



---

# **European guidelines for quality assurance in breast cancer screening and diagnosis** *Fourth Edition*

---

## **Editors**

N. Perry  
M. Broeders  
C. de Wolf  
S. Törnberg  
R. Holland  
L. von Karsa

## **Technical editor**

E. Puthaar

This document has been prepared with financial support from the European Commission [grant agreement SPC.2002482].

The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission and are in no way an indication of the Commission's future position in this area.

Neither the Commission nor any person acting on its behalf can be held responsible for any use that may be made of the information in this document.

***Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers  
to your questions about the European Union***

**Freephone number (\*):  
00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11**

(\* ) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet. It can be accessed through the Europa server (<http://europa.eu.int>).

Further information on the Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General is available at: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/health\\_consumer/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/health_consumer/index_en.htm)

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication.

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2006

ISBN 92-79-01258-4

© European Communities, 2006

*Printed in Belgium*

PRINTED ON WHITE CHLORINE-FREE PAPER

**Jan H.C.L. Hendriks** | 1941-2004 |

**This edition is dedicated to the memory of our colleague and friend Jan Hendriks who pioneered the quality assurance of breast radiology in The Netherlands and throughout Europe**

**N. Perry**

Breast Assessment Centre  
The West Wing Breast Care Centre  
St Bartholomew's Hospital  
London EC1A 7 BE / United Kingdom

**M. Broeders**

Department of Epidemiology and  
Biostatistics / EUREF Office 451  
Radboud University Medical Centre Nijmegen  
PO Box 9101  
6500 HB Nijmegen / The Netherlands

**C. de Wolf**

Centre fribourgeois de dépistage du  
cancer du sein  
Beaumont 2 – CP 75  
1709 Fribourg / Switzerland

**S. Törnberg**

Cancer Screening Unit  
Oncologic Centre  
Karolinska University Hospital  
S-17176 Stockholm / Sweden

**R. Holland**

National Expert and Training Centre for Breast  
Cancer Screening / EUREF Office 451  
Radboud University Medical Centre Nijmegen  
PO Box 9101  
6500 HB Nijmegen / The Netherlands

**L. von Karsa**

European Breast Cancer Network (EBCN) Coordination Office  
International Agency for Research on Cancer  
150 cours Albert-Thomas  
F-69372 Lyon cedex 08 / France

**E. Puthaar**

EUREF Office 451  
Radboud University Medical Centre Nijmegen  
PO Box 9101  
6500 HB Nijmegen / The Netherlands

**Address for correspondence**

European Breast Cancer Network (EBCN) Coordination Office  
International Agency for Research on Cancer  
150 cours Albert-Thomas  
F-69372 Lyon cedex 08  
France

## Preface

Markos Kyprianou\*

The completion of the fourth edition of the European Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Breast Cancer Screening and Diagnosis exemplifies the unique role the European Union can play in cooperation with national governments, professional organisations and civil society to maintain and improve the health of Europe's citizens.

Breast cancer is the most frequent cancer and accounts for the largest number of cancer-related deaths in women in Europe. Due to demographic trends, significantly more women will be confronted with this disease in the future. Systematic screening of the female population based on mammography offers the perspective of saving many lives while reducing the negative side-effects of treatment by detecting cancer at earlier stages, when it is more responsive to less aggressive treatment.

These benefits can only be achieved, however, if the quality of services offered to women is optimal – not only with regard to the screening examination, but also the further diagnostic procedures, and the treatment of women for whom the screening examination yields abnormal results. Quality assurance of population-based breast screening programmes is therefore a challenging and complex management endeavour encompassing the entire screening process. This is only one of the key lessons learned in the European Breast Cancer Network in which scientists, clinicians and paramedical staff as well as advocates, health care planners and administrators across Europe have shared experiences. By working together to develop and implement comprehensive guidelines, women throughout the Union will receive the same high level services for breast screening.

The financial support of the European Union for this multidisciplinary, pan-European forum has not only helped to establish Europe as the world leader in implementing population-based breast cancer screening programmes. It has also helped to reveal that implementation of high quality standards in regional and national population-based screening programmes naturally leads to further innovation and improvement in the quality of breast services provided outside of screening programmes. The potential benefit to women of extending the improvements in quality assurance of screening to the full range of breast cancer care is enormous, because many women seek medical assistance for breast problems outside of screening programmes. The editors and contributors to this edition are therefore to be applauded for extending the scope of the guidelines so as to include quality assurance of multidisciplinary diagnosis of breast cancer, standards for specialist breast units and a certification protocol for diagnostic and screening services.

This Publication of the fourth edition of the guidelines by the European Union will ensure that any interested organisation, programme or authority in the Member States can obtain the recommended standards and procedures and appoint appropriate persons, organisations and institutions for the implementation of those.

Let me finally thank the editors and contributors for their efforts in compiling this volume which I am confident will be useful to guide work on breast cancer screening and diagnosis for the years to come.

Brussels, January 2006

\* European Commissioner for Health and Consumer Protection

## Preface

Maurice Tubiana\*

It is a great honour for me to have been asked to write a preface to this fourth edition of the European Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Breast Cancer Screening and Diagnosis. My purpose will be to put them into perspective. At their meeting in Milan in June 1985, the heads of state of the Member States of the European Community (EC) decided to launch a European action against cancer. This decision was taken within the framework of the so-called 'Citizen' programme, the aim of which was to illustrate the practical advantages that a European cooperation could bring to the citizens of the Member States, in particular regarding health. Each of the 12 Member States appointed an expert in oncology, or in public health, in order to constitute the Committee of Cancer Experts. Sweden, which was not yet a member of the European Union (EU), was invited as an observer and also appointed an expert. The committee met for the first time in Brussels in November 1985, where the objectives of the action programme were discussed.

From the outset, reduction in the number of cancer deaths was the primary purpose of the European action. A reduction of 15% in the number of cancer deaths that would have occurred in the absence of such action appeared to be a difficult but realistic goal and was adopted by the committee. In fact, the Europe against Cancer programme achieved a reduction of 9% from 1985 to 2000 a result which is still appreciable. To move forward, the programme had to coordinate the efforts of various health professions as well as, political decision makers, governmental offices, and nongovernmental organisations in a common drive to achieve this goal. A further ambition was to show that actions on a European scale could enhance national strategies against cancer in each of the Member States.

