other medical interventions because they are proactively administered to healthy individuals instead of in response to a symptom, sign, or diagnosis. Thus, the decision to recommend a screening test or preventive intervention requires a particularly high bar of evidence that testing and intervention are both practical and effective.

Because population-based screening and prevention strategies must be extremely low risk to have an acceptable benefit-to-harm ratio, the ability to target individuals who are more likely to develop disease could enable the application of a wider set of potential approaches and increase efficiency. Currently, there are many types of data that can predict disease incidence in an asymptomatic individual. Genomic data have received the most attention to date, at least in part because mutations in high-penetrance genes have clear implications for preventive care (Chap. 84). Women with mutations in either *BRCA1* or *BRCA2*, the two major breast cancer susceptibility genes identified to date, have a markedly increased risk (5- to 20-fold) of breast and ovarian cancer. Screening and prevention recommendations include prophylactic oophorectomy and breast magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), both of which are considered to incur too much harm for women at average cancer risk. Some women opt for prophylactic mastectomy to dramatically reduce their breast cancer risk. Although the proportion of common disease explained by high-penetrance genes appears to be relatively small (5–10% of most diseases), mutations in rare, moderate-penetrance genes, and variants in low-penetrance genes, also contribute to the prediction of disease risk. The advent of affordable whole exome/whole genome sequencing is likely to speed the dissemination of these tests into clinical practice and may transform the delivery of preventive care.

Other forms of "omic" data also have the potential to provide important predictive information, including proteomics and metabolomics. These fields are earlier in development and have yet to move into clinical practice. Imaging and other clinical data may also be integrated into a risk-stratified paradigm as evidence grows about the predictive ability of these data and the feasibility of their collection. Of course, all of these data may also be helpful in predicting the risk of harms from screening or prevention, such as the risk of a false-positive mammogram. To the degree that this information can be incorporated into personalized screening and prevention strategies, it could also improve delivery and efficiency.

In addition to advances in risk prediction, there are several other factors that are likely to promote the importance of screening and prevention in the near term. New imaging modalities are being developed that promise to detect changes at the cellular and subcellular levels, greatly increasing the probability that early detection improves outcomes. The rapidly growing understanding of the biologic pathways underlying initiation and progression of many common diseases has the potential to transform the development of preventive interventions, including chemoprevention. Furthermore, screening and prevention offer the promise of both improving health and sparing the costs of disease treatment, an issue that has gained national attention with the continued growth in health care costs.

This chapter will review the basic principles of screening and prevention in the primary care setting. Recommendations for specific disorders such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and cancer are provided in the chapters dedicated to those topics.

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF SCREENING

The basic principles of screening populations for disease were published by the World Health Organization in 1968 (Table 4-1).

In general, screening is most effective when applied to relatively common disorders that carry a large disease burden (Table 4-2). The five leading causes of mortality in the United States are heart diseases, malignant neoplasms, accidents, cerebrovascular diseases, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Thus, many screening strategies are targeted at these conditions. From a global health perspective, these conditions are priorities, but malaria, malnutrition, AIDS, tuberculosis, and violence also carry a heavy disease burden (Chap. 2).

Having an effective treatment for early disease has proven challenging for some common diseases. For example, although Alzheimer's disease is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States, there are no curative treatments and no evidence that early treatment improves outcomes. Lack of facilities for diagnosis and treatment is a particular challenge for developing countries and may change screening strategies, including the development of "see and treat" approaches such as those currently used for cervical cancer screening in some countries. A long latent or preclinical phase where early treatment increases the chance of cure is a hallmark of many cancers; for example, polypectomy prevents progression to colon cancer. Similarly, early identification of hypertension or hyperlipidemia allows therapeutic interventions that reduce the long-term risk of cardiovascular or cerebrovascular events. In contrast, lung cancer screening has historically proven more challenging because most tumors are not curable by the time they can be detected on a chest x-ray. However, the length of the preclinical phase also depends on the level of resolution of the screening test, and this situation changed with the development of chest computed tomography (CT). Low-dose chest CT scanning can detect tumors earlier and was recently demonstrated to reduce lung cancer mortality by 20% in individuals who had at least a 30-pack-year history of smoking. The short interval between the ability to detect disease on a screening test and the development of incurable disease also contributes to the limited effectiveness of mammography screening in reducing breast cancer mortality among premenopausal women. Similarly, the early detection of prostate cancer may not lead to a difference in the mortality rate because the disease is often indolent and competing morbidities, such as coronary artery disease, may ultimately cause mortality (Chap. 100). This uncertainty about the natural history is also reflected in the controversy about treatment of prostate cancer, further contributing to the challenge of screening in this disease. Finally, screening programs can incur significant economic costs that must be considered in the context of the available resources and alternative strategies for improving health outcomes.

TABLE 4-1 PRINCIPLES OF SCREENING

The condition should be an important health problem.
There should be a treatment for the condition.
Facilities for diagnosis and treatment should be available.
There should be a latent stage of the disease.
There should be a test or examination for the condition.
The test should be acceptable to the population.
The natural history of the disease should be adequately understood.
There should be an agreed policy on whom to treat.
The cost of finding a case should be balanced in relation to overall medical expenditure.

METHODS OF MEASURING HEALTH BENEFITS

Because screening and preventive interventions are recommended to asymptomatic individuals, they are held to a high standard for demonstrating a favorable risk-benefit ratio before implementation. In general, the principles of evidence-based medicine apply to demonstrating the efficacy of screening tests and preventive interventions, where randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with mortality outcomes are the gold standard. However, because RCTs are often not feasible, observational studies, such as case-control designs, have been used to assess the effectiveness of some interventions such as colorectal cancer screening. For some strategies, such as cervical cancer screening, the only data available are ecologic data demonstrating dramatic declines in mortality.

TABLE 4-2 LIFETIME CUMULATIVE RISK

Breast cancer for women	10%
Colon cancer	6%
Cancer of the cervix for women[a]	2%
Domestic violence for women	Up to 15%
Hip fracture for white women	16%

[a]Assuming an unscreened population.