Guibout et al. Malignant breast tumors after radiotherapy for a first cancer during childhood. J Clin Oncol 2005;23:197–204

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Multi-centre	1,814 female 3-yr	Chest radiation:	Relative risk (95% CI)	Analyses were adjusted for age at
cohort study	childhood cancer survivors	13/16 (81·3%) survivors with	Breast dose	childhood cancer, attained age, castration,
	aged <17 yr at diagnosis	breast cancer	>0-<1 Gy vs. 0 Gy:	chemotherapy, and childhood cancer
1946-1986		1245/1798 (69·2%) survivors	1.3 (0.3-6.3)	diagnosis.
	Breast cancer:	without breast cancer	1-<10 Gy vs. 0 Gy:	
Follow-up:	16/1814 (0.9%)		1.5 (0.3-8.1)	There is a significant methodological issue
Mean 16 (range 3-		Absorbed radiation dose:	10-<20 Gy vs. 0 Gy:	with this paper. The authors estimated
46) yr		Mean 5·06 (range 0-78·6) Gy	3.7 (0.6-24.2)	the dose to the nipple and called it the
Person-years of			≥20 Gy vs. 0 Gy:	dose to the breast throughout the paper.
follow-up: 20,323			2.5 (0.1-22.1)	The nipple in a mantle field is generally
			P for trend = $0.06$	near the edge or possibly under the
				blocking, therefore the dose to the nipple
			Excess relative risk per Gy to the	is not a mean dose to all of the breast. The
			breasts (95% CI)	unblocked portion of the breast receives
			0.13 (<0.0-0.75)	the highest dose. Hodgkin lymphoma
				represented 5 of 13 breast cancer cases
				with radiation in their analysis and so this
				issue affects the interpretation of the
				findings. This methodological limitation
				may have resulted in an underestimation
				of the risk.

Inskip et al. Radiation dose and breast cancer risk in the childhood cancer survivor study. J Clin Oncol 2009;27:3901–7

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Multi-centre case-	6,647 5-yr childhood	Chest radiation:	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Analyses were adjusted for type of
control study	cancer survivors aged ≤21	107/120 (89%) cases	Breast dose	childhood cancer diagnosis.
	yr at diagnosis	328/464 (71%) controls	>0-0·13 Gy vs. 0 Gy:	
1970-1986			1.4 (0.5-4.4)	
	120 childhood cancer	Absorbed radiation dose:	0·14-1·29 Gy vs. 0 Gy:	
Follow-up:	survivors with breast	Mean 13.4 Gy controls	1.9 (0.7-5.4)	
Median 19·4	cancer matched to 464	Dose cases not reported (range	1·30-11·39 Gy vs. 0 Gy:	
(range 6·7-29·6) yr	childhood cancer survivors	>0-0·13 Gy to 30·0-60·0 Gy)	1.9 (0.7-5.0)	
	without breast cancer		11·40-29·99 Gy vs. 0 Gy:	
			7.1 (2.9-17.0)	
			30·0-60·0 Gy vs. 0 Gy:	
			10.8 (3.8-31.0)	
			P for trend <0.001	
			Excess odds ratio per Gy to the	
			breasts (95% CI)	
			0.27 (0.10-0.67)	
			Recalculated odds ratio (95% CI)	
			Breast dose	
			1·3-9·9 Gy vs. 0 Gy:	
			1.9 (0.7-5.4)	
			10·0-19·9 Gy vs. 0 Gy:	
			6.5 (2.3-18.5)	

<sup>\*</sup> Personal communication from Peter Inskip, PhD, May 18, 2012.

*Taylor et al.* Second primary neoplasms in survivors of Wilms' tumour – a population-based cohort study from the British Childhood Cancer Survivor Study. Int J Cancer 2008;122:2085–93

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Population-based	1,441 5-yr Wilms tumour	Radiotherapy:	Breast cancer	For the females, 1 had 3000 cGy to the
cohort study	survivors aged <15 yr at diagnosis	1269/1441 (88·1%)	9/1441 (0·6%); 8 females, 1 male	right and left lower lobes of the lung in addition to 3000 cGy to the right and left
1940-1991		Radiation dose not reported	Standardized incidence ratio (95% CI)	abdomen; 4 women had 1200-1500 cGy
Follow-up:			5.8 (2.6-11.0)	whole lung radiation in addition to their abdominal radiation and 1 woman had
Mean 19·3 yr;				unknown radiation. In summary, of the 7
Person-years of				women with known radiation fields, 5 had
follow-up since 5- yr survival: 27,841				chest radiation in addition to abdominal radiation. Thus, we do not know whether
,				the breast cancer was secondary to the
				low dose chest radiation (12-15 Gy), the
				high abdominal fields, or a combination.

