

## References:

- Elliott, VS. Mammography debate: Who should get screened and when? American Medical News, an AMA publication. Volume 10, number 42, pages 35-37, November 10, 2003. [www.amednews.com](http://www.amednews.com).
- Kerlikowske, K. *Use of mammograms in older women questionable*. JAMA. December 10, 2003.
- Time Magazine, April 28, 2003. Cover story: *The No. 1 Killer of Women*.
- SEER, National Cancer Institute: *Chances of developing breast cancer at a given age*. de Sanjose S, et al. *Prevalence of BRCA1 and BRCA2 germline mutations in young breast cancer patients: a population-based study*. Int J Cancer 2003; 106 (4): 588-93.
- Furstenberger et al. Insulin like growth factors mediate breast cancer growth and proliferation. *Onkologie*, 2003. Volume 26, number 3, pages 290-94.
- Baker L. Breast cancer detection demonstration project: Five year summary report. *Cancer*, 1982, volume 32, pages 194-225.
- Sickles EA. Breast masses: mammographic evaluation. *Radiology* 1989. Pages 173- 303.
- Fletcher, S W, and Elmore, J G. Mammographic Screening for Breast Cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine*. Volume 348, no. 17, pages 1672-80. April 24, 2003.
- Ostbye, T. Elderly women over-screened for cancers with little measurable benefit. *Annals of Family Practice*. November/December issue, 2003.
- Pisano, E. Digital Mammography Offers Better Breast Cancer Diagnoses. Presented at the Radiologic Society of North America annual meeting, December 2003. Research conducted at University of North Carolina School of Medicine. [etpisano@med.unc.edu](mailto:etpisano@med.unc.edu).
- Freidrich M. MRI of the breast: State of the art. *European Radiology*, 1998. Volume 8, pages 707-725.
- Avril N, Rose CA, Schelling M, et al. Breast imaging with positron emission tomography and fluorine-18 flourodeoxyglucose: use and limitations. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 2000. Volume 18, pages 3495-3502.
- Avril N. Discussions in PET Imaging 2003. CMP Healthcare Media, DPI no. 621, PET and Breast Cancer.
- Gautherie, M, Haehnel, P, Walter, J p, Keith, L. Long-Term Assessment of Breast Cancer Risk by Liquid-Crystal Thermal Imaging. *Biomedical Thermology*, pages 279-301. 1982 Alan R. Liss, Incl, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10011.
- Parisky, Y R, et al. Efficacy of Computerized Infrared Imaging Analysis to Evaluate Mammographically Suspicious Lesions. *American Journal of Roentgenology*, January 2003, 263-69.
- Gautherie, M, and Gros, C M. Breast Thermography and Cancer Risk Prediction. *Cancer*, 1980, volume 56, 45-51.
- Nyirjesy, M D, et al. Clinical Evaluation, Mammography and Thermography in the Diagnosis of Breast Carcinoma. *Thermology*, 1986, volume 1, 170-73.
- Keyserlingk, M D, et al. Infrared Imaging of the Breast: Initial Reappraisal Using High-Resolution Digital Technology in 100 successive cases of Stage I and II Breast Cancer. *The Breast Journal*, volume 4, 1998, 245-51.

Bolan, P. In vivo quantification of choline compounds in the breast with <sup>1</sup>H MR spectroscopy. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*. Volume 50, Issue 6, Date: December 2003, Pages: 1134-1143.

Saputo L. Beyond Mammography. *The Townsend Letter*

Gofman, J. W. Preventing Breast Cancer: The Story of a Major Proven Preventable Cause of this Disease. Committee for Nuclear Responsibility, San Francisco, 1995. Epstein, S. S., Steinman, D., and LeVert, S. *The Breast Cancer Prevention Program*, Ed. 2. Macmillan, New York, 1998.

Bertell, R. Breast cancer and mammography. *Mothering*, Summer 1992, pp. 49-52. National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Advisory Committee. *Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (BEIR)*. Washington, D.C., 1972.

Swift, M. Ionizing radiation, breast cancer, and ataxia-telangiectasia. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 86(21): 1571-1572, 1994.

