

be markedly lower for populations that had previously been exposed to vaccine-specific HPV strains. The vaccine is recommended in the United States for females and males age 9–26 years.

SURGICAL PREVENTION OF CANCER

Some organs in some individuals are at such high risk of developing cancer that surgical removal of the organ at risk may be considered. Women with severe cervical dysplasia are treated with laser or loop electrosurgical excision or conization and occasionally even hysterectomy. Colectomy is used to prevent colon cancer in patients with familial polyposis or ulcerative colitis.

Prophylactic bilateral mastectomy may be chosen for breast cancer prevention among women with genetic predisposition to breast cancer. In a prospective series of 139 women with *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutations, 76 chose to undergo prophylactic mastectomy and 63 chose close surveillance. At 3 years, no cases of breast cancer had been diagnosed in those opting for surgery, but eight patients in the surveillance group had developed breast cancer. A larger (n = 639) retrospective cohort study reported that three patients developed breast cancer after prophylactic mastectomy compared with an expected incidence of 30–53 cases: a 90–94% reduction in breast cancer risk. Postmastectomy breast cancer–related deaths were reduced by 81–94% for high-risk women compared with sister controls and by 100% for moderate-risk women when compared with expected rates.

Prophylactic oophorectomy may also be employed for the prevention of ovarian and breast cancers among high-risk women. A prospective cohort study evaluating the outcomes of *BRCA* mutation carriers demonstrated a statistically significant association between prophylactic oophorectomy and a reduced incidence of ovarian or primary peritoneal cancer (36% relative risk reduction, or a 4.5% absolute difference). Studies of prophylactic oophorectomy for prevention of breast cancer in women with genetic mutations have shown relative risk reductions of approximately 50%; the risk reduction may be greatest for women having the procedure at younger (i.e., <50 years) ages.

All of the evidence concerning the use of prophylactic mastectomy and oophorectomy for prevention of breast and ovarian cancer in high-risk women has been observational in nature; such studies are prone to a variety of biases, including case selection bias, family relationships between patients and controls, and inadequate information about hormone use. Thus, they may give an overestimate of the magnitude of benefit.

CANCER SCREENING

Screening is a means of detecting disease early in asymptomatic individuals, with the goal of decreasing morbidity and mortality. While screening can potentially reduce disease-specific deaths and has been shown to do so in cervical, colon, lung, and breast cancer, it is also subject to a number of biases that can suggest a benefit when actually there is none. Biases can even mask net harm. Early detection does not in itself confer benefit. Cause-specific mortality, rather than survival after diagnosis, is the preferred endpoint (see below).

Because screening is done on asymptomatic, healthy persons, it should offer substantial likelihood of benefit that outweighs harm. Screening tests and their appropriate use should be carefully evaluated before their use is widely encouraged in screening programs, as a matter of public policy.

A large and increasing number of genetic mutations and nucleotide polymorphisms have been associated with an increased risk of cancer. Testing for these genetic mutations could in theory define a high-risk population. However, most of the identified mutations have very low penetrance and individually provide minimal predictive accuracy. The ability to predict the development of a particular cancer may some day present therapeutic options as well as ethical dilemmas. It may eventually allow for early intervention to prevent a cancer or limit its severity. People at high risk may be ideal candidates for chemoprevention and screening; however, efficacy of these interventions in the high-risk population should be investigated. Currently, persons at high risk for a particular cancer can engage in intensive screening. While this course is clinically reasonable, it is not known if it reduces mortality in these populations.

TABLE 100-2 ASSESSMENT OF THE VALUE OF A DIAGNOSTIC TEST^a

	Condition Present	Condition Absent
Positive test	a	b
Negative test	c	d
a = true positive		
b = false positive		
c = false negative		
d = true negative		
Sensitivity	The proportion of persons with the condition who test positive: $a/(a + c)$	
Specificity	The proportion of persons without the condition who test negative: $d/(b + d)$	
Positive predictive value (PPV)	The proportion of persons with a positive test who have the condition: $a/(a + b)$	
Negative predictive value	The proportion of persons with a negative test who do not have the condition: $d/(c + d)$	
Prevalence, sensitivity, and specificity determine PPV		
$PPV = \frac{\text{prevalence} \times \text{sensitivity}}{(\text{prevalence} \times \text{sensitivity}) + (1 - \text{prevalence})(1 - \text{specificity})}$		

^aFor diseases of low prevalence, such as cancer, poor specificity has a dramatic adverse effect on PPV such that only a small fraction of positive tests are true positives.

The Accuracy of Screening A screening test's accuracy or ability to discriminate disease is described by four indices: sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, and negative predictive value (Table 100-2). *Sensitivity*, also called the true-positive rate, is the proportion of persons with the disease who test positive in the screen (i.e., the ability of the test to detect disease when it is present). *Specificity*, or 1 minus the false-positive rate, is the proportion of persons who do not have the disease that test negative in the screening test (i.e., the ability of a test to correctly identify that the disease is not present). The *positive predictive value* is the proportion of persons who test positive that actually have the disease. Similarly, *negative predictive value* is the proportion testing negative that do not have the disease. The sensitivity and specificity of a test are independent of the underlying prevalence (or risk) of the disease in the population screened, but the predictive values depend strongly on the prevalence of the disease.

Screening is most beneficial, efficient, and economical when the target disease is common in the population being screened. Specificity is at least as important to the ultimate feasibility and success of a screening test as sensitivity.

Potential Biases of Screening Tests Common biases of screening are lead time, length-biased sampling, and selection. These biases can make a screening test seem beneficial when actually it is not (or even causes net harm). Whether beneficial or not, screening can create the false impression of an epidemic by increasing the number of cancers diagnosed. It can also produce a shift in the proportion of patients diagnosed at an early stage and inflate survival statistics without reducing mortality (i.e., the number of deaths from a given cancer relative to the number of those at risk for the cancer). In such a case, the *apparent* duration of survival (measured from date of diagnosis) increases without lives being saved or life expectancy changed.

Lead-time bias occurs whether or not a test influences the natural history of the disease; the patient is merely diagnosed at an earlier date. Survival *appears* increased even if life is not really prolonged. The screening test only prolongs the time the subject is aware of the disease and spends as a patient.

Length-biased sampling occurs because screening tests generally can more easily detect slow-growing, less aggressive cancers than fast-growing cancers. Cancers diagnosed due to the onset of symptoms between scheduled screenings are on average more aggressive, and treatment outcomes are not as favorable. An extreme form of length bias sampling is termed *overdiagnosis*, the detection of "pseudo disease." The reservoir of some undetected slow-growing tumors is large. Many of these tumors fulfill the histologic criteria of cancer but will