Travis et al. Breast cancer following radiotherapy and chemotherapy among young women with Hodgkin disease. JAMA 2003;290:465–75

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Population-based	3,817 female 1-yr Hodgkin	Chest radiation:	Relative risk (95% CI)	Analyses were adjusted for number of
nested case-	lymphoma survivors aged	104/105 (99%) cases	Breast dose median (range)	cycles of alkylating agents and radiation
control study	≤30 yr at diagnosis (20% <18)	256/266 (96%) controls	4·6 (4·0-6·9) Gy vs. 3·2 (0-3·9) Gy: 1·8 (0·7-4·5)	dose delivered to the ovaries.
1965-1994		Absorbed radiation dose:	21·0 (7·0-23·1) Gy vs. 3·2 (0-3·9) Gy:	
	105 survivors with breast	Mean 37·7 ± 4.7 Gy cases	4.1 (1.4-12.3)	
Follow-up:	cancer matched to 266	Mean 37·3 ± 4.1 Gy controls	24·5 (23·2-27·9) Gy vs. 3·2 (0-3·9) Gy:	
Median 18 (range	survivors without breast		2.0 (0.7-5.9)	
7-30) yr	cancer		35·2 (28·0-37·1) Gy vs. 3·2 (0-3·9) Gy:	
			6.8 (2.3-22.3)	
			39·8 (37·2-40·4) Gy vs. 3·2 (0-3·9) Gy:	
			4.0 (1.3-13.4)	
			41·7 (40·5-61·3) Gy vs. 3·2 (0-3·9) Gy:	
			8.0 (2.6-26.4)	
			Excess relative risk per Gy to the	
			breasts (95% CI)	
			0·15 (95% CI: 0·04-0·73)	
			Detailed estimation relative risk (95%	
			CI)*	
			Breast dose	
			<b>1 Gy:</b> 1·15 (1·04-1·73)	
			<b>5 Gy:</b> 1·75 (1·20-4·65)	
			<b>6 Gy:</b> 1·90 (1·24-5·38)	
			<b>7 Gy:</b> 2·05 (1·28-6·11)	
		<b>13 Gy:</b> 2.95 (1.52-10.49)		
			<b>14 Gy:</b> 3·10 (1·56-11·22)	
			<b>19 Gy:</b> 3.85 (1.76-14.87)	
			<b>20 Gy:</b> 4·00 (1·80-15·60)	
			<b>30 Gy:</b> 5·50 (2·20-22·90)	
			<b>40 Gy:</b> 7·00 (2·60-30·20)	

<sup>\*</sup> Post hoc analysis performed by Cecile Ronckers, PhD, 2010.

van Leeuwen et al. Roles of radiation dose, chemotherapy, and hormonal factors in breast cancer following Hodgkin's disease. J Natl Cancer Inst 2003;95:971–80

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Population-based	650 female 5-yr Hodgkin	Chest radiation:	Relative risk (95% CI)	Analyses were adjusted for ovary
nested case-	lymphoma survivors aged	48/48 (100%) cases	Breast dose median (range)	radiation dose and chemotherapy.
control study	≤40 yr at diagnosis (30% <20 yr)	172/175 (98%)controls	15·5 (4-23·2) Gy vs. 3·6 (0·26-3·9) Gy:	
1965-1988	48 survivors with breast	Absorbed radiation dose: Mean 38·5 Gy cases	1.11 (0.32-3.58)	
Follow-up:	cancer matched to 175 survivors without breast	Mean 37.6 Gy controls	30·2 (24-38·2) Gy vs. 3·6 (0·26-3·9) Gy:	
Median 18∙7 yr	cancer		4·20 (0·99-17·8)	
			40·7 (38·5-56) Gy vs. 3·6 (0·26-3·9)	
			Gy:	
			5·16 (1·27-21·0)	
			Excess relative risk per Gy (95% CI)	
			0.06 (0.01-0.13)	

This cohort was also included in the cohort of Travis 2003.