It appeared immediately that prevention and screening were the two main areas in which a European action could be more effective than uncoordinated national efforts. Other areas of lesser priority were: clinical research, information for the general public, and education of health professionals in oncology. The budget was modest (11 million euros per year) but, nevertheless, it enabled the expert committee to propose and to carry out an ambitious strategy in a few well defined areas.

The decision to include systematic population based screening for specific sites of cancer was taken by the Committee of Cancer Experts at the first meeting in Brussels in November 1985. It was at the second meeting in February 1986 in Paris that breast, cervical and colorectal cancers were considered. At that time evidence was growing that screening for breast cancer by means of mammography could reduce mortality from this disease, at least in women aged 50 years and over. Experience had been accumulating in Europe, notably in Sweden, the UK, the Netherlands, and Italy, that population screening was feasible, with participation rates varying between 70 and 90%. A plan was made to enable each of the 12 EC Member States to propose pilot projects within its borders. The benefits of a European pilot network co-funded by the European Community would result from the pooling and dissemination of knowledge and expertise. A European action could also provide a practical basis for a decision, in the event that governments consider the implementation of a national breast cancer screening programme.

A subcommittee on screening was appointed by the Committee of the European Cancer Experts in order to select and fund pilot studies in the Member States after full consent of the national authorities. Another aim of the subcommittee was to monitor the results obtained in each pilot study and to promote cooperation among all persons involved in this action: project leaders of the pilot studies, expert consultants, and members of the staff of the Europe against Cancer

\* Emeritus Professor of radiotherapy, Honorary Director of Institut Gustave Roussy, Villejuif, Chairman of expert committee of the European Action Against Cancer 1985-1994.

programme. A network of individuals involved in the program was set up and meetings were held every six months in order to discuss problems encountered by the pilot studies. During the meetings the need for common rules concerning quality assurance and data collection became apparent.

The existence of false negatives (undetected cancers) reduces the number of detected cancers. On the other hand, a high rate of false positives increases the anxiety of women because they provoke unnecessary examinations. Screening is worthwhile only if the increase in human life outweighs the economic and social costs (anxiety, unnecessary examinations) that it may produce. Thus it is mandatory to find a balance between sensitivity and specificity in order to reach an acceptable ratio between true positives and false positives. Improvement of benefits (fewer false negatives) and a decrease in the social and psychological burden (fewer false positives) can be achieved by the implementation of rigorous quality assurance, systematic training of health care personnel, follow-up of women who have been screened, and an annual evaluation of screening results.

We knew that modern medical undertakings require specific training, accreditation, quality assurance and evaluation, including audits by outside teams. In 1988-1990, many observers were sceptical; they felt that in many EU countries physicians accustomed to substantial professional freedom would not accept the standardization of diagnostic procedures and protocols inherent to population-based screening programmes, such as double reading of mammograms. Within the Screening Subcommittee, we were much more optimistic but realised that it was a difficult challenge. In 1990, the subcommittee decided that guidelines should be prepared in order to assist health professionals and project leaders. These draft guidelines were circulated among network members for comment and the final version of the first edition was adopted in 1992.

The first edition of the document 'European Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Mammography Screening' (Kirkpatrick et al, 1993) was available in each of the official languages of the European Community on request. It was extremely well accepted and deeply appreciated because it provided a basic tool for all those interested in breast screening. These guidelines contributed immensely to the success of the breast screening projects of the Europe against Cancer programme and had a great impact in all Member States. In France, for example, the national guidelines were based on the European guidelines which set the standards. A few years later the evolution of techniques and practices rendered necessary the publication of a second edition which was followed by a third four years later, both of which were very successful. Thus, the standards and recommendations in the third edition provided the regulatory framework for the population-based breast screening programme recently introduced in Germany. Without any doubt the current fourth edition will also become the basic reference for quality assurance of breast cancer screening.

The European guidelines, besides their contribution to the accomplishments of the breast screening projects, have had two beneficial consequences. First, they not only improved the quality of breast screening but also that of diagnosis and treatment of breast cancer, and they have greatly reduced the differences among EU countries in the quality of care of breast disease. The second favourable outcome has been the demonstration that, contrary to some preconceptions, the basic requirements of modern medicine are well accepted when efforts are made in EU countries. Training can be improved; accreditation, rigorous quality assessment and evaluation by outside experts can be implemented. Ultimately, progress depends not only on the dedication of practitioners, but also on the courage of politicians and administrators. Breast cancer screening and efforts in prevention, such as the fight against smoking, clearly show that European cooperation in public health can be fruitful.

Paris, September 2005





# Table of contents

Introduction	1
Executive Summary	5
<b>1. Epidemiological guidelines for quality assurance in breast cancer screening</b>	<b>15</b>
1.1 Introduction	17
1.2 Local conditions governing the screening process at the beginning of a breast screening programme	19
1.3 Invitation scheme	22
1.4 Screening process and further assessment	25
1.5 Primary treatment of screen-detected cancers	30
1.6 Disease stage of screen-detected cancers	32
1.7 Post-surgical treatment of screen-detected cancers	34
1.8 Follow up of the target population and ascertainment of interval cancers	35
1.9 Evaluation and interpretation of screening outcomes	42
1.9.1 Performance indicators	42
1.9.2 Impact indicators	44
1.9.3 Cost-effectiveness	47
1.10 References	48
1.11 Glossary of terms	49
<b>2. European protocol for the quality control of the physical and technical aspects of mammography screening</b>	<b>57</b>
Executive summary	59
<b>2a Screen-film mammography</b>	<b>61</b>
2a.1 Introduction to the measurements	63
2a.1.1 Staff and equipment	64
2a.1.2 Definition of terms	64
2a.2 Description of the measurements	69
2a.2.1 X-ray generation	69
2a.2.1.1 X-ray source	69
2a.2.1.2 Tube voltage and beam quality	73
2a.2.1.3 AEC-system	74
2a.2.1.4 Compression	76
2a.2.2 Bucky and image receptor	77
2a.2.2.1 Anti scatter grid	77
2a.2.2.2 Screen-film	78
2a.2.3 Film processing	79
2a.2.3.1 Baseline performance of the processor	79
2a.2.3.2 Film and processor	79
2a.2.3.3 Darkroom	80
2a.2.4 Viewing conditions	81
2a.2.4.1 Viewing box	82
2a.2.4.2 Ambient light	82
2a.2.5 System properties	83
2a.2.5.1 Dosimetry	83
2a.2.5.2 Image quality	83
2a.3 Daily and weekly QC tests	85

