

Guideline Page and Request	Panel Discussion/References	Institution Vote			
		YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
<p>BSCR-2 External request: Submission request from Myriad Genetic Laboratories to “add a list of commonly qualifying family history examples as sub-bullets or a footnote under the screening or symptom category for Women who have a lifetime risk >20% as defined by models that are largely dependent on family history.”</p>	<p>Based on the data in the noted references, the panel consensus was to not include a list of qualifying family history examples.</p> <p><u>References:</u> Metcalfe KA1, Finch A, Poll A, Horsman D, Kim-Sing C, Scott J, Royer R, Sun P, Narod SA. Breast cancer risks in women with a family history of breast or ovarian cancer who have tested negative for a BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutation. <i>Br J Cancer</i>. 2009 Jan 27;100(2):421-5.</p> <p>Collaborative Group on Hormonal Factors in Breast Cancer. Familial breast cancer: collaborative reanalysis of individual data from 52 epidemiological studies including 58,209 women with breast cancer and 101,986 women without the disease. <i>Lancet</i>. 2001 Oct 27;358(9291):1389-99.</p> <p>Pharoah PD1, Day NE, Duffy S, Easton DF, Ponder BA. Family history and the risk of breast cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Int J Cancer</i>. 1997 May 29;71(5):800-9.</p> <p>Rawal R1, Bertelsen L, Olsen JH. Cancer incidence in first-degree relatives of a population based set of cases of early-onset breast cancer. <i>Eur J Cancer</i>. 2006 Nov;42(17):3034-40. Epub2006 Sep 22.</p> <p>Olsen JH1, Seersholm N, Boice JD Jr, Krüger Kjaer S, Fraumeni JF Jr. Cancer risk in close relatives of women with early-onset breast cancer--a population-based incidence study. <i>Br J Cancer</i>. 1999 Feb;79(3-4):673-9.</p>	0	20	0	7

Guideline Page and Request	Panel Discussion/References	Institution Vote			
		YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
<p>BSCR-A (1 of 2) External request: Submission request from Hologic, Inc. to revise the 8th bullet point to state, “Digital breast tomosynthesis is a standard mammography platform that is an established alternative to conventional digital screening and diagnostic mammography. Studies show that breast tomosynthesis significantly decreases call back rates, improves cancer detection, and represents an improvement in breast cancer screening as compared to conventional digital mammography. Most early studies used double the dose of radiation. New developments, including synthesized 2-D reconstruction, allow breast tomosynthesis exams to be performed with a radiation dose similar to conventional digital mammography.”</p>	<p>Based on the review of the data, the panel did not accept Hologic’s request; however, agreed to modify the 8th bullet to state, “Multiple studies show a combined use of digital mammography and tomosynthesis <i>appears to</i> improve cancer detection and decreased call back rates. Of note, most studies used double the dose of radiation. The radiation dose can be minimized by synthetic 2-D reconstruction.”</p> <p>See submission for references.</p>	0	20	0	7

Guideline Page and Request	Panel Discussion/References	Institution Vote			
		YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
<p>BSCR-A (1 of 2) External request: Submission request from the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine to provide recent study findings which support the use of digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT) for breast cancer mammography screening.</p>	<p>Based on the review of data, the panel did not accept the University of Pennsylvania’s request; however, agreed to include “consider tomosynthesis” as a method for mammography screening.</p> <p>McDonald E, Oustimov A, Weinstein S, et al. Effectiveness of digital breast tomosynthesis compared with digital mammography: Outcomes analysis from 3 years of breast cancer screening. JAMA Oncology 2016;2:1-7. http://oncology.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?articleid=2491465</p>	0	20	0	7