#### 2. What is the risk of breast cancer in childhood, adolescent and young adult cancer survivors treated with TBI?

*Friedman et al.* Increased risk of breast cancer among survivors of allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation: a report from the FHCRC and the EBMT-Late Effect Working Party. Blood 2008;111:939–44

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Multi-centre cohort study  1969-2000  Follow-up: Median 9·9 (range 7·0-32·2) yr	3,337 female 5-yr HCT survivors aged 28·1 (0·2-70·3) yr at treatment (14% <18 yr)  Breast cancer: 52/3337 (1·6%)	TBI:  47/52 (90·4%) survivors with breast cancer  2115/3285 (64·4%) survivors without breast cancer  TBI dose:  8-15·75 Gy fractionated  9·2-10 Gy single fraction  Absorbed radiation dose: Mean 5·06 Gy (range 0-78·6)	10 yr cumulative incidence (95% CI) No TBI: 0·1 (0·02-0·8) TBI: 1.1 (0·6-1·7)  20 yr cumulative incidence (95% CI) No TBI: 1·3 (0·4-3·3) TBI: 6·1 (3·9-8·9)  25 yr cumulative incidence (95% CI) No TBI: 2·8 (0·7-7·4) TBI: 16·9 (9·4-26·2)  Hazard ratio (95% CI) TBI vs. no TBI: 4·0 (1·6-10·3) HCT <18 yr vs. HCT >40 yr: 9·5 (1·8-51·0)	No TBI group may not be an appropriate reference category, since patients in no TBI group are more likely to have ovarian failure due to high-dose alkylating agent preconditioning therapy (article did not provide information about therapy administered to non-TBI group or their menopausal status). This may have resulted in an overestimation of the risk.  25-yr cumulative breast cancer incidence was 6·5% (95%CI 2·3-13·8) among women <18 yr at HCT. Although, unclear how many were treated with TBI.  Analyses were adjusted for follow-up time, age at transplantation and HCT location.

HCT = haematopoietic cell transplantation, TBI = total body irradiation.

## 3. What is the risk of breast cancer in childhood, adolescent and young adult cancer survivors treated with high abdominal field radiation (with or without chest radiation)?

*Taylor et al.* Second primary neoplasms in survivors of Wilms' tumour – a population-based cohort study from the British Childhood Cancer Survivor Study. Int J Cancer 2008;122:2085–93

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Population-based	1,441 5-yr Wilms tumour	Radiotherapy:	Breast cancer	For the females, 1 had 3000 cGy to the
cohort study	survivors aged <15 yr at diagnosis	1269/1441 (88·1%)	9/1441 (0·6%); 8 females, 1 male	right and left lower lobes of the lung in addition to 3000 cGy to the right and left
1940-1991		Radiation dose not reported	All treated with abdominal field radiation (20-35 Gy)	abdomen; 4 women had 1200-1500 cGy whole lung radiation in addition to their
Follow-up:			, ,,	abdominal radiation and 1 woman had
Mean 19·3 yr;			Standardized incidence ratio (95% CI)	unknown radiation. In summary, of the 7
Person-years of follow-up since 5- yr survival: 27,841			5.8 (2.6-11.0)	women with known radiation fields, 5 had chest radiation in addition to abdominal radiation. Thus, we do not know whether the breast cancer was secondary to the low dose chest radiation (12-15 Gy), the high abdominal fields, or a combination.

**Bhatia et al.** High risk of subsequent neoplasms continues with extended follow-up of childhood Hodgkin's disease: report from the Late Effects Study Group. J Clin Oncol 2003;21:386–94

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Multi-centre	1,380 5-yr childhood	Chest radiation:	Relative risk (95% CI)	Analyses were adjusted for age at
cohort study	Hodgkin lymphoma	30/30 (100%) survivors with	Alkylating agent score 3-9 vs. <3:	diagnosis, clinical stage, treatment groups
	survivors aged ≤16 yr at	breast cancer	0.62 (0.09-2.48)	(radiotherapy, chemotherapy, both) and
1955-1986	diagnosis			recurrence of Hodgkin lymphoma.
		Prescribed radiation dose:		
Follow-up:	Breast cancer:	Median 35 (range 26-46) Gy in		Alkylating agent score is an approximate
Median 18·1	30/1380 (2·2%); 42 breast	survivors with breast cancer		measure of the total amount alkylating
(range 4.3-28·2) yr;	cancers in 30 patients (29			agents received.
Person-years of	females, 1 male)	Number of patients treated		
follow-up: 20,340		with alkylating agents not		
		reported		

Kenney et al. Breast cancer after childhood cancer: a report from the Childhood Cancer Survivor Study. Ann Intern Med 2004;141:590–7