2a.4 Tables	86
2a.5 Bibliography	89
2a.6 Completion forms for QC reporting	93
<b>2b Digital mammography</b>	<b>105</b>
2b Foreword	107
2b.1 Introduction to the measurements	108
2b.1.1 Staff and equipment	110
2b.1.2 System demands	111
2b.1.3 Order of the measurements	112
2b.1.4 Philosophy	113
2b.1.4.1 Methods of testing	114
2b.1.4.2 Limiting values	114
2b.1.4.3 Image acquisition	114
2b.1.4.4 Image quality evaluation	115
2b.1.4.5 Glandular dose	116
2b.1.4.6 Exposure time	117
2b.1.4.7 Image receptor	118
2b.1.4.8 Image presentation	119
2b.1.5 Definition of terms	120
2b.2 Image acquisition	123
2b.2.1 X-ray generation	123
2b.2.1.1 X-ray source	123
2b.2.1.2 Tube voltage and beam quality	124
2b.2.1.3 AEC-system	124
2b.2.1.4 Compression	126
2b.2.1.5 Anti scatter grid	126
2b.2.2 Image receptor	127
2b.2.2.1 Image receptor response	127
2b.2.2.2 Missed tissue at chest wall side	128
2b.2.2.3 Image receptor homogeneity and stability	128
2b.2.2.4 Inter plate sensitivity variations (CR systems)	130
2b.2.2.5 Influence of other sources of radiation (CR systems)	130
2b.2.2.6 Fading of latent image (CR systems)	130
2b.2.3 Dosimetry	130
2b.2.4 Image Quality	130
2b.2.4.1 Threshold contrast visibility	130
2b.2.4.2 Modulation Transfer Function (MTF) and Noise Power Spectrum (NPS) [optional]	132
2b.2.4.3 Exposure time	132
2b.2.4.4 Geometric distortion and artefact evaluation	132
2b.2.4.5 Ghost image / erasure thoroughness	133
2b.3 Image processing	134
2b.4 Image presentation	134
2b.4.1 Monitors	134
2b.4.1.1 Ambient light	134
2b.4.1.2 Geometrical distortion (CRT displays)	135
2b.4.1.3 Contrast visibility	135
2b.4.1.4 Resolution	136
2b.4.1.5 Display artefacts	137
2b.4.1.6 Luminance range	137
2b.4.1.7 Greyscale Display Function	137
2b.4.1.8 Luminance uniformity	137
2b.4.2 Printers	139
2b.4.2.1 Geometrical distortion	139
2b.4.2.2 Contrast visibility	139
2b.4.2.3 Resolution	139
2b.4.2.4 Printer artefacts	140
2b.4.2.5 Optical Density Range (optional)	140

2b.4.2.6 Greyscale Display Function	140
2b.4.2.7 Density uniformity	140
2b.4.3 Viewing boxes	141
2b.5 CAD software	141
2b.6 References and Bibliography	141
2b.6.1 References	141
2b.6.2 Bibliography	142
Table 2b.1: Frequencies of Quality Control	145
Table 2b.2: Limiting values	148
<b>2a + 2b Appendices and Notes</b>	<b>151</b>
Appendix 1 Mechanical and electrical safety checks	151
Appendix 2 Film-parameters	153
Appendix 3 A method to discriminate between processing and exposure variations by correction for the film-curve	155
Appendix 4 Typical spectra per PMMA thickness in screen-film mammography	156
Appendix 5 Procedure for determination of average glandular dose	157
A5.1 Dose to typical breasts simulated with PMMA	157
A5.2 Clinical breast doses	157
Appendix 6 Calculation of contrast for details in a contrast–detail test object	162
Appendix 7 Computed Radiography screen processing modes	163
Notes	165
<b>3 Radiographical guidelines</b>	<b>167</b>
3.1 Introduction	169
3.2 Technical quality control	169
3.3 Ergonomic design of the machine	171
3.4 Mammographic examination	171
3.4.1 Introduction to the examination	171
3.4.2 Starting the examination	171
3.4.3 Compression	172
3.4.4 Positioning	172
3.4.5 Standard views	172
3.4.5.1 Cranio-caudal view	173
3.4.5.2 Mediolateral oblique view	174
3.4.6 Other additional views	175
3.5 Social skills	175
3.6 Consent	175
3.7 Teamwork	175
3.8 Radiographic quality standards	176
3.9 Training	176
3.9.1 Academic component	176
3.9.2 Clinical component	177
3.9.3 Certification	177
3.9.4 Continuing education	177
3.10 Staffing levels and working practices	177
3.11 Digital Mammography	178
3.12 Summary	179
3.12.1 Skills	179
3.12.2 Technical quality control	179
3.12.3 Multidisciplinary teamwork	179
3.12.4 Training	179
3.13 Conclusion	179
3.14 Bibliography	180

