Factors that influence mammography use and breast cancer detection among Mexican-American and African-American women. Cancer Caus Contr 2012;23:165-73.

65. Gigerenzer G, Mata J, Frank R. Public knowledge of benefits of breast and prostate cancer screening in Europe. *JNCI* 2009;101:1216-20.
66. Gigerenzer G, Mata J, Frank R. Re: Public knowledge of benefits of breast and prostate cancer screening in Europe. *JNCI* 2010;102:356-7.
67. Goodman SN. The mammography dilemma: A crisis for evidence-based medicine? *Ann Intern Med* 2002;137:363-5.
68. Greif JM. Mammographic screening for breast cancer: An invited review of the benefits and costs. *Breast* 2010;19:268-72.
69. Grimes DA, Schulz KF. Uses and abuses of screening tests. *Lancet* 2002;359:881-4.
70. Gui GPH, Kadayaprath G, Darhouse N, Self J, Ward A, A'Hern R, et al. Clinical outcome and service implications of screening women at increased breast cancer risk from a family history. *Eur J Surg Onc* 2006;32:719-24.
71. Hackshaw AK, Paul EA. Breast self-examination and death from breast cancer: a meta-analysis. *Br J Cancer* 2003;88:1047-53.
72. Harper S, Lynch J, Meersman SC, Breen N, Davis WW, Reichman MC. Trends in area-socioeconomic and race-ethnic disparities in breast cancer incidence, stage at diagnosis, screening, mortality, and survival among women ages 50 years and over (1987-2005). *Cancer Epi Biom Prev* 2009;18:121-31.
73. Hemmer PHJ, Klasse JM, Mastboom WJB, Gerritsen JJGM, Mulder HJ, Volker EDP. The continued utility of needle localised biopsy for non-palpable breast lesions. *Eur J Surg Onc* 2004;30:10-4.
74. Henschke CI, Yankelevitz DF. CT screening for lung cancer. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2004;42:747-55.
75. Herr HW. Words of wisdom. Re: Rethinking screening for breast cancer and prostate cancer. *Eur Urol* 2010;57:540.
76. Hofvind SS, Wang H, Thoresen S. The Norwegian Breast Cancer Screening Program: re-attendance related to the women's experiences, intentions and previous screening result. *Cancer Causes Contr* 2003;14:391-8.
77. Humphrey LL, Helfand M, Chan BKS, Woolf SH. Breast cancer screening: A summary of the evidence for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *Ann Intern Med* 2002;137:347-60.
78. Jackson VP. Screening mammography: Controversies and headlines. *Radiology* 2002;225:323-6.
79. Jones BA, Dailey A, Calvocoressi L, Reams K, Kasl SV, Lee C, et al. Inadequate follow-up of abnormal screening mammograms: findings from the race differences in screening mammography process study (United States). *Cancer Causes Contr* 2005;16:809-21.

80. Juarbe TC, Kaplan CP, Somkin CP, Pasick R, Gildengorin G, Perez-Stable EJ. Are risk factors for breast cancer associated with follow-up procedures in diverse women with abnormal mammography? *Cancer Causes Contr* 2005;16:245-53.
81. Kacher DF, Jolesz FA. MR imaging--guided breast ablative therapy. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2004;42:947-62.
82. Kalager M, Zelen M, Langmark F, Adami HO. Effect of screening mammography on breast-cancer mortality in Norway. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;363:1203-10.
83. Keen JD. Non-mammographic screening for breast cancer. *JAMA* 2008;300:1515-6.
84. Kettritz U, Rotter K, Schreer I, Murauer M, Schulz-Wendtiand R, Peter D, et al. Stereotactic vacuum-assisted breast biopsy in 2874 patients - A Multicenter study. *Cancer* 2004;100:245-51.
85. Kinsinger LS, Harris R. Chemoprevention of breast cancer: a promising idea with an uncertain future. *Lancet* 2002;360:813-4.
86. Kmietowicz Z. WHO insists screening can cut breast cancer rates. *BMJ*. 2002;324(7339):695.
87. Koomen M, Pisano ED, Kuzmiak C, Pavic D, McLelland R. Future directions in breast imaging. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:1674-7.
88. Kopans DB. The most recent breast cancer screening controversy about whether mammographic screening benefits women at any age: Nonsense and nonscience. *Am J Roentgenol* 2003;180:21-6.
89. Kopans DB. The 2009 US Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) guidelines are not supported by science: the scientific support for mammography screening. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2010;48:843-57.
90. Kopans DB, Monsees B, Feig SA. Screening for cancer: When is it valid? - Lessons from the mammography experience. *Radiology* 2003;229:319-27.
91. Krekel NM, Zonderhuis BM, Stockmann HB, Schreurs WH, van der Veen H, de Lange de Klerk ES, et al. A comparison of three methods for nonpalpable breast cancer excision. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2011;37:109-15.
92. Kriege M, Brekelmans CTM, Boetes C, Besnard PE, Zonderland HM, Obdeijn IM, et al. Efficacy of MRI and mammography for breast-cancer screening in women with a familial or genetic predisposition. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:427-37.
93. Lampic C, Thurfjell E, Sjoden PO. The influence of a false-positive mammogram on a woman's subsequent behaviour for detecting breast cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 2003;39:1730-7.
94. Langhorne P. Screening mammography: setting the record straight. *Lancet* 2002;359:440.
95. Lawrence W. Editorial commentary: Screening mammography. *J Surg Oncol* 2002;81:159.

