Results of Topic Selection Process & Next Steps

The nominator, Kaiser Permanente Care Management Institute, is interested in using a new systematic review to develop new guidelines pertaining to breast cancer screening in high-risk women.

We identified an ongoing systematic review commissioned by a cancer organization that covers the scope of the key questions; therefore, a new review would be duplicative of an existing in-progress product. No further activity on this topic will be undertaken by the Effective Health Care (EHC) Program.
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Summary of Key Findings:
- Appropriateness and importance: The topic is both appropriate and important.
- Duplication: A new review on this topic would be duplicative of an existing product. A systematic review, which encompasses the scope of the topic nomination, is currently being conducted by a cancer organization to update their guidelines.
Table of Contents
Introduction ..................................................................................................................... 2
Methods .......................................................................................................................... 5
  Appropriateness and Importance.............................................................................. 5
  Desirability of New Review/Duplication................................................................. 5
  Compilation of Findings ......................................................................................... 5
Results ........................................................................................................................... 5
  Appropriateness and Importance.............................................................................. 5
  Desirability of New Review/Duplication................................................................. 5
Summary of Findings ...................................................................................................... 6
References .................................................................................................................... 6
  Appendix A. Selection Criteria Summary..............................................................A-1
  Appendix B. Search for Systematic Reviews (Duplication).................................B-1
Introduction

In 2018, the American Cancer Society projects breast cancer to be the most frequently diagnosed non-dermatologic malignancy (266,120 new cases) and the second leading cause of cancer death (40,920 deaths) among women in the United States.\textsuperscript{1} The annual national expenditure in the United States for treatment of breast cancer was estimated to be $39 billion in 2017.\textsuperscript{2} Although the impact of population screening for breast cancer in low- and average-risk women are well reviewed,\textsuperscript{3} evidence on the effectiveness and harms of breast cancer screening in high-risk women have not been adequately synthesized and subsequent practice guidelines have not been well developed. In addition, controversy remains regarding the criteria to properly categorize breast cancer risk among women with greater than average risk.\textsuperscript{4}

The Kaiser Permanente Care Management Institute nominated this topic on 11/10/2017. The questions are:

Key Question 1. What is the effectiveness of breast cancer screening in reducing breast cancer mortality in asymptomatic high-risk women?

Key Question 2. What is the effectiveness of breast cancer screening in reducing breast cancer incidence in asymptomatic high-risk women?

Key Question 3. What are the harms of breast cancer screening in asymptomatic high-risk women?

Contextual Question: What is the most optimal definition of high-risk for breast cancer?

In Table 1, we define the population, interventions, comparators, outcomes, and timing (PICOT) for each Key Question.
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Population    | Adult women not diagnosed with breast cancer but are at high-risk due to any of the following:  
- A BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutation (and 1° relatives, but personally have not been tested for BRCA1/2 mutations)  
- A personal history of ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS), ductal carcinoma in situ (LCIS), or atypical hyperplasia  
- Radiation treatment to the chest area between ages 10-30  
- Li-Fraumeni, Cowden/PTEN or Bannayan-Riley-Ruvalcaba syndrome (and first-degree relatives)  
- An ATM, CDH1, CHEK2, NBN, NF1, PALB2, PTEN, STK11 or TP53 gene mutation  
- A greater than 20% lifetime risk of invasive breast cancer based mainly on family history | Adult women not diagnosed with breast cancer but are at high-risk due to any of the following:  
- A BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutation (and 1° relatives, but personally have not been tested for BRCA1/2 mutations)  
- A personal history of ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS), lobular carcinoma in situ (LCIS), or atypical hyperplasia  
- Radiation treatment to the chest area between ages 10-30  
- Li-Fraumeni, Cowden/PTEN or Bannayan-Riley-Ruvalcaba syndrome (and first-degree relatives)  
- An ATM, CDH1, CHEK2, NBN, NF1, PALB2, PTEN, STK11 or TP53 gene mutation  
- A greater than 20% lifetime risk of invasive breast cancer based mainly on family history | Adult women not diagnosed with breast cancer but are at high-risk due to any of the following:  
- A BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutation (and 1° relatives, but personally have not been tested for BRCA1/2 mutations)  
- A personal history of ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS), lobular carcinoma in situ (LCIS), or atypical hyperplasia  
- Radiation treatment to the chest area between ages 10-30  
- Li-Fraumeni, Cowden/PTEN or Bannayan-Riley-Ruvalcaba syndrome (and first-degree relatives)  
- An ATM, CDH1, CHEK2, NBN, NF1, PALB2, PTEN, STK11 or TP53 gene mutation  
- A greater than 20% lifetime risk of invasive breast cancer based mainly on family history |
| Interventions | Mammography  
MRI as an adjunct to mammography screening  
Ultrasoundography as an adjunct to mammography or as an alternative to MRI when it is not tolerated  
Digital breast tomosynthesis  
Clinical breast examination | Mammography  
MRI as an adjunct to mammography screening  
Ultrasoundography as an adjunct to mammography or as an alternative to MRI when it is not tolerated  
Digital breast tomosynthesis  
Clinical breast examination | Mammography  
MRI as an adjunct to mammography screening  
Ultrasoundography as an adjunct to mammography or as an alternative to MRI when it is not tolerated  
Digital breast tomosynthesis  
Clinical breast examination |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparators</th>
<th>No screening; screening modalities compared to each other</th>
<th>No screening; screening modalities compared to each other</th>
<th>No screening; screening modalities compared to each other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Breast cancer mortality; all-cause mortality</td>
<td>Breast cancer incidence (cancer detection rates); diagnostic accuracy</td>
<td>Harms (false positives, unnecessary biopsy, psychological harms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting</strong></td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>Outpatient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbreviations:* DCIS=Ductal Carcinoma In Situ; LCIS= Lobular Carcinoma In Situ; KQ=Key Question; MRI=Magnetic Resonance Imaging
Methods

To assess topic nomination Breast Cancer Screening in High-Risk Women #739, for priority for a systematic review or other AHRQ EHC report, we used a modified process based on established criteria. Our assessment is hierarchical in nature, with the findings of our assessment determining the need for further evaluation. Details related to our assessment are provided in Appendix A.