Bridges, B. A., and Arlett, C. F. Risk of breast cancer in ataxia-telangiectasia. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 326(20): 1357, 1992.

Quigley, D. T. Some neglected points in the pathology of breast cancer, and treatment of breast cancer. *Radiology*, May 1928, pp. 338-346.

Watmough, D. J., and Quan, K. M. X-ray mammography and breast compression. *Lancet* 340: 122, 1992.

Martinez, B. Mammography centers shut down as reimbursement feud rages on. *Wall Street Journal*, October 30, 2000, p. A-1.

Vogel, V. G. Screening younger women at risk for breast cancer. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst. Monogr.* 16: 55-60, 1994.

Baines, C. J., and Dayan, R. A tangled web: Factors likely to affect the efficacy of screening mammography. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 91(10): 833-838, 1999.

Laya, M. B. Effect of estrogen replacement therapy on the specificity and sensitivity of screening mammography. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 88(10): 643-649, 1996.

Spratt, J. S., and Spratt, S. W. Legal perspectives on mammography and self-referral. *Cancer* 69(2): 599-600, 1992.

Skrabanek, P. Shadows over screening mammography. *Clin. Radiol.* 40: 4-5, 1989. Davis, D. L., and Love, S. J. Mammography screening. *JAMA* 271(2): 152-153, 1994. Christiansen, C. L., et al. Predicting the cumulative risk of false-positive mammograms. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 92(20): 1657-1666, 2000.

Napoli, M. Overdiagnosis and overtreatment: The hidden pitfalls of cancer screening. *Am. J. Nurs.*, 2001, in press.

Baum, M. Epidemiology versus scaremongering: The case for humane interpretation of statistics and breast cancer. *Breast J.* 6(5): 331-334, 2000.

Miller, A. B., et al. Canadian National Breast Screening Study-2: 13-year results of a randomized trial in women aged 50-59 years. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 92(18): 1490-1499, 2000.

Black, W. C. Overdiagnosis: An underrecognized cause of confusion and harm in cancer screening. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 92(16): 1280-1282, 2000.

Napoli, M. What do women want to know. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst. Monogr.* 22: 11-13, 1997.

Lerner, B. H. Public health then and now: Great expectations: Historical perspectives on genetic breast cancer testing. *Am. J. Public Health* 89(6): 938-944, 1999.

Gotzsche, P. C., and Olsen, O. Is screening for breast cancer with mammography justifiable? *Lancet* 355: 129-134, 2000.

National Institutes of Health Consensus Development Conference Statement. Breast cancer screening for women ages 40-49, January 21-23, 1997. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst. Monogr.* 22: 7-18, 1997.

Ross, W. S. *Crusade: The Official History of the American Cancer Society*, p. 96. Arbor House, New York, 1987.

Hall, D. C., et al. Improved detection of human breast lesions following experimental training. *Cancer* 46(2): 408-414, 1980.

Smigel, K. Perception of risk heightens stress of breast cancer. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 85(7): 525-526, 1993.

Baines, C. J. Efficacy and opinions about breast self-examination. In *Advanced Therapy of Breast Disease*, edited by S. E. Singletary and G. L. Robb, pp. 9-14. B. C. Decker, Hamilton, Ont., 2000.

Leight, S. B., et al. The effect of structured training on breast self-examination search behaviors as measured using biomedical instrumentation. *Nurs. Res.* 49(5): 283-289, 2000.

Worden, J. K., et al. A community-wide program in breast self-examination. *Prev. Med.* 19: 254-269, 1990.

Fletcher, S. W., et al. How best to teach women breast self-examination: A randomized control trial. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 112(10): 772-779, 1990. Associated Press. FDA approves use of pad in breast exam. *New York Times*, December 25, 1995, p. 9Y.

Gehrke, A. Breast self-examination: A mixed message. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 92(14): 1120-1121, 2000.

Thomas, D. B., et al. Randomized trial of breast self-examination in Shanghai: Methodology and preliminary results. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 89: 355-365, 1997. Baines, C. J., Miller, A. B., and Bassett, A. A. Physical examination: Its role as a single screening modality in the Canadian National Breast Screening Study. *Cancer* 63: 1816-1822, 1989.