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Multi-centre	6,068 5-yr childhood	Chest radiation:	Relative rate (95% CI)	Analyses were adjusted for chest
cohort study	cancer survivors aged ≤21	73/95 (77%) survivors with	Alkylating agent score 1-2 vs. 0:	radiation.
1970-1986  Follow-up: Median 19 (range 6-29) yr	yr at diagnosis  Breast cancer: 95/6068 (1.6%)	breast cancer 1185/5973 (20%) survivors without breast cancer  Radiation dose not reported	0.8 (0.4-1.6)  Alkylating agent score 3-4 vs. 0:  0.8 (0.4-1.4)  Alkylating agent score ≥5 vs. 0:  1.11 (0.6-2.0)	Alkylating agent score accounts for exposure to various alkylating agents and range of doses.
,,		Alkylating agents: 47/95 (50%) survivors with breast cancer 2939/5973 (49%) survivors without breast cancer	P for trend > 0·2	

Inskip et al. Radiation dose and breast cancer risk in the childhood cancer survivor study. J Clin Oncol 2009;27:3901–7

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Multi-centre case-	6,647 5-yr childhood	Chest radiation:	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Analyses on alkylating agents were
control study	cancer survivors aged ≤21	107/120 (89%) cases	Chest radiation vs. no chest	adjusted for radiation dose delivered to
	yr at diagnosis	328/464 (71%) controls	radiation:	the breasts and ovaries, and for type of
1970-1986			2·7 (1·4-5·4)	childhood cancer diagnosis.
	120 childhood cancer	Absorbed radiation dose:	Alkylating agents vs. no alkylating	
Follow-up:	survivors with breast	Mean 13-4 Gy controls	agents:	Alkylating agent dose scores were
Median 19·4	cancer matched to 464	Dose cases not reported	0.93 (0.56-1.55)	assigned to individual alkylating agents on
(range 6·7-29·6) yr	childhood cancer survivors		Alkylating agent score 1 vs. 0:	the basis of the distributions of doses to
	without breast cancer	Alkylating agents:	0.67 (0.30-1.51)	each agent, and these scores were
		53/120 (44%) cases	Alkylating agent score 2 vs. 0:	summed across agents.
		200/464 (43%) controls	1.40 (0.58-3.39)	
			Alkylating agent score 3 vs. 0:	
			1.15 (0.55-2.41)	

Travis et al. Breast cancer following radiotherapy and chemotherapy among young women with Hodgkin disease. JAMA 2003; 290: 465–75

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Population-based	3,817 female 1-yr Hodgkin	Chest radiation: 104/105 (99%)	Relative risk (95% CI)	Analyses on alkylating agents were
nested case-	lymphoma survivors aged	cases; 256/266 (96%)controls	Chest radiation only vs. none:	adjusted for radiation dose delivered to
control study	≤30 yr at diagnosis (20%		3.2 (1.4-8.2)	the breasts and ovaries.
	<18)	Absorbed radiation dose:	Alkylating agents only vs. none:	
1965-1994		Mean 37·7 ± 4·7 Gy cases	0.6 (0.2-2.0)	
	105 survivors with breast	Mean 37·3 ± 4·1 Gy controls	Alkylating agents and chest	
Follow-up:	cancer matched to 266		radiation vs. none:	
Median 18 (range	survivors without breast	Alkylating agents:	1.4 (0.6-3.4)	
7-30) yr	cancer	31/105 (30%) cases	1-4 cycles alkylating agents vs. 0	
		104/266 (39%) controls	cycles:	
			0.7 (0.3-1.7)	
			5-8 cycles alkylating agents vs. 0	
			cycles:	
			0.6 (0.3-1.1)	
			≥9 cycles alkylating agents vs. 0	
			cycles:	
			0.2 (0.1-0.7)	
			P for trend = 0.003	

Same cohort as Travis 2005.

Travis et al. Cumulative absolute breast cancer risk for young women treated for Hodgkin lymphoma. J Natl Cancer Inst 2005;97:1428–37