<b>4.</b>	<b>Radiological guidelines</b>	<b>181</b>
4.1	Introduction	183
4.2	Image quality	184
4.3	Full Field Digital Mammography (FFDM) with Soft Copy Reading	184
4.4	Radiologist performance issues	185
4.4.1	Advancement of the time of diagnosis	185
4.4.2	Reduction of adverse effects	186
4.5	Operating procedures	188
4.5.1	Viewing conditions	188
4.5.2	Single/double reading	189
4.5.3	Assessment of screen-detected abnormalities	189
4.5.4	Quality assurance organisation	190
4.5.5	Number of views	190
4.5.6	Localisation of non-palpable lesions	191
4.5.7	Multidisciplinary meetings	191
4.6	Interval cancers	191
4.7	Professional requirements	193
4.8	Screening women at high risk	194
4.9	Bibliography	194
<b>5.</b>	<b>Multi-disciplinary aspects of quality assurance in the diagnosis of breast disease</b>	<b>197</b>
5.1	Introduction	199
5.2	Training and Quality Assurance	200
5.3	Imaging Procedures	200
5.4	Diagnostic Breast Imaging Unit	202
5.4.1	Mammography Equipment	202
5.4.1.1	Targets	203
5.4.2	Ultrasound equipment	203
5.4.3	Radiographic staff	203
5.4.3.1	Targets	204
5.4.3.2	Basic quality control	204
5.4.4	Radiological staff	204
5.4.5	Basic Requirements of a Diagnostic Mammography Unit	205
5.5	Breast Assessment Unit	206
5.5.1	Diagnostic classification	207
5.5.2	Targets	207
5.5.3	Cytology/histology quality assurance	208
5.5.4	Audit	208
5.5.5	Cytology/core biopsy reporting standards	208
5.5.6	Basic requirements for a Breast Assessment Unit	209
5.6	Multidisciplinary Activity	209
5.7	Staging and Follow-up	209
5.8	Surgical Aspects	211
5.8.1	Pre-operative localisation	212
5.8.2	Targets	213
5.9	Anxiety and Delays	213
5.9.1	Rapid diagnostic / one stop clinics	214
5.10	Pathology QA Aspects	214
5.11	The Place of Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Breast Diagnosis	215
5.12	Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy Procedures	215
5.13	References	216

<b>6</b>	<b>Quality assurance guidelines for pathology</b>	<b>219</b>
<b>6a</b>	<b>Cytological and histological non-operative procedures</b>	<b>221</b>
6a.1	Introduction	223
6a.2	Use of non-operative diagnostic techniques	223
6a.3	Choice of sampling technique	224
6a.4	Indications	226
6a.5	Complications and changes secondary to FNAC, NCB and VANCB	227
6a.6	NCB and VANCB reporting guidelines	228
6a.6.1	Specimen information & handling	228
6a.6.2	Recording basic information	230
6a.6.3	Reporting categories	232
6a.6.4	Problems and pitfalls in diagnosis	235
6a.6.5	Rare lesions	237
6a.6.6	Assessment of prognostic information	238
6a.6.7	Oestrogen receptor (ER) assessment	238
6a.7	FNAC reporting guidelines	238
6a.7.1	Using the cytology reporting form	239
6a.7.2	Recording basic information	241
6a.7.3	Reporting categories	242
6a.7.4	Diagnostic pitfalls in interpretation of breast FNAC	243
6a.7.5	Prognostic information	248
6a.8	References	249
Appendix 1	Quality assurance	252
A1.1	Definitions	252
A1.2	How to calculate these figures	253
A1.3	Suggested thresholds where therapy is partially based on FNAC/needle core biopsy	254
A1.4	How to interpret the results	255
<b>6b</b>	<b>Open biopsy and resection specimens</b>	<b>257</b>
6b.1	Introduction	259
6b.2	Macroscopic examination of biopsy and resection specimens	259
6b.2.1	Introduction	259
6b.2.2	Surgical handling	259
6b.2.3	Laboratory handling	260
6b.3	Guidance for pathological examination of lymph nodes	264
6b.3.1	Background	264
6b.3.2	Lymph node sample specimens	264
6b.3.3	Axillary clearance specimens	264
6b.3.4	Sentinel lymph nodes (SN)	265
6b.4	Using the histopathology reporting form	268
6b.4.1	Introduction	268
6b.4.2	Recording basic information	268
6b.4.3	Classifying benign lesions	269
6b.4.4	Classifying epithelial proliferation	273
6b.4.5	Classifying malignant non invasive lesions	278
6b.4.6	Microinvasive carcinoma	280
6b.4.7	Classifying invasive carcinoma	282
6b.4.8	Recording prognostic data	284
6b.4.8.1	Tumour size	284
6b.4.8.2	Disease extent	286
6b.4.8.3	Histological grade	287
6b.4.8.4	Lymph node stage	290
6b.4.8.5	Reporting and definitions of micrometastatic disease and isolated tumour cells	290
6b.4.8.6	Vascular invasion	291
6b.4.8.7	Excision margins	291

6b.4.9 Steroid receptors	292
6b.4.9.1 Recommendations for steroid receptor testing	292
6b.4.9.2 Principles	293
6b.4.9.3 Ductal carcinoma in situ	294
6b.4.10 Comments/additional information	294
6b.4.11 Histological diagnosis	294
6b.5 Quality assurance	294
6b.6 References	295
Appendix 2 Index for screening office pathology system	298
Appendix 3 Immunohistochemical detection of steroid receptors in breast cancer	303
Appendix 4 Recommendations for HER2 testing	304
A4.1 Introduction	304
A4.2 General principles	304
A4.2.1 Suitable samples	304
A4.2.2 Caseload	304
A4.2.3 Appropriate laboratory assay methods	304
A4.2.4 Controls	305
A4.2.5 Evaluation	305
A4.2.5.1 Immunohistochemistry	305
A4.2.5.2 Fluorescence in situ hybridisation (FISH)	306
A4.3 References	308
Appendix 5 Definitions of the pTNM categories	309
<b>7. Quality assurance guidelines for surgery</b>	<b>313</b>
<b>7a European guidelines for quality assurance in the surgical management of mammographically detected lesions</b>	<b>315</b>
7a.1 Introduction	317
7a.2 General performance of a breast screening unit	317
7a.3 Surgical diagnosis	318
7a.4 Management	319
7a.5 Follow up	320
7a.6 Training	320
7a.7 Bibliography	320
<b>7b Quality control in the locoregional treatment of breast cancer</b>	<b>323</b>
7b.1 Introduction	325
7b.2 Diagnosis of the primary lesion	325
7b.3 Diagnosis of distant disease	326
7b.4 Surgery of the breast	326
7b.5 Breast conserving treatment	327
7b.6 Mastectomy	327
7b.7 Preoperative chemotherapy (for tumours too large for breast conserving treatment)	328
7b.8 Locally advanced breast cancer (LABC)	329
7b.9 Lymphatic dissemination	329
7b.10 Ductal carcinoma in situ	331
7b.11 Follow-up	332
7b.12 Participants	332
7b.13 References	332