Lewis, T. Women's health is no longer a man's world. *New York Times*, February 7, 2001, p. 1. Miller, A. B., Baines, C. J., and Wall, C. Correspondence. *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* 93(5): 396, 2001.

Kuroishi, T., et al. Effectiveness of mass screening for breast cancer in Japan. *Breast Cancer* 7(1): 1-8, 2000.

Epstein, S. S. American Cancer Society: The world's wealthiest «non-profit» institution. *Int. J. Health Serv.* 29(3): 565-578, 1999.

Epstein, S. S., and Gross, L. The high stakes of cancer prevention. *Tikkun* 15(6): 33- 39, 2000. Epstein, S. S. *The Politics of Cancer Revisited*. East Ridge Press, Hankins, N.Y., 1998.

Ramirez, A. Mammogram reimbursements. *New York Times*, February 19, 2001. John, L. Digital imaging: A marketing triumph. *Breast Cancer Action Newsletter*, No. 62, November-December 2000.

Tarkan, L. An update that matters? Mammography's next step is assessed. *New York Times*, January 2, 2001, p. D5.

Miller, A. B. The role of screening in the fight against breast cancer. *World Health Forum* 13: 277-285, 1992.

Mitra, I. Breast screening: The case for physical examination without mammography. *Lancet* 343(8893): 342-344, 1994.

Greenlee, R. T. *Cancer Statistics, 2001*. *CA Cancer J. Clin.* 51(1): 15-36, 2001.

Epstein, S., Bertell, R., Seaman, B., Danger and Unreliability of Mammography. *International Journal of Health Services*, Volume 31, Number 3, Pages 605-615, 2001  
Christiansen 2000, Cindy L. et al. "Predicting the Cumulative Risk of False-Positive Mammograms," *J. of the Natl Cancer Inst* Vol.92, No.20: 1657-1666.

Doody 2000, Michele M. et al. "Breast Cancer Mortality after Diagnostic Radiography: Findings from the U.S. Scoliosis Cohort," *Spine* Vol.25, No.16: 2052- 2063.

Elmore 1998, Joann G. et al. "Ten-Year Risk of False Positive Screening Mammograms and Clinical Breast Examinations," *New England J. of Med.* Vol.338, No.16: 1089-1096.

Gofman 1990, John W. *Radiation-Induced Cancer from Low-Dose Exposure: An Independent Analysis*. 480 pages. ISBN 0-932682-89-8. San Francisco: Committee for Nuclear Responsibility Books.

Gofman 1999, John W. *Radiation from Medical Procedures in the Pathogenesis of Cancer and Ischemic Heart Disease: Dose-Response Studies with Physicians per 100,000 Population*. 699 pages. ISBN 0-932682-97-9. San Francisco: Committee for Nuclear Responsibility Books.

Gray 1998a, Joel E. "Lower Radiation Exposure Improves Patient Safety," in *Diagnostic Imaging* Vol.20, No.9: 61-64.

NRPB 1995. *National Radiological Protection Board (British Government). Risk of Radiation-Induced Cancer at Low Doses and Low Dose Rates for Radiation Protection Purposes*. 77 pages. ISBN 0-85951-386-6. Documents of the NRPB, Vol.6, No.1. Chilton, Didcot: NRPB.

UNSCEAR 1993, *United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. Sources and Effects of Ionizing Radiation: 1993 Report to the General Assembly, with Scientific Annexes*. 922 pages. ISBN 92-1-142200-0. U.N. sales number E.94.IX.2.

Miller 2000, Anthony B. et al. "Canadian National Breast Screening Study-2: 13-Year Results of a Randomized Trial in Women Aged 50-59 Years," *J. of the Natl Cancer Inst* Vol.92, No.18: 1490-1499.

Woolf 1999, Steven H. "Differing Perspectives on Preventive Care Guidelines: A New Look at the Mammography Controversy," *Amer. J. of Preventive Med.* Vol.17, No.4: 260-268.

Wright 1995 (July 1), Charles J. "Screening Mammography and Public Health Policy: The Need for Perspective," *Lancet* Vol.346: 29-32.