96. Leary A, Smith IE. Survival from breast cancer in England and Wales up to 2001 - Clinical commentary. *Br J Cancer* 2008;99:S56-S8.
97. Lee CH. Screening mammography: proven benefit, continued controversy. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2002;40:395-407.
98. Lee JH, Zuckerman D. Screening for breast cancer with mammography. *Lancet* 2001;358:2164-5.
99. Lee SJ, Zelen M. Modelling the early detection of breast cancer. *Ann Oncol* 2003;14:1199-202.
100. Luck AA, Evans AJ, James JJ, Rakha EA, Paish EC, Green AR, et al. Breast carcinoma with basal phenotype: Mammographic findings. *Am J Roentgenol* 2008;191:346-51.
101. Lyratzopoulos G, Barbieri JM, Rachet B, Baum M, Thompson MR, Coleman MP. Changes over time in socioeconomic inequalities in breast and rectal cancer survival in England and Wales during a 32-year period (1973-2004): the potential role of health care. *Ann Oncol* 2011;22:1661-6.
102. MacLennan AH, Lawton B, Baber RJ. Hormone replacement therapy and the breast - Studies must determine the evidence. *BMJ* 2002;324:915-6.
103. Mandelblatt J, Buist D. The elusive goal of maintaining population cancer screening: it is time for a new paradigm. *JNCI* 2010;102:998-9.
104. Mayor S. Row over breast cancer screening shows that scientists bring "some subjectivity into their work". *BMJ* 2001;323:956.
105. McCartney M. Medicine and the Media Selling health to the public *BMJ* 2010;341:c6639.
106. McLellan F. Independent US panel fans debate on mammography. *Lancet* 2002;359:409.
107. McPherson K. Should we screen for breast cancer? *BMJ* 2010;341:233-5.
108. Meissner HI, Klabunde CN, Han PK, Benard VB, Breen N. Breast cancer screening beliefs, recommendations and practices: primary care physicians in the United States. *Cancer* 2011;117:3101-11.
109. Meissner HI, Smith RA, Rimer BK, Wilson KM, Rakowski W, Vernon SW, et al. Promoting cancer screening: Learning from experience. *Cancer* 2004;101:1107-17.
110. Michaelson JS, Satija S, Kopans D, Moore R, Silverstein M, Comegno A, et al. Gauging the impact of breast carcinoma screening in terms of tumor size and death rate. *Cancer* 2003;98:2114-24.
111. Miettinen OS, Henschke CI, Pasmantier MW, Smith JP, Libby DM, Yankelevitz DF. Mammographic screening: no reliable supporting evidence? *Lancet* 2002;359:404-5.
112. Miller AB. Screening for breast cancer with mammography. *Lancet* 2001;358:2164.