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Population-based	3,817 female 1-yr Hodgkin	Chest radiation:	Relative risk (95% CI)	Relative risk (95% CI)
cohort study	lymphoma survivors aged	104/105 (99%) survivors with	Reference ≥40 Gy mediastinal	Reference general population
	≤30 yr at diagnosis (20%	breast cancer	radiation without alkylating agents	Alkylating agents without mediastinal
1965-1994	<18 yrs)	256/266 (96%) survivors	Alkylating agents without	radiation:
		without breast cancer	mediastinal radiation:	0.8 (0.3-2.6)
Follow-up:	Breast cancer:		0.07 (0.02-0.36)	No alkylating agents, no mediastinal
Median 18 (range	105/3817 (2.8%)	Absorbed radiation dose:	No alkylating agents, no mediastinal	radiation:
7-30) yr		Mean 38-9 Gy cases	radiation:	1.7 (0.6-5.2)
		Mean 38⋅6 Gy controls	0.16 (0.47-0.72)	Alkylating agents with 20-<40 Gy
			Alkylating agents with 20-<40 Gy	mediastinal radiation:
		Alkylating agents:	mediastinal radiation:	4.0 (2.5-5.9)
		31/105 (30%) survivors with	0.38 (0.19-0.77)	Alkylating agents with ≥40 Gy
		breast cancer	Alkylating agents with ≥40 Gy	mediastinal radiation:
		104/266 (39%) survivors	mediastinal radiation:	4.9 (2.9-7.5)
		without breast cancer	0.47 (0.27-0.79)	No alkylating agents with 20-<40 Gy
			No alkylating agents with 20-<40 Gy	mediastinal radiation:
			mediastinal radiation:	8.5 (5.4-13.2)
			0.82 (0.47-1.43)	No alkylating agents with ≥40 Gy mediastinal radiation:
				10.5 (6.8-16.0)

Same cohort as Travis 2003.

van Leeuwen et al. Roles of radiation dose, chemotherapy, and hormonal factors in breast cancer following Hodgkin's disease. J Natl Cancer Inst 2003;95:971–80

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Population-based	650 female 5-yr Hodgkin	Chest radiation:	Relative risk (95% CI)	Analyses were adjusted for radiation dose
nested case-	lymphoma survivors aged	48/48 (100%) cases	<6 cycles alkylating agents vs chest	delivered to the breasts and ovaries.
control study	≤40 yr at diagnosis (30%	172/175 (98%) controls	radiation only:	
	<20 yr)		0.31 (0.09-1.05)	
1965-1988 Follow-up:	48 survivors with breast cancer matched to 175	Absorbed radiation dose: Mean 38·5 Gy cases Mean 37·6 Gy controls	≥6 cycles alkylating agents vs chest radiation only:  0·33 (0·13-0·86)	
Median 18∙7 yr	survivors without breast cancer	Alkylating agents:	0 33 (0 13 0 33)	
		12/48 (25%) cases 92/175 (53%) control		

This cohort was also included in the cohort of Travis 2003 and Travis 2005.

de Bruin et al. Breast cancer risk in female survivors of Hodgkin's lymphoma: lower risk after smaller radiation volumes. J Clin Oncol 2009;27:4239–46

Study design Treatment era Years of follow-up	Participants	Treatment	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Population-based cohort study  1965-1995  Follow-up: Median 17-8 (range 5-40) yr	1,122 female 5-yr Hodgkin lymphoma survivors aged <51 yr at diagnosis (30% ≤20 yr)  Breast cancer: 120/1222 (9·8%)	Chest radiation:  119/120 (99·2%) survivors with breast cancer  813/1002 (81·1%) survivors without breast cancer  Prescribed radiation dose not reported (patients usually received 40 Gy (36-44 Gy))  Alkylating agents:  33/120 (27·5%) survivors with breast cancer  448/1002 (44·7%) survivors without breast cancer	Hazard ratio (95% CI)  Mantle radiation vs. mediastinal radiation:  2·7 (1·1-6·9)  ≤8·4 g/m² procarbazine vs. no alkylating agents:  0·6 (0·3-0·9)  >8.4 g/m² procarbazine vs. no alkylating agents:  0·4 (0·1-1·3)  Chest radiation and MOPP vs. chest radiation only:  0·5 (0·3-0·9)  Chest radiation and MOPP/ABV vs. chest radiation only:  0·5 (0·2-1·1)  Chest radiation, MOPP and other alkylating agent vs. chest radiation only:  0·5 (0·2-1·2)  Chest radiation and other alkylating agent vs. chest radiation only:	Analyses were based on 782 women treated with mantle field, axillary, or mediastinal radiation before age 41.  Analyses on alkylating agents were adjusted for chest radiation, age at first radiation to the breast, time since first radiation to the breast, and pelvic radiation.

