

Mammography Screening

Truth, lies and controversy

PETER C GÖTZSCHE

MD, DrMedSci, MSc

Professor of Clinical Research Design and Analysis

Director, The Nordic Cochrane Centre

Chief Physician

Rigshospitalet and the University of Copenhagen

Denmark

Forewords by

IONA HEATH

President of the Royal College of General Practitioners

London

and

FRAN VISCO

President of the National Breast Cancer Coalition

The United States

Radcliffe Publishing

London • New York

Contents

<i>Foreword by Iona Heath</i>	vii
<i>Foreword by Fran Visco</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xi
1 Introduction	1
● What it really means to be ‘controversial’	5
● Our collaboration with the media	10
2 Important issues in cancer screening	13
● What it means ‘to have cancer’	13
● Overdiagnosis and overtreatment	15
● Erroneous diagnoses and carcinoma <i>in situ</i>	16
● Basic issues in cancer epidemiology	19
● Randomised trials, observational studies and a little statistics	20
● Why screening leads to misleading survival statistics	22
● Why 10-year survival is also misleading	23
3 Does screening work in Sweden?	29
4 Stonewalling the Cochrane report on screening	34
● The Danish National Board of Health interferes with our report	40
5 Troubling results in the <i>Lancet</i>	46
● The Canadian trials	50
● Media storm	52
● Email from researchers	55
● Our collaboration with the trialists	56
● Ten letters to the editor	58
● Creative manipulations in Sweden	60
● Peter Dean, a remarkable character	63

Contents

● Bad manners also in Norway	66
● Continued troubles in Denmark	68
6 Harms dismissed by the Cochrane Breast Cancer Group	73
● The process with the Cochrane review	75
● Of mites and men	77
● Confusion over who is in charge	78
7 The <i>Lancet</i> publishes the harms of screening	85
● Vitriolic mass email from Peter Dean	90
● Beating about the bush in the United Kingdom	93
● Condemnations in Sweden	95
● Contempt of science in Denmark and Norway	99
8 Delayed media storm in the United States after our 2001 reviews	103
● Miettinen and Henschke's cherry-picking in the <i>Lancet</i>	107
● Additional reactions in the United States	108
9 The Danish National Board of Health circles the wagons	114
10 US and Swedish 2002 meta-analyses	120
● US Preventive Services Task Force's meta-analysis	120
● Nyström's updated Swedish meta-analysis	121
11 Scientific debates in the United States	126
● Peter Dean is wrong again	126
● Multiple errors in the <i>International Journal of Epidemiology</i>	130
12 Publication of entire Cochrane review obstructed for 5 years	136
● Cochrane editors stonewall our Cochrane review	138
● Lessons for the future	143
● Welcome results in France	145
13 Editorial misconduct in the <i>European Journal of Cancer</i>	147
● Editorial misconduct	151
● Threats, intimidation and falsehoods	155
● Debates in the <i>Scientist</i> and the <i>Cancer Letter</i>	158
14 Tabár's 'beyond reason' studies	163
● Criticism of our work in the <i>Journal of Surgical Oncology</i>	168

15	Other observational studies of breast cancer mortality	173
	● The United States and the United Kingdom	174
	● Denmark, Lyngge's 2005 study	175
	● Denmark, our 2010 study	177
16	Overdiagnosis and overtreatment	185
	● Cancers that regress spontaneously	186
	● The 1986 UK Forrest report	188
	● Overdiagnosis in the randomised trials	189
	● Systematic review of overdiagnosis in observational studies	194
	● Observational studies from Denmark and New South Wales	200
	● The doubt industry	202
	● Duffy's studies on overdiagnosis	205
	● Lyngge's studies on overdiagnosis	207
	● Carcinoma <i>in situ</i> and the increase in mastectomies	210
17	<i>Ad hominem</i> attacks: a measure of desperation?	220
	● UK statistician publishes in Danish	222
	● Inappropriate name-dropping	223
	● Further <i>ad hominem</i> arguments	226
	● Lyngge's unholy mixture of politics and science	227
	● <i>Ad hominem</i> attacks <i>ad infinitum</i>	230
18	US recommendations for women aged 40–49 years	238
19	What have women been told?	245
	● Website information on screening	245
	● Invitations to screening	247
	● A scandalous revision of the Danish screening leaflet	252
	● Our screening leaflet	254
	● Breast screening: the facts, or maybe not	255
	● American Cancer Society	262
	● Information from other cancer societies	267
	● Getting funding or not getting funding	271
	● What do women believe?	272
20	Extraordinary exaggerations	279
	● What is the ratio between benefits and harms?	280

Contents

● Duffy's 'funny' numbers	282
● Exaggerating 25-fold	287
● The exaggerations finally backfire	292
● The ultimate exaggeration	294
21 Tabár threatens the <i>BMJ</i> with litigation	298
22 Falsehoods and perceived censorship in Sweden	306
23 Celebrating 20 years of breast screening in the United Kingdom	311
24 Can screening work?	320
● Plausible effect based on tumour sizes in the trials	320
● Lead time	323
● Plausible effect based on tumour stages in the trials	324
● No decrease in advanced cancers	326
25 Where is screening at today?	331
● Problems with reading mammograms	332
● False promises	333
● Important information is being ignored	336
● Beliefs warp evidence at conferences	338
● Does breast screening make women live longer?	340
26 Where next?	347
● Is screening a religion?	351
● A press release from <i>Radiology</i> that wasn't	352
● Has all my struggle achieved anything?	353
● Why has so much evidence about screening been distorted?	357
● Time to stop breast cancer screening	358
<i>Appendix 1: Tabár's explanations in the Cancer Letter and our replies</i>	363
<i>Appendix 2: Our 2008 mammography screening leaflet</i>	369
<i>Appendix 3: The press release Radiology withdrew at the last minute</i>	381
<i>Index</i>	384