113. Miller AB, To T, Baines CJ, Wall C. The Canadian National Breast Screening Study-1: Breast cancer mortality after 11 to 16 years of follow-up - A randomized screening trial of mammography in women age 40 to 49 years. *Ann Intern Med* 2002;137:305-12.
114. Moss SM, Cuckle H, Evans A, Johns L, Waller M, Bobrow L. Effect of mammographic screening from age 40 years on breast cancer mortality at 10 years' follow-up: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2006;368:2053-60.
115. Mulshine JL. Commentary: lung cancer screening--progress or peril. *Oncologist* 2008;13:435-8.
116. Nelson HD, Humphrey L, Tyne K. Re: The background review for the USPSTF recommendation on screening for breast cancer. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;152:537-8.
117. Newman DH. Screening for breast and prostate cancers: moving toward transparency. *JNCI* 2010;102:1008-11.
118. Niederhuber JE. Seeking calmer waters in a sea of controversy. *Oncologist* 2002;7:172-3.
119. Nystrom L, Andersson I, Bjurstam N, Frisell J, Rutqvist LE. Update on effects of screening mammography - Reply. *Lancet* 2002;360:339-40.
120. Olsen AH, Njor SH, Vejborg I, Schwartz W, Dalgaard P, Jensen MB, et al. Breast cancer mortality in Copenhagen after introduction of mammography screening: cohort study. *Brit Med J* 2005;330:220-2A.
121. Paci E, Coviello E, Miccinesi G, Puliti D, Cortesi L, De Lisi V, et al. Evaluation of service mammography screening impact in Italy. The contribution of hazard analysis. *Eur J Cancer* 2008;44:858-65.
122. Paci E, Duffy SW, Giorgi D, Zappa M, Crocetti E, Vezzosi V, et al. Are breast cancer screening programmes increasing rates of mastectomy? Observational study. *BMJ* 2002;325:418.
123. Ponzzone R, Sismondi P, Baum M. Beyond randomized controlled trials - Organized mammographic screening substantially reduces breast carcinoma mortality. *Cancer* 2002;94:579-80.
124. Qaseem A, Snow V, Sherif K, Aronson M, Weiss KB, Owens DK. Screening mammography for women 40 to 49 years of age: A clinical practice guideline from the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med* 2007;146:511-5.
125. Quinn MJ. Cancer trends in the United States - A view from Europe. *JNCI* 2003;95:1258-61.
126. Rakowski W, Breslau ES. Perspectives on behavioral and social science research on cancer screening. *Cancer* 2004;101:1118-30.
127. Rayter Z, Kutt E. Overdiagnosis of breast cancer in screening. *Ejso-Eur J Surg Onc* 2004;30:711-2.
128. Rickard M, Taylor R, Page A, Estoesta J. Cancer detection and mammogram volume of radiologists in a population-based screening programme. *Breast*. 2006;15:39-43.

129. Rogers LF. Screening mammography: Target of opportunity for the media. *Am J Roentgenol* 2003;180:1.
130. Rosenberg L, Wise LA, Palmer JR, Horton NJ, Adams-Campbell LL. A multilevel study of socioeconomic predictors of regular mammography use among African-American women. *Cancer Epidemiol Biom* 2005;14:2628-33.
131. Rossi PG, Federici A, Farchi S, Chini F, Barca A, Guasticchi G, et al. The effect of screening programmes on the treatment of benign breast neoplasms: observations from current practice in Italy. *J Med Screen* 2006;13:123-8.
132. Rozenberg S, Ham H, Liebens F. Screening for breast cancer with mammography. *Lancet* 2001;358:2167.
133. Schopper D, de Wolf C. How effective are breast cancer screening programmes by mammography? Review of the current evidence. *Eur J Cancer* 2009;45:1916-23.
134. Schousboe JT, Kerlikowske K, Loh A, Cummings SR. Personalizing mammography by breast density and other risk factors for breast cancer: analysis of health benefits and cost-effectiveness. *Ann Intern Med* 2011;155:10-20.
135. Schwartz LM, Woloshin S. News media coverage of screening mammography for women in their 40s and tamoxifen for primary prevention of breast cancer. *JAMA* 2002;287:3136-42.
136. Schwartz LM, Woloshin S, Fowler FJ, Welch HG. Enthusiasm for cancer screening in the United States. *JAMA* 2004;291:71-8.
137. Senn S. Screening for breast cancer with mammography. *Lancet* 2001;358:2165.
138. Sherman ME, Howatt W, Blows FM, Pharoah P, Hewitt SM, Garcia-Closas M. Molecular pathology in epidemiologic studies: a primer on key considerations. *Cancer Epidemiol Bio Prev* 2010;19:966-72.
139. Simes J, Wilcken N, Brunswick C, Clarke M, Ganz P, Ghersi D, et al. Screening mammography: setting the record straight. *Lancet* 2002;359:439-40.
140. Sistrom CL. The Appropriateness of Imaging: A Comprehensive Conceptual Framework. *Radiology* 2009;251:637-49.
141. Smith JA, Andreopoulou E. An overview of the status of imaging screening technology for breast cancer. *Ann Oncol* 2004;15:118-126.
142. Smith R, Duffy S, Tabar L. The mammographic screening trials: Commentary on the recent work by Olsen and Gøtzsche. *J Surg Oncol* 2002;81:164-6.
143. Smith RA. The ongoing evaluation of breast cancer screening. *Cancer* 2004;100:1327-30.
144. Smith RA, Cokkinides V, Eyre HJ. American Cancer Society guidelines for the early detection of cancer, 2003. *Ca-Cancer J Clin* 2003;53:27-43.