Dershaw et al. Breast carcinoma in women previously treated for Hodgkin disease: mammographic evaluation. Radiology 1992;184:421–3

Study design Study years Years of follow-up	Participants Age at study	Diagnostic test	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Single-centre	27 female Hodgkin	Mammography, physical	26/29 (89·7%) breast cancers	Interpretation of the results is limited by
retrospective cohort	lymphoma survivors treated	findings	detectable by mammography	the retrospective study design and small
study	with chest radiation with 29			number of cases.
	secondary breast cancers		11/29 (37.9%) breast cancers only	
Study years not			detected by mammography	
reported	Prescribed radiation dose:			
	20-50 Gy		18/29 (62·1%) breast cancers	
Follow-up:			detected by physical findings	
Mean 18 (range 8-34)	Age at study:			
yr after diagnosis	Mean 48 (range 33-75) yr at			
-	breast cancer diagnosis; 9/29 (31·0%) aged 33-39 yr			

Wolden et al. Management of breast cancer after Hodgkin's disease. J Clin Oncol 2000;18:765–72

Study design Study years Years of follow-up	Participants Age at study	Diagnostic test	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Single-centre	65 female Hodgkin	Self-examination, clinical	19/71 (26·8%) breast cancers	Interpretation of the results is limited by
retrospective cohort	lymphoma survivors treated	breast exam,	detected by mammography; of	the retrospective study design.
study	with chest radiation aged	mammography	which 4 detected in women aged 33-	
	13·3-71·8 (median 24·6) yr		38 yr	
Until 1997	at diagnosis with 71			
	secondary breast cancers		7/71 (9.9%) breast cancer detected	
Follow-up:			by clinical breast exam	
Median 17·4 (range	Prescribed radiation dose:			
1·5-32·7) yr after	mean 43·3 (range 24·0-51·0)		45/71 (63·3%) breast cancers	
diagnosis	Gy		detected by self-examination	
	Age at study:			
	Median 42·6 (range 23·0-			
	79·1) yr at breast cancer			
	diagnosis			

Diller et al. Breast cancer screening in women previously treated for Hodgkin's disease: a prospective cohort study. J Clin Oncol 2002;20:2085–91

Study design Study years Years of follow-up	Participants Age at study	Diagnostic test	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Single-centre	90 female 8-yr Hodgkin	Mammography: 79/90	Baseline mammography	1/12 (8·3%) breast cancers in women aged
prospective cohort	lymphoma survivors treated	(87·8%) at baseline; 84/90	10/79 (12·7%) abnormal	25-29 yr;
study	with mantle radiation; Age	(93·3%) during study	mammography	2/12 (16·7%) breast cancers in women
	at diagnosis: Median 20			aged 30-34 yr;
1995-1999	(range 13-30) yr		Recalls	0/12 (0%) breast cancers in women aged
			5/79 (6·3%) further imaging	35-39 yr.
Follow-up:	Prescribed radiation dose:		5/79 (6·3%) biopsy	
Median 16 (range 8-	median 37·5 (range 30·0-		2/10 (20·0%) breast cancer	
30) yr after diagnosis	41·5) Gy			
Median 3.1 (range 0-			Prevalent and incident breast cancers	
4·2) yr during study;	Age at study:		12/90 (13·3%) breast cancers	
Person-years of	Median 38 (range 24-51) yr;		detected in 10 patients; 10 invasive,	
follow-up: 219·8	40% <35 yr		2 DCIS	
			7/12 (58·3%) breast cancers initially	
			detected by mammography; 12/12	
			(100%) detectable by mammography	

DCIS = ductal carcinoma-in-situ.

Kwong et al. Mammographic screening in women at increased risk of breast cancer after treatment of Hodgkin's disease. Breast J 2008;14:39–48

Study design Study years Years of follow-up	Participants Age at study	Diagnostic test	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Single-centre	115 female Hodgkin	Mammography: 99/115	Baseline mammography	1/4 (25·0%) breast cancers in women aged
prospective cohort	lymphoma survivors treated	(86·1%)	17/99 (17·2%) abnormal	25-29 yr;
study	with chest radiation; Age at		mammography	0/4 (0%) breast cancers in women aged
	diagnosis: Median 24 (range			30-34 yr;
2002	13-24) yr		Recalls	2/4 (50·0%) breast cancers in women aged
			10/99 (10·1%) further imaging	35-39 yr.
Follow-up:	Prescribed radiation dose:		7/99 (7·1%) biopsy	
Median 16·9 (range 4·5-32·5) yr after	15-≥44 Gy		1/17 (5·9%) breast cancer	
radiation	Age at study:		Prevalent and incident breast cancers	
No follow-up years	Mean 40·4 (range 26-55) yr		4/115 (3·5%) breast cancers detected	
during study, only baseline	, -		in 4 patients; 2 invasive, 2 DCIS	
examinations			3/4 (75·0%) breast cancers initially	
			detected by mammography; 4/4	
			(100%) detectable by mammography	