<b>8.</b>	<b>Data collection and monitoring in breast cancer screening and care</b>	<b>335</b>
8.1	Background and aims	337
8.2	Definitions	337
8.3	Data reporting and audit systems	338
	8.3.1 The European Screening Evaluation Database (SEED)	339
	8.3.2 Audit system on Quality of breast cancer diagnosis and Treatment (QT)	339
8.4	The quality cycle	340
8.5	References	341
<b>9.</b>	<b>The requirements of a specialist Breast Unit</b>	<b>343</b>
9.1	Introduction	345
9.2	Objectives	345
9.3	Background	345
9.4	General recommendations	346
9.5	Mandatory requirements	347
9.6	Equipment	349
9.7	Facilities/Services	349
9.8	Associated Services and non-core personnel	352
9.9	Research	352
9.10	Teaching	353
9.11	Additional points	353
9.12	References	354
<b>10.</b>	<b>Guidelines for training</b>	<b>355</b>
10.1	Introduction	357
10.2	General requirements	357
10.3	Epidemiologist	358
10.4	Physicist	358
10.5	Breast Radiographer	359
10.6	Breast Radiologist	360
10.7	Breast Pathologist	361
10.8	Breast Surgeon	362
10.9	Breast Care Nurse	363
10.10	Medical Oncologist / Radiotherapist	363
10.11	Bibliography	364
<b>11.</b>	<b>Certification protocol for breast screening and breast diagnostic services</b>	<b>367</b>
11.1	Executive Summary	369
11.2	Introduction	370
11.3	Breast screening versus diagnostic breast imaging activity	371
11.4	Certification categories and visits	371
	11.4.1 Certification protocol of a diagnostic breast imaging unit	372
	11.4.2 Certification protocol of a diagnostic breast assessment unit	373
	11.4.3 Certification protocol of a loco-regional breast screening programme	373
	11.4.4 Certification protocol of a European reference centre for breast screening	375
	11.4.5 Specialised visits	377
	11.4.6 Sources and criteria	377
	11.4.7 Methodology	377
	11.4.8 Frequency of certification	378
11.5	References	378

## 12. Guidance on breast screening communication 379

Introduction 381

### First part

12.1 Communicating information to enable decision-making	382
12.1.1 Ethical principles	382
12.1.2 Population heterogeneity and informed choice	382
12.1.3 The role of the media	383
12.2 Problems related to effective communication in screening	383
12.2.1 Access to the information about breast screening	383
12.2.2 Lack of clarity of health professionals involved in the screening programme	384
12.2.3 Communication skills of primary care and health professionals	384
12.2.4 Consumers' health literacy skills	384
12.2.5 The communication paradox	385
12.2.6 Developing client-centred information	385

### Second part

12.3 Improving the quality of breast screening communications	386
12.4 Recommendations on the contents of written information (invitation letter/leaflet)	388
12.5 Other issues to consider when developing communication strategies for breast screening	390
12.5.1 Relationship between information provision and participation in breast cancer screening	390
12.5.2 The role of advocacy groups	391
12.5.3 The Internet	391
12.5.4 Communication quality indicators	391
12.6 Developing a communication strategy for breast cancer screening – a summary	392
12.7 References	393

## Annexes

Council Recommendation of 2 December 2003 on cancer screening (2003/878/EC)	395
European Parliament resolution on breast cancer in the European Union (2002/2279(INI))	401
Recommendation R (94) 11 of the committee of ministers to Member States on screening as a tool of preventive medicine	409

## Summary document

Summary document	Supplement page 3
Summary table of key performance indicators	Supplement page 16



# **Introduction**



In presenting this fourth edition to you, we pay tribute to the success of its predecessor, published in 2001, which has been one of the most requested European Commission publications and used as the basis for the formation of several national guidelines. European Parliament subsequently requested the European Breast Cancer Network (EBCN) to produce a further edition. EUREF, as the guidelines co-ordinating organisation of the Network, and the guidelines Editors welcomed the opportunity to broaden the screening focus of previous editions, introducing further aspects of diagnosis and breast care, by collaborating with EUSOMA. The title of these guidelines has accordingly been altered to reflect this, with the addition of EUSOMA chapters on specialised breast units, quality assurance in diagnosis and loco-regional treatment of breast cancer. Important new chapters have been added on communication and the physico-technical aspects of digital mammography, while other chapters have been revised and updated. There is an executive summary for quick reference including a summary table of key performance indicators. Variations in style and emphasis have been unavoidable given the diverse sources of the contributions. However, the Editors have attempted to maintain conformity of approach.

Since the third edition, the European Union has gained 10 new Member States having varying levels of experience and infrastructure for breast screening and diagnosis. While this presents a new challenge for the EBCN, it is a pleasure to welcome our new colleagues and revisit the original concept of the Europe against Cancer Pilot Programmes, founded in 1988, the success of which led to the production of the first edition of the European Guidelines in 1993. This concept was to share multidisciplinary experience, disseminate best practice and provide a mechanism whereby support for the less experienced could be provided to ensure a more uniform standard of service delivery with the ability to progress as one with continuing advances in technical and professional knowledge.

Certain principles remain just as important in diagnosis as they are in screening. Training, multidisciplinary teamwork, monitoring and evaluation, cost-effectiveness, minimising adverse effects and timeliness of further investigations are referred to constantly throughout subsequent chapters, reflecting their crucial place in any breast unit. A multidisciplinary team should include radiographers, pathologists, surgeons and nurses with additional input from oncologists, physicists and epidemiologists as appropriate. It is recognised that different team compositions will be suitable according to various stages of the screening, diagnostic and treatment processes.

Mammography is still the cornerstone of screening and much diagnostic work, so that a substantial part of these guidelines remain dedicated to those necessary processes and procedures which will optimise benefits, reduce morbidity and provide an adequate balance of sensitivity and specificity. It is essential that these guidelines be used to support and enhance local guidelines and not to conflict with them.

As pointed out in the third edition, there must be political support in order to achieve high quality screening, diagnostic and breast care services. Mechanisms for a meaningful quality-assured programme rely on sufficient infrastructure, financing and supervision, all of which require political goodwill to implement and maintain.

These guidelines have relied significantly upon knowledge and experience gained by the European Breast Cancer Network and its associated professionals. Over 200 professionals and client and patient advocates from 18 Member States of the European Union as well as Norway, Switzerland, Israel, Canada and the United States contributed to the current revised edition of the European guidelines. The new chapters and the major changes in the previous chapters were discussed and approved by the members of the European Breast Cancer Network (EBCN) at its annual meeting held 23-25 September 2004 in Budapest. The United Kingdom National Guidelines have formed the basis of some sections.