145. Smith RA, Cokkinides V, von Eschenbach AC, Levin B, Cohen C, Runowicz CD, et al. American Cancer Society guidelines for the early detection of cancer. *Ca-Cancer J Clin* 2002;52:8-22.
146. Smith RA, Duffy SW, Gabe R, Tabar L, Yen AM, Chen TH. The randomized trials of breast cancer screening: what have we learned? *Rad Clin North Am* 2004;42:793-806.
147. Smith RA, Saslow D, Sawyer KA, Burke W, Costanza ME, Evans WP, et al. American cancer society guidelines for breast cancer screening: Update 2003. *Ca-Cancer J Clin* 2003;53:141-69.
148. Sox H. Screening mammography for younger women: Back to basics. *Ann Intern Med* 2002;137:361-2.
149. Stojadinovic A, Nissan A, Gallimidi Z, Lenington S, Logan W, Zuley M, et al. Electrical impedance scanning for the early detection of breast cancer in young women: Preliminary results of a multicenter prospective clinical trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:2703-15.
150. Tabar L, Duffy SW, Yen MF, Warwick J, Vitak B, Chen HH, et al. All-cause mortality among breast cancer patients in a screening trial: support for breast cancer mortality as an end point. *J Med Screen* 2002;9:159-62.
151. Tabar L, Yen MF, Vitak B, Chen HHT, Smith RA, Duffy SW. Mammography service screening and mortality in breast cancer patients: 20-year follow-up before and after introduction of screening. *Lancet* 2003;361:1405-10.
152. Thornton H. Screening for breast cancer with mammography. *Lancet*. 2001;358:2165.
153. Thornton H. Breast screening seems driven by belief rather than evidence. *BMJ* 2002;324:677.
154. Thornton H. The screening debates: time for a broader approach? *Eur J Cancer*. 2003;39:1807-9.
155. Tice JA, Feldman MD. Full-field digital mammography compared with screen-film mammography in the detection of breast cancer: rays of light through DMIST or more fog? *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2008;107:157-65.
156. Turner NC, Jones AL. Management of breast cancer--part I. *BMJ* 2008;337:a421.
157. Uematsu T, Yuen S, Kasami M, Uchida Y. Dynamic contrast-enhanced MR imaging in screening detected microcalcification lesions of the breast: is there any value? *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2007;103:269-81.
158. Vaidya JS. Screening for breast cancer with mammography. *Lancet*. 2001;358:2166.
159. van Veen WA, Knottnerus JA. Screening mammography. *Lancet*. 2002;359:1701.
160. von Eschenbach AC. NCI remains committed to current mammography guidelines. *Oncologist* 2002;7:170-1.

161. Weir HK, Thun MJ, Hankey BF, Ries LAG, Howe HL, Wingo PA, et al. Annual report to the nation on the status of cancer, 1975-2000, featuring the uses of surveillance data for cancer prevention and control. *JNCI* 2003;95:1276-99.
162. Woloshin S, Schwartz LM. Numbers needed to decide. *JNCI* 2009;101:1163-5.
163. Woloshin S, Schwartz LM. The benefits and harms of mammography screening: understanding the trade-offs. *JAMA* 2010;303:164-5.
164. Yankelevitz DF. Screening for a cancer: Acting on social responsibility. *Am J Roentgenol* 2007;188:1171-2.
165. Yao SL, Lu-Yao G. Understanding and appreciating overdiagnosis in the PSA era. *JNCI* 2002;94:958-60.
166. Yasunaga H, Ide H, Imamura T, Ohe K. Women's anxieties caused by false positives in mammography screening: a contingent valuation survey. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2007;101:59-64.
167. Yu YH, Liang C, Yuan XZ. Diagnostic value of vacuum-assisted breast biopsy for breast carcinoma: a meta-analysis and systematic review. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2010;120:469-79.
168. Zackrisson S, Janzon L, Manjer J, Andersson I. Improved survival rate for women with interval breast cancer - results from the breast cancer screening programme in Malmo, Sweden 1976-1999. *J Med Screen*. 2007;14:138-43.
169. Zahl PH. Overdiagnosis of breast cancer in Denmark. *Br J Cancer* 2004;90:1686.
170. Zahl PH. An inverse association between tumour size and overdiagnosis may explain the results by Bucchi et al. *Br J Cancer* 2005;92:1814.
171. Zahl PH, Strand H, Maehlen J. Incidence of breast cancer in Norway and Sweden during introduction of nationwide screening: prospective cohort study. *BMJ* 2004;328:921-4.