Lee et al. Screening mammography for young women treated with supradiaphragmatic radiation for Hodgkin's lymphoma. Ann Oncol 2008;19:62–7

Study design Study years Years of follow-up	Participants Age at study	Diagnostic test	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Single-centre	115 female 8-yr Hodgkin	Mammography only:	Recalls not reported	0/12 (0%) breast cancers in women aged
prospective cohort	lymphoma survivors treated	82/115 (71·3%)		25-29 yr;
study	with chest radiation; Age at	Mammography + MRI:	Prevalent and incident breast cancers	2/12 (16·7%) breast cancers in women
	diagnosis: Median 22 (9-31)	12/115 (10·4%)	12/115 (10·4%) breast cancers	aged 30-34 yr;
1997-2006	yr	Mammography +	detected in 12 patients; 7 invasive, 5	3/12 (25.0%) breast cancers in women
		ultrasound:	DCIS	aged 35-39 yr.
Follow-up:	Prescribed radiation dose:	3/115 (2·6%)		
Median 13 (range 6-	Median 35 (range 15-60) Gy	MRI only:	5/12 (41·7%) breast cancers initially	6 of 7 breast cancer cases presented with
29) yr after diagnosis		1/115 (0·7%)	detected by mammography; 11/12	palpable masses were large, invasive
Median 5 (range 1-9)	Age at study:		(91.7%) detectable by	ductal carcinomas with nodal
yr during study;	Median 35 (range 24-55) yr		mammography	involvement.
Person-years of				
follow-up 855				

DCIS = ductal carcinoma-in-situ.

Howell et al. The UK national breast cancer screening programme for survivors of Hodgkin lymphoma detects breast cancer at an early stage. Br J Cancer 2009;101:582–8

Study design Study years Years of follow-up	Participants Age at study	Diagnostic test	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Population-based	243 female 8-yr Hodgkin	Mammography's in the	Mammography within screening	-
retrospective cohort	lymphoma survivors treated	national notification risk	program	
study	with chest radiation; Age at	assessment and screening	39/370 (10·5%) abnormal	
	diagnosis: Mean 25·5 ± 5·3	program: 171/243 (70·4%);	mammography	
2003-2007	yr	370 in 171 patients		
			Recalls	
Follow-up:	Prescribed radiation dose:		31/370 (8·4%) further imaging 8/370	
Mean 14·6 ± 9·1 yr	35·2 ± 4·6 Gy for breast		(2·2%) biopsy	
after diagnosis	cancer cases;		5/39 (12·8%) breast cancer	
Follow-up during	33.92 ± 4.8 Gy for controls			
study not reported			Prevalent and incident breast cancers	
	Age at study:		28/243 (11·5%) breast cancers	
	Mean 40·3 ± 9·09 yr (none		detected in 23 patients; 25 invasive,	
	aged <30 yr)		3 DCIS	
			10/28 (35·7%) breast cancers initially	
			detected by mammography	

DCIS = ductal carcinoma-in-situ.

# 6. What is the diagnostic value of a mammography, compared to a breast MRI, to detect breast cancer in an early stage in women in a young age group compared to another age group?

*Kriege et al.* Factors affecting sensitivity and specificity of screening mammography and MRI in women with an inherited risk for breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2006;100:109–19

