

This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:

The authors respond to "Informed decision-making and breast cancer screening: An oxymoron?"

Reference:

Ritchie David, Van Hal Guido F., Van den Broucke Stephan.- The authors respond to "Informed decision-making and breast cancer screening: An oxymoron?"
Health policy - ISSN 0168-8510 - Clare, Elsevier ireland ltd, 125:1(2021), p. 132-133
Full text (Publisher's DOI): <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.HEALTHPOL.2020.10.013>
To cite this reference: <https://hdl.handle.net/10067/1760480151162165141>

The authors respond to “*Informed decision-making and breast cancer screening: an oxymoron?*”

We welcome the comments (1) in response to our study “*How is informed decision-making about breast cancer screening addressed in Europe? An international survey of 28 countries*” (2).

With this study we aimed to gain some appreciation of how the general commitment to support informed choice is being implemented. As referenced in the letter to the editor, one of the key highlights is that widely accepted measurements of informed decision-making, which are feasible to implement in practice, are lacking at this moment. Encouragingly, research in this direction is a current topic (3) (4), which will need to be addressed by policymakers in the near term.

Regarding the response rate for experts contacted for the purpose of this study, whilst it was not high, enough responses were received to cover 28 different countries in Europe. Therefore, we are more optimistic in the sense that non-response from experts we contacted for this study does not necessarily imply disinterest about informed decision-making. Rather, it reflects the fact that our survey was quite detailed and lengthy, requiring completion by the appropriate data provider. Thus, for a number of countries, this required contacting several experts, which thereby inflated the contact rate.

Concerning the European Commission Initiative on Breast Cancer, although the initiative has not produced a specific leaflet, similar in vein to the example referenced from Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre referenced in the letter to the editor (5), the guidelines development group of the initiative has recently published guidance on inviting and informing women about organised screening programmes (6). Therefore, such guidance can be used to help decision-makers provide evidence-based communication tools.

We acknowledge the point raised regarding the participation rate reported in table 2 of the study. With this study, we followed the protocol and definitions of the second implementation report on the Council recommendation for Cancer Screening (2003), as the most comprehensive source of comparable data available on cancer screening programmes in Europe (7). However, accounting for the heterogenous context at national and regional level in Europe poses a pragmatic challenge for the reporting of comparable data, which future research should address.

Nevertheless, we fulsomely agree that breast screening is best 'offered' to women in the context of a well organised programme, which commits to continuous monitoring and evaluation for quality improvement. Countries with widespread spontaneous screening must consider how to ensure women receive the same quality of clear, appropriate, and evidence-based information to support informed choice as they would in an organised population-based programme.

Whilst universal consensus about the appropriate data and methods to communicate to women may still be lacking, recent research to quantify the benefits and harms of cancer screening programmes (8) coupled with development of new literature to encourage women to weigh up the offer of screening (9), provides a great deal of encouragement.

References

- (1) Braillon, A. (2020) Informed decision-making and breast cancer screening: an oxymoron? **Health Policy XXX (complete full citation)**
- (2) Ritchie D, Van Hal G, Van den Broucke S (2020) How is informed decision-making about breast cancer screening addressed in Europe? An international survey of 28 countries. **Health Policy XXX (complete full citation)**. doi: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2020.05.011
- (3) Reder, M., Berens, E., Spallek, J. et al. (2019) Development of the Informed Choice in Mammography Screening Questionnaire (IMQ): factor structure, reliability, and validity. BMC Psychol 7, 17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-019-0291-2>
- (4) Pérez-Lacasta MJ, Martínez-Alonso M, Garcia M, Sala M, Perestelo-Pérez L, Vidal C, et al. (2019) Effect of information about the benefits and harms of mammography on women's decision making: The InforMa randomised controlled trial. PLoS ONE 14(3): e0214057. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0214057>
- (5) Kohn L, Mambourg F, Robays J, Albertijn M. (2014) INFORMED CHOICE ON BREAST CANCER SCREENING: MESSAGES TO SUPPORT INFORMED DECISION. [cited 2020 Jul 2]. Available from: https://kce.fgov.be/sites/default/files/atoms/files/KCE_216_breast_cancer_screening.pdf
- (6) European Commission, ECIBC (2020) Inviting and informing women about organised screening programmes. [cited 2020 Jul 2]. Available from: <https://healthcare-quality.jrc.ec.europa.eu/european-breast-cancer-guidelines/Invitation-to-screening-and-decision-aid>
- (7) Ponti A, Anttila A, Ronco G, Senore C. (2017) Cancer Screening in Report on the implementation of the Council Recommendation on cancer screening [Internet]. International Agency for Research on Cancer. [cited 2020 Jul 2]. Available from:

https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/major_chronic_diseases/docs/2017_cancerscreening_2ndreportimplementation_en.pdf

- (8) EU-topia (not dated) WP2 - Key benchmarks and indicators to quantify equity, benefits and harms of screening. [cited 2020 Jul 2]. Available from: <https://eu-topia.org/workpackages/wp2-key-benchmarks-and-indicators-to-quantify-equity-benefits-and-harms-of-screening/>
- (9) NHS (2018) Breast cancer screening. [cited 2020 Jul 2]. Available from: <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/breast-cancer-screening/>