The Editors are conscious of the importance of raising and maintaining standards across all the Member States. While never abandoning those standards crucial for mortality reduction, we have as far as possible attempted to set out an equitable balance of best practice and performance indicators which can be used across a wide spectrum of cultural and economic healthcare settings. As with any targets, these can be constantly reviewed in the light of future experience. It is not the purpose of these guidelines to promote recent (and often costly) research findings

until they have been demonstrated to be of proven benefit in clinical practice, neither should this edition be regarded as a text book or in any way a substitute for practical clinical training and experience.

The third edition correctly forecast an increase in the use of digital mammographic techniques, although the logistical use of these in screening is still being evaluated. This edition therefore includes a section on physico-technical guidelines for digital mammography – the production of which was eagerly awaited by equipment manufacturers and professionals alike. Over the next five years we are likely to see an increase in three-dimensional imaging techniques – using ultrasound, digital mammography with tomosynthesis, and even computed tomography.

We believe that a major change will occur with more widespread use of accreditation/ certification of clinics and hospitals providing breast services. A process of voluntary accreditation is seen as central in the drive towards the provision of reliable services. Women, as well as purchasers and planners of healthcare services, should be able to identify those units where they will receive a guaranteed level of service, and one obvious way to provide this knowledge is through a mechanism of external inspection of processes and outcomes resulting in the granting of a certificate. Even highly centralised and quality assured national screening programmes require each unit to undergo full external multi-disciplinary review on a regular basis. We believe that Europa Donna could play an important role in encouraging women to recognise the importance of such an enterprise.

As nominated representatives of EUREF and EUSOMA we are proud to introduce this fourth edition of the European Guidelines to you. Although the largest version yet, we trust that it remains manageable and will be of continued benefit to those colleagues striving to improve their services, and to those many women in need of them.

**Dr Nick Perry,**  
Chairman of the European  
Reference Organisation for  
Quality Assured Breast Screening  
and Diagnostic Services

**Professor Luigi Cataliotti,**  
President of the European  
Society of Mastology

# **Executive Summary**



Breast cancer is currently the most frequent cancer and the most frequent cause of cancer-induced deaths in women in Europe. Demographic trends indicate a continuing increase in this substantial public health problem. Systematic early detection through screening, effective diagnostic pathways and optimal treatment have the ability to substantially lower current breast cancer mortality rates and reduce the burden of this disease in the population.

In order that these benefits may be obtained, high quality services are essential. These may be achieved through the underlying basic principles of training, specialisation, volume levels, multidisciplinary team working, the use of set targets and performance indicators and audit. Ethically these principles should be regarded as applying equally to symptomatic diagnostic services and screening.

The editors of the fourth edition have maintained focus on screening for breast cancer while at the same time supporting the provision of highly effective diagnostic services and the setting up of specialist breast units for treatment of women, irrespective of whether a breast lesion has been diagnosed within a screening programme or not. By so doing we support the resolution of the European Parliament in June 2003 (OJ C 68 E, 2004), calling on the EU member states to make the fight against breast cancer a health policy priority and to develop and implement effective strategies for improved preventive health care encompassing screening, diagnosis and treatment throughout Europe.

The primary aim of a breast screening programme is to reduce mortality from breast cancer through early detection. Unnecessary workup of lesions which show clearly benign features should be avoided in order to minimise anxiety and maintain a streamlined cost-effective service. Women attending a symptomatic breast service have different needs and anxieties and therefore mixing of screening and symptomatic women in clinics should be avoided.

Our incorporation of additional text and sections on diagnostic activity has resulted in an expanded fourth edition. We have prepared this Executive Summary in an attempt to underline what we feel to be the key principles that should support any quality screening or diagnostic service. However the choice of content is to some extent arbitrary and cannot in any way be regarded as an alternative to the requirement for reading each chapter as a whole, within the context of the complete guidelines.

## Fundamental points and principles

- In June 2003 the European Parliament called for establishment of a programme by 2008 which should lead to a future 25% reduction in breast cancer mortality rates in the EU and also a reduction to 5% in the disparity in the survival rates between member states (OJ C 68 E, 2004).
- Implementation of population-based breast screening programmes, prioritisation of quality assurance activities such as training and audit, together with the setting up of specialist breast units for management of breast lesions detected inside or outside screening programmes are regarded as essential to achieving these aims.
- Results of randomised trials have led to the implementation of regional and national population based screening programmes for breast cancer in at least 22 countries within the past 20 years (Shapiro et al. 1998).
- An international agency for research on cancer (IARC) expert working group, has reviewed the evidence and confirmed that service screening should be offered as a public health policy directed to women age 50-69 employing two-yearly mammography (IARC Working Group on the Evaluation of Cancer Preventive Strategies 2002). This is consistent with the European Council Recommendation Recommendation of 2 December 2003 on Cancer Screening (OJ L 327/34-38).