Study design Study years Years of follow-up	Participants Age at study	Diagnostic test Breast cancer	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
Multi-centre prospective cohort study	1,779 women with a high familial risk of breast cancer (≥15% lifetime) without	Mammography, MRI Screening examinations:	Sensitivity mammography; odds ratio (95% CI) ≥50 yr: 55·6%; ref	Screening exam was defined positive if BI-RADS score was 0, 3, 4 or 5.
1999-2003	prior history of breast cancer	4134	<b>40-49 yr:</b> 38-9%; 0.58 (0·11-3·0) <b>&lt;40 yr:</b> 33·3%; 0·53 (0·09-3·04)  P = 0·75	Results were blinded so that the
Follow-up:	Age at study:	Breast cancer: 45/1779 (2·5%); 39 invasive,	Sensitivity MRI; odds ratio (95% CI) ≥ <b>50 yr:</b> 66·7%; ref	two examinations were not linked.
Median 2·9 (range 0·1-3·9) yr; 5,249 person-years at risk	Mean 40 (range 19-72) yr	6 DCIS  Cases of interval cancer:	<b>40-49 yr:</b> 83·3%; 2·77 (0·34-22·25) <b>&lt;40 yr:</b> 61·1%; 0·74 (0·09-5·94) $P = 0.36$	Analyses were adjusted for hereditary risk and breast density.
		4/45 (8·9%)	Positive predictive value mammography ≥50 yr: 7·8%	The precision of sensitivity estimates was affected by the small
			<b>40-49 yr:</b> 7·4% <b>&lt;40 yr:</b> 9·6% $P = 0.89$	number of detected breast cancers resulting in wide confidence intervals.
			Positive predictive value MRI ≥50 yr: 5·7% 40-49 yr: 8·2%	
			<b>&lt;40 yr:</b> $8.2\%$ $P = 0.60$ False positive rate mammography; odds	BI-RADS = Breast Imaging- Reporting and Data System.
			ratio (95% CI) ≥50 yr: 5·4%; ref	
			<b>40-49 yr:</b> 6·3%; 1·10 (0·76-1·60) <b>&lt;40 yr:</b> 3·9%; 0·64 (0·43-0·59) <i>P</i> = 0·004	
			False positive rate MRI; odds ratio (95% CI) ≥50 yr: 7·6%; ref	
			<b>40-49 yr:</b> 12·1%; 1·58 (1·17-2·13) <b>&lt;40 yr:</b> 9·9%; 1·28 (0·95-1·73)  P = 0·009	
			Discriminating capacity MRI vs. mammography; AUC difference	
			≥50 yr: 0·114 ( <i>P</i> = 0·53) <b>40-49</b> yr: 0·227 ( <i>P</i> = 0·02) < <b>40</b> yr: 0·068 ( <i>P</i> = 0·47)	

# 6. What is the diagnostic value of a mammography, compared to a breast MRI, to detect breast cancer in an early stage in women in a young age group compared to another age group?

**Sardanelli et al.** Multicenter surveillance of women at high genetic breast cancer risk using mammography, ultrasonography, and contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging (the high breast cancer risk Italian 1 study): final results. Invest Radiol 2011;46:94–105

Study design Study years Years of follow-up	Participants Age at study	Diagnostic test Breast cancer	Main outcomes	Additional remarks
	Age at study  501 women with a high familial risk of breast cancer; 44% prior history of breast and/or ovarian cancer  Age at study: Median 45·0 (range 22-79) yr	Mammography, MRI, ultrasound, clinical breast exam  Screening examinations: 1592; mean 3·2 per patient  Breast cancer: 52/501 (10·4%); 44 invasive, 8 DCIS  Cases of interval cancer: 3/52 (5·8%)  2/52 (3·8%) breast cancers in women aged 20-29 yr 9/52 (17·3%) breast cancers in women aged 30-39 yr	Cancer detection rate per woman-year (95% CI): 3·1 (2·3-4·0)  Mammography women <50 yr Sensitivity: 45·5% (24·5-67·8) Specificity: 98·7% (97·5-99·5) Positive predictive value: 55·6% (30·8-78·5) Negative predictive value: 98·1% (96·7-99·0)  Mammography women ≥50 yr Sensitivity: 53·6% (33·9-72·5) Specificity: 99·5% (98·2-99·9) Positive predictive value: 88·2% (63·6-98·5) Negative predictive value: 96·9% (94·8-98·3)  MRI women <50 yr Sensitivity: 88·9% (65·3-98·6) Specificity: 96·6% (94·8-97·9) Positive predictive value: 43·2% (27·1-60·5) Negative predictive value: 99·7% (98·8-100)  MRI women ≥50 yr Sensitivity: 92·9% (76·5-99·1) Specificity: 96·9% (94·6-98·4) Positive predictive value:	Screening exam was defined positive if BI-RADS score was 4 or 5.  Results were blinded so that the two examinations were not linked.  BI-RADS = Breast Imaging-Reporting and Data System.
			68·4% (51·3-82·5)  Negative predictive value: 99·5% (98·1-99·9)	

7. What is the risk of breast cancer in childhood, adolescent and young adult cancer survivors aged >50 years treated with chest radiation?
lo studies identified in childhood, adolescent and young adult cancer survivors or in other populations.
8. What is the diagnostic value of a clinical breast exam to detect breast cancer in an early stage in women aged <25 years?
lo studies identified in childhood, adolescent and young adult cancer survivors or in other populations.
9. What is the diagnostic value of a breast MRI and a mammogram compared to a breast MRI to detect breast cancer in an early stage in women aged 25-35 years?
lo studies identified in childhood, adolescent and young adult cancer survivors or in other populations.