

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, Lyngø'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
● Lyngø'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
● Lyngø'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>	<i>363</i>
<i>Appendix 2: Our 2008 mammography screening leaflet</i>	<i>369</i>
<i>Appendix 3: The press release Radiology withdrew at the last minute</i>	<i>381</i>
<i>Index</i>	<i>384</i>