- Breast cancer screening is a complex multidisciplinary undertaking, the objective of which is to reduce mortality and morbidity from the disease without adversely affecting the health status of participants. It requires trained and experienced professionals using up-to-date and specialised equipment.
- Screening usually involves a healthy and asymptomatic population which requires adequate information presented in an appropriate and unbiased manner in order to allow a fully informed choice as to whether to attend. Information provided must be balanced, honest, adequate, truthful, evidence-based, accessible, respectful and tailored to individual needs where possible.
- Mammography remains the cornerstone of population-based breast cancer screening. Due attention must be paid to the requisite quality required for its performance and interpretation, in order to optimise benefits, lower mortality and provide an adequate balance of sensitivity and specificity.
- Physico-technical quality control must ascertain that the equipment used performs at a constant high quality level providing sufficient diagnostic information to be able to detect breast cancer using as low a radiation dose as is reasonably achievable. Routine performance of basic test procedures and dose measurements is essential for assuring high quality mammography and comparison between centres.
- Full-field digital mammography can achieve high image quality and is likely to become established due to multiple advantages such as image manipulation and transmission, data display and future technological developments. Extensive clinical, comparative and logistical evaluations are underway.
- The role of the radiographer is central to producing high quality mammograms which, in turn, are crucial for the early diagnosis of breast cancer. Correct positioning of the breast on the standard lateral oblique and cranio-caudal views is necessary to allow maximum visualisation of the breast tissue, reduce recalls for technical inadequacies and maximise the cancer detection rate.
- Radiologists take prime responsibility for mammographic image quality and diagnostic interpretation. They must understand the risks and benefits of breast cancer screening and the dangers of inadequately trained staff and sub-optimal equipment. For quality loop purposes the radiologist performing the screen reading should also be involved at assessment of screen detected abnormalities.
- All units carrying out screening, diagnosis or assessment must work to agreed protocols forming part of a local quality assurance (QA) manual, based on national or European documents containing accepted clinical standards and published values. They should work within a specialist framework, adhering to set performance indicators and targets. Variations of practices and healthcare environments throughout the member states must not interfere with the achievement of these.
- A robust and reliable system of accreditation is required for screening and symptomatic units, so that women, purchasers and planners of healthcare services can identify those breast clinics and units which are operating to a satisfactory standard. Any accreditation system should only recognise centres that employ sufficiently skilled and trained personnel.
- The provision of rapid diagnostic clinics where skilled multidisciplinary advice and investigation can be provided is advantageous for women with significant breast problems in order to avoid unnecessary delay in outline of management planning or to permit immediate discharge of women with normal/benign disease.
- Population breast screening programmes should ideally be based within or closely associated with a specialised breast unit and share the services of trained expert personnel.



- All staff in a screening programme should:
  - Hold professional qualifications as required in each member state
  - Undertake specialist training
  - Participate in continuing medical education and updates
  - Take part in any recognised external quality assessment schemes
  - Hold any necessary certificate of competence
- Each screening unit should have a nominated lead professional in charge of overall performance, with the authority to suspend elements of the service if necessary in order to maintain standards and outcomes.
- All units involved in screening, diagnostic or therapeutic activities must ensure the formation of proper multidisciplinary teamwork involving a full range of specially trained professionals including a radiologist, radiographer, pathologist, surgeon, nurse counsellor and medical oncologist/radiotherapist.
- All women requiring breast surgery or other treatment should have their clinical, imaging and pathology findings discussed and documented in regular pre-operative and post-operative meetings of the full multi-disciplinary team.
- The surgeon must ensure that women receive information on treatment options and be aware that breast conserving surgery is the treatment of choice for the majority of small screen-detected cancers. Where appropriate, patients should be offered a choice of treatment including immediate or delayed breast reconstruction should mastectomy be required.
- The pathologist is a key member of the multidisciplinary team and must participate fully in pre-operative and post-operative case discussions. Accurate pathological diagnosis and the provision of prognostically significant information are vital to ensure appropriate patient management as well as accurate programme monitoring and evaluation.
- Patient support must be provided by specialist breast care nurses or appropriately psychologically professionally trained persons with expertise in breast cancer. They must be available to counsel, offer practical advice and emotional support.
- Quality assurance programmes should be mandatory for breast cancer services in order to qualify for funding from healthcare providers.
- Evaluation of the impact of screening requires the complete and accurate recording of all individual data pertaining to the target population, the screening test, its result, decisions made and the eventual outcome in terms of diagnosis and treatment.
- The protection of individual data is a basic right of every citizen in the EU – however, if appropriate precautions are taken, personal data may be used for promotion of public health.

## References

Council Recommendation of 2 December 2003 on cancer screening (2003/878/EC) OJ L 327/34-38.

European Parliament Resolution. "Breast Cancer in the European Union", OJ C 68 E (18.03.2004) p. 611.

IARC Working Group on the Evaluation of Cancer Preventive Strategies. Breast cancer screening. IARC Handbooks of Cancer Prevention, volume 7. Lyon: IARC Press, 2002, ISBN 92 832 300 8.

Perry N, Broeders M, de Wolf C, Törnberg S, Holland R, von Karsa L (eds) European Guidelines for quality assurance in breast cancer screening and diagnosis. 4th ed. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

Shapiro S, Coleman EA, Broeders M, Codd M, de Koning H, Fracheboud J, et al. for the International Breast Screening Network, and the European Network of Pilot Projects for Breast Cancer Screening. Breast cancer screening programmes in 22 countries: current policies, administration and guidelines. *Int J Epidemiol* 1998;27:735-42.

## Summary table of key performance indicators

### Introduction

For ease of reference we have included a summary table of key performance indicators from these guidelines. Please note that the numbering of the indicators is not indicative of importance. For more complete information regarding definition and context, further reference should be made to the source of each parameter within the text as listed. On occasions we have had to accept that different disciplines and different Member States show some variation of priorities and target levels. In all cases we have attempted to list what we regard as the most widely used and generally appropriate professionally agreed levels for usage in a Pan-European setting. In any case, all targets should be constantly reviewed in the light of experience and revised accordingly with regard to results achieved and best clinical practice. As far as possible, targets given refer to women over 50 years of age attending a screening programme.

#### Abbreviations used for reference to the chapters, e.g.:

- 3T1 Chapter 3, table 1  
4.7 Chapter 4, paragraph 7

Performance indicator	Acceptable level	Desirable level
1. Target optical density <sup>2AT4.1</sup>	1.4 - 1.9 OD	1.4 - 1.9 OD
2. Spatial resolution <sup>2AT4.1</sup>	> 12 lp/mm	> 15 lp/mm
3. Glandular dose – PMMA thickness at 4.5 cm <sup>2AT4.1</sup>	< 2.5 mGy	< 2.0 mGy
4. Threshold contrast visibility <sup>2AT4.1</sup>	< 1.5%	< 1.5%
5. Proportion of women invited that attend for screening <sup>1T32</sup>	> 70%	> 75%
6. Proportion of eligible women reinvited within the specified screening interval <sup>1T32</sup>	> 95%	100%
7. Proportion of eligible women reinvited within the specified screening interval + 6 months <sup>1T32</sup>	> 98%	100%
8. Proportion of women with a radiographically acceptable screening examination <sup>3.8, 5.4.3.1</sup>	97%	> 97%
9. Proportion of women informed of procedure and time scale of receiving results <sup>3.8, 5.4.3.1</sup>	100%	100%
10. Proportion of women undergoing a technical repeat screening examination <sup>1T32, 3.8, 4T2, 5.4.3.1</sup>	< 3%	< 1%
11. Proportion of women undergoing additional imaging at the time of the screening examination in order to further clarify the mammographic appearances <sup>1T32</sup>	< 5%	< 1%
12. Proportion of women recalled for further assessment <sup>1T32, 4T2</sup>		
• initial screening examinations	< 7%	< 5%
• subsequent screening examinations	< 5%	< 3%

