

Published in NY Times

Robert A. Schmidt, MD Chicago, IL

The tilted presentation of the rehash of the extremely contentious Canadian NBSS study with no reference to larger trials (133,065 vs 89,835) over longer follow up times (29 years vs "up to 25 years") with very different results (31% mortality reduction vs 5% excess mortality in the NBSS) is very unsettling, which is perhaps the main intent of the reportage. Excess mortality for those screened by mammography is an anomalous result compared with almost all other screening studies. For those who wish to untilt their views, see the Swedish Two-County trial results by Tabar et al. published in 2011: *Radiology*, 2011, Vol.260: 658-663. That trial began in 1977/78, similar to the Canadian study's 1980 start. And then wonder why the Swedish study did not receive the attention being lavished on this lesser study, which has been dissected negatively in the literature even by some Canadian investigators (Boyd et. al, "A critical appraisal of the Canadian National Breast Cancer Screening Study," *Radiology*. 1993 Dec;189(3):661-3).