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Preface

Why a Handbook on breast cancer screening?

The scientific process of acquiring information about the efficacy of breast cancer screening was initiated in 1963, when Sam Shapiro and coworkers introduced the Health Insurance Plan study (Shapiro et al., 1988a) in New York, USA, the first randomized controlled trial of the effect of mammography and clinical breast examination in reducing mortality from breast cancer. This study opened the era of randomized controlled trials for evaluation of screening techniques. Cancer screening techniques used before that, such as the Papanicolau (Pap) smear, never underwent proper evaluation in randomized trials before their introduction as a means for population screening.

Randomized controlled trials have been criticized many times as expensive and slow to provide results. The Breast Cancer Detection Demonstration Project (Baker, 1982) in the USA was initiated to provide data on the efficacy of breast cancer screening rapidly, and the first results appeared in 1979, 3 years before publication of the results of the Health Insurance Plan study. Three more studies — in Malmö, Sweden (Andersson et al., 1988), Edinburgh, Scotland (Roberts et al., 1990) and in two Swedish counties (Tabár et al., 1985) — were initiated 13–14 years after the beginning of the Health Insurance Plan study, and another three studies were initiated in 1980–82, in Canada (Miller et al., 1992a,b) and in Stockholm (Frisell et al., 1986) and Göteborg, Sweden (Bjurstam et al., 1997). Thus, a number of randomized controlled trials, initiated in five different countries over a 20-year period, provide the basis for evidence in the field of mammographic screening.

Mammography was first officially introduced in a population-wide, organized screening programme in Iceland and in several districts in Sweden in 1987. The Netherlands and several regions of Canada followed in 1988, and Finland in 1989. In 1988, the American Cancer Society and the Preventive Services Task Force established policies in favour of screening for breast cancer in the USA (US Preventive Task Force, 1996). In contrast to the policies in other countries, that in the USA emphasized a triple approach, involving breast self-examination, clinical breast examination and mammography. The Europe Against Cancer programme simultaneously initiated a series of pilot screening programmes in several countries in Europe (Commission of the European Communities, 1996) in order to develop expertise in planning and running high-quality population-based screening programmes before their incorporation into national policy. In the early 1990s, national screening programmes were initiated in Australia and the United Kingdom, and these were followed by organized programmes in several states of the USA, in Israel and, later, in France. Germany and Switzerland were among the last western countries to join the international trend, with plans to introduce national screening at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

Experience in large-scale mammographic screening by the mid-1990s, and the availability of data on more recent follow-up from the trials, led to discussion about the value of mammographic screening for women under the age of 50. Even on the basis of the same scientific evidence, few countries have established the same breast cancer screening policy. The policies differ with respect to the target age group to be screened, the frequency of screening, the number of mammographic views to be taken and the screening modalities. In Japan, the policy was based on clinical breast examination until recently, when it was decided to add mammography.

In spite of the vast amount of information available from several randomized trials, some doubt has recently been cast on the value of breast cancer screening in reducing mortality from breast cancer (Gotzsche & Olsen, 2000; Olsen & Gotzsche, 2001). In this volume, the relevant published studies are thoroughly reassessed, together with the newest data, either recently published or in press, according to the procedures and guidelines followed in the Handbooks (see pp. 223).