Performance indicator	Acceptable level	Desirable level
13. Proportion of screened women subjected to early recall following diagnostic assessment <sup>4T2</sup>	< 1%	0%
14. Breast cancer detection rate, expressed as a multiple of the underlying, expected, breast cancer incidence rate in the absence of screening (IR) <sup>1T33, 4T1</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• initial screening examinations</li> <li>• subsequent-regular screening examinations</li> </ul>	3 x IR 1.5 x IR	> 3 x IR > 1.5 x IR
15. Interval cancer rate as a proportion of the underlying, expected, breast cancer incidence rate in the absence of screening <sup>1T33</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• within the first year (0-11 months)</li> <li>• within the second year (12-23 months)</li> </ul>	30% 50%	< 30% < 50%
16. Proportion of screen-detected cancers that are invasive <sup>1T33, 4T1</sup>	90%	80-90%
17. Proportion of screen-detected cancers that are stage II+ <sup>1T33</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• initial screening examinations</li> <li>• subsequent-regular screening examinations</li> </ul>	NA 25%	< 30% < 25%
18. Proportion of invasive screen-detected cancers that are node-negative <sup>1T33</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• initial screening examinations</li> <li>• subsequent-regular screening examinations</li> </ul>	NA 75%	> 70% > 75%
19. Proportion of invasive screen-detected cancers that are ≤ 10 mm in size <sup>1T33, 4T1</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• initial screening examinations</li> <li>• subsequent-regular screening examinations</li> </ul>	NA ≥ 25%	≥ 25% ≥ 30%
20. Proportion of invasive screen-detected cancers that are < 15 mm in size <sup>7A.2</sup>	50%	> 50%
21. Proportion of invasive screen-detected cancers < 10 mm in size for which there was no frozen section <sup>5.8.2, 9T1</sup>	95%	> 95%
22. Absolute sensitivity of FNAC <sup>5.5.3, 6A A1.3</sup>	> 60%	> 70%
23. Complete sensitivity of FNAC <sup>5.5.3, 6A A1.3</sup>	> 80%	> 90%
24. Specificity of FNAC <sup>5.5.3, 6A A1.3</sup>	> 55%	> 65%
25. Absolute sensitivity of core biopsy <sup>5.5.3, 6A A1.3</sup>	> 70%	> 80%
26. Complete sensitivity of core biopsy <sup>5.5.3, 6A A1.3</sup>	> 80%	> 90%
27. Specificity of core biopsy <sup>5.5.3, 6A A1.3</sup>	> 75%	> 85%
28. Proportion of localised impalpable lesions successfully excised at the first operation <sup>4T2, 5.8.2, 7A.3</sup>	> 90%	> 95%

Performance indicator	Acceptable level	Desirable level
29. Proportion of image-guided FNAC procedures with insufficient result <sup>4T2, 5.5.2</sup>	< 25%	< 15%
30. Proportion of image-guided FNAC procedures from lesions subsequently proven to be malignant, with an insufficient result <sup>4T2, 5.5.2</sup>	< 10%	< 5%
31. Proportion of patients subsequently proven to have breast cancer with a pre-operative FNAC or core biopsy at the diagnosis of cancer <sup>7B.2</sup>	90%	> 90%
32. Proportion of patients subsequently proven to have clinically occult breast cancer with a pre-operative FNAC or core biopsy that is diagnostic for cancer <sup>7B.2</sup>	70%	> 70%
33. Proportion of image-guided core/vacuum procedures with an insufficient result <sup>4T2</sup>	< 20%	< 10%
34. Benign to malignant open surgical biopsy ratio in women at initial and subsequent examinations <sup>1T32, 4T2, 5.8.2, 7A.3</sup>	≤ 1 : 2	≤ 1 : 4
35. Proportion of wires placed within 1 cm of an impalpable lesion prior to excision <sup>4T2, 5.8.2, 7A.3</sup>	90%	> 90%
36. Proportion of benign diagnostic biopsies on impalpable lesions weighing less than 30 grams <sup>5.8.2, 7A.3</sup>	90%	> 90%
37. Proportion of patients where a repeat operation is needed after incomplete excision <sup>7A.4</sup>	10%	< 10%
38. Time (in working days) between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• screening mammography and result<sup>4T2</sup></li> <li>• symptomatic mammography and result<sup>5.9</sup></li> <li>• result of screening mammography and offered assessment<sup>4T2</sup></li> <li>• result of diagnostic mammography and offered assessment<sup>5.9</sup></li> <li>• assessment and issuing of results<sup>5.9</sup></li> <li>• decision to operate and date offered for surgery<sup>5.9</sup></li> </ul>	15 wd 5 wd 5 wd 5 wd 5 wd 15 wd	10 wd  3 wd   10 wd
39. Time (in working days) between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• screening mammography and result <sup>1)</sup> ≤ 15 wd</li> <li>≤ 10 wd</li> <li>• symptomatic mammography and result <sup>1)</sup> ≤ 5 wd</li> <li>• result of screening mammography and offered assessment <sup>1)</sup> ≤ 5 wd</li> <li>≤ 3 wd</li> </ul>	95% 90% 90% 90% 70%	> 95% > 90% > 90% > 90% > 70%

Performance indicator	Acceptable level	Desirable level
• result of symptomatic mammography and offered assessment <sup>1)</sup> ≤ 5 wd	90%	> 90%
• assessment and issuing of results <sup>1)</sup> ≤ 5 wd	90%	> 90%
• decision to operate and date offered for surgery <sup>1)</sup> ≤ 15 wd	90%	> 90%
≤ 10 wd	70%	> 70%

<sup>1)</sup> To assist in monitoring and comparing performance between and within screening programmes, this summary table of indicators includes recommendations on the minimum proportion of women who should observe acceptable and recommended time periods.