1. Determine the appropriateness of the nominated topic for inclusion in the EHC program.
2. Establish the overall importance of a potential topic as representing a health or healthcare issue in the United States.
3. Determine the desirability of new evidence review by examining whether a new systematic review or other AHRQ product would be duplicative.
4. Assess the potential impact a new systematic review or other AHRQ product.
5. Assess whether the current state of the evidence allows for a systematic review or other AHRQ product (feasibility).
6. Determine the potential value of a new systematic review or other AHRQ product.

Appropriateness and Importance
We qualitatively assessed the nomination for appropriateness and importance.

Desirability of New Review/Duplication
We searched for relevant high quality, completed or in-process evidence reviews from the last three years. Databases searched included AHRQ Effective Health Care Program website, VA Evidence Synthesis Program website, PubMed, Cochrane Collaboration, and PROSPERO register of systematic reviews.

Compilation of Findings
We constructed a table outlining the selection criteria (Appendix A).

Results

Appropriateness and Importance
This is an appropriate and important topic. Breast cancer represents both high mortality burden for women as well as high cost burden in the United States.

Desirability of New Review/Duplication
A new evidence review examining breast cancer screening in high-risk women would be duplicative of an existing product. A systematic review, which encompasses the scope of the topic nomination, was commissioned by a cancer organization in the United States to update their guidelines. We have withheld the organization name because they have not publicly disclosed these efforts.

In addition, we found three reviews that are relevant to KQ2.^5^-^7 One review focused on the contribution of mammography to magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) screening in BRCA mutation carriers.5 One review examined screening MRI in women with a personal history of breast cancer^6 and another review assesses ultrasound as an adjunct to mammography.7 See Table 2, Duplication column for the systematic review citations that were determined to address the key questions.
Table 2. Key questions with identified corresponding evidence reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Question</th>
<th>Duplication (Completed or In-Process Evidence Reviews)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KQ 1: What is the effectiveness of breast cancer screening in reducing breast cancer mortality in asymptomatic high-risk women?</td>
<td>Total number of completed or in-progress reviews — None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KQ 2: What is the effectiveness of breast cancer screening in reducing breast cancer incidence in asymptomatic high-risk women?</td>
<td>Total number of completed or in-progress systematic reviews - 3 • Other – 3 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KQ 3: What are the harms of breast cancer screening in asymptomatic high-risk women?</td>
<td>Total number of completed or in-progress evidence reviews – None identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: KQ=Key Question

Summary of Findings

- Appropriateness and Importance: The topic is both appropriate and important.
- Duplication: A new review on this topic would be duplicative of an existing product. A systematic review, which encompasses the scope of the topic nomination, is currently underway.
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## Appendix A. Selection Criteria Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Supporting Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriateess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Does the nomination represent a health care drug, intervention, device, technology, or health care system/setting available (or soon to be available) in the U.S.?</td>
<td>Yes, this topic represents a health care drug and intervention available in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Is the nomination a request for a systematic review?</td>
<td>Yes, this topic is a request for a systematic review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Is the focus on effectiveness or comparative effectiveness?</td>
<td>The focus of this review is on both effectiveness and comparative effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Is the nomination focus supported by a logic model or biologic plausibility? Is it consistent or coherent with what is known about the topic?</td>
<td>Yes, it is biologically plausible. Yes, it is consistent with what is known about the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Represents a significant disease burden; large proportion of the population</td>
<td>Yes, this topic represents a significant burden. Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death in women in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Is of high public interest; affects health care decision making, outcomes, or costs for a large proportion of the US population or for a vulnerable population</td>
<td>Yes, this topic affects heath care decisions for a large proportion of the U.S. population. National healthcare expenditure for treating breast cancer was estimated to be $39 billion in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Represents important uncertainty for decision makers</td>
<td>Yes, this topic represents important uncertainty for decision makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d. Incorporates issues around both clinical benefits and potential clinical</td>
<td>Yes, this nomination addresses both benefits and potential harms of screening interventions for breast cancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e. Represents high costs due to common use, high unit costs, or high associated costs to consumers, to patients, to health care systems, or to payers</td>
<td>Yes, breast cancer is the second most common non-dermatologic malignancy in women in the U.S. Treatments are costly for the individual patient and to payers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Desirability of a New Evidence Review/Duplication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Would not be redundant (i.e., the proposed topic is not already covered by available or soon-to-be available high-quality systematic review by AHRQ or others)</td>
<td>A systematic review, which encompasses the scope of the topic nomination, is being conducted by a cancer organization to update their guidelines. In addition, we found three reviews that are relevant to KQ2. 5-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbreviations: U.S.=United States; AHRQ= Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; KQ=Key Question*
Appendix B. Search for Systematic Reviews (Duplication)

Listed below are the sources searched and results of our search for existing guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breast Cancer Screening in High-Risk Women</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search for Duplication: January 1, 2018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHRQ: Evidence reports and technology assessments, USPSTF recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Products: PBM, and HSR&amp;D (ESP) publications, and VA/DoD EBCPG Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochrane Systematic Reviews and Protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PubMed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSPERO Database (international prospective register of systematic reviews and protocols)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/">http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>