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Process for American Cancer Society Update of Breast Cancer Screening Guideline 2015

Formulate questions and define approach to evidence review.
- GDG selects independent evidence review team through a Request for Proposal process.
- An independent group of twenty-two professionals including research methodologists, experts in cancer screening, and clinicians in relevant specialties such as radiology and oncology, were invited to serve as expert advisors to the GDG.
- Expert advisors provide comments, and evidence review team and GDG refine research protocol.

Produce evidence report.
- The Duke University Evidence Synthesis Group performs a systematic evidence review of the scientific literature, including synthesis of the evidence and rating the quality of evidence using Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) Working Group criteria.
- GDG provides comments on an initial draft report; expert advisors and GDG review second draft evidence report.
- Evidence review team revises and produces final report.
- To address identified gaps, GDG commissions supplemental analysis on intervals from Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium (BCSC) and SEER disease burden data from ACS Surveillance and Health Services Research Program.
- GDG member and staff perform supplemental literature searches on clinical breast examination and modeling studies of effects on quality-adjusted life years.

Develop and grade recommendations.
- GDG considers evidence and delibertes based on GRADE domains (balance between desirable and undesirable outcomes, values and preferences, and confidence in the magnitude of the effects on outcomes).
- GDG rates proposed recommendations as “strong” or “qualified” according to GRADE criteria.
- The ACS Mission Outcomes Committee and Board of Directors review and approve proposed recommendations.
- Stakeholder organizations and expert advisors review proposed recommendations; GDG determines any modifications and response.

Disseminate guideline recommendations.
- Recommendations and rationale and evidence report are published in a peer-reviewed journal.
- Full evidence report is posted on ACS website, at www.cancer.org.
• Communication plan is implemented to promote understanding and minimize confusion.
• ACS information and education resources and practice tools are revised to present, explain, and facilitate new recommendations.

Guideline Development Group Voting Process

Development of recommendation wording and grading was an iterative process and took place in one face-to-face meeting and teleconferences of the GDG subgroup charged with leading this guideline update and in teleconferences and email voting surveys (some blind and some open, with consent of the members) of the full committee. Full agreement was reached on the basic elements of all recommendations with the exception of one dissenting opinion about beginning screening at age 45 vs. age 40. For some recommendations, subsequent discussion and multiple rounds of voting were held to resolve disagreements about wording and achieve greater clarity. At least 9 of 11 GDG members agreed to the final wording of each recommendation.

Organizations Invited to Review the Breast Cancer Screening Guideline

1. Agency for Health Care Research and Quality (AHRQ)
2. American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP)
3. American College of Preventive Medicine (ACPM)
4. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG)
5. American College of Physicians (ACP)
6. American College of Radiology (ACR)
7. American College of Surgeons Commission on Cancer (CoC)
8. American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO)
9. American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO)
10. American Society of Clinical Pathologists (ASCP)
11. American Society of Preventive Oncology (ASPO)
12. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Division of Cancer Prevention and Control (CDC)
13. College of American Pathologists (CAP)
14. International Society of Breast Pathology (ISBP)
15. Living Beyond Breast Cancer (LBBC)
16. National Accreditation Program for Breast Centers (NAPBC)
17. National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA)
18. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN)
19. National Consortium of Breast Centers (NCBC)
20. Nurse Practitioners in Women’s Health (NPWH)
21. Oncology Nursing Society (ONS)
22. Radiological Society of North America (RSNA)
23. Society of Breast Imaging (SBI)
24. Society of General Internal Medicine (SGIM)
25. Susan G. Komen for the Cure
26. US Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF)
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