ARTICLE IN PRESS



ELSEVIER

3

5

7

11

13

15

17

19

21

23

25

27

29

31

33

35

37

39

41

43

45

47

51

53

55





www.elsevier.com/locate/ijnurstu

Commentary

Why are we still promoting breast self-examination?

Marie Tarrant*

Department of Nursing Studies, Faculty of Medicine, University of Hong Kong, 4/F, William M.W. Mong Block, 21 Sassoon Road, Hong Kong, China

Received 2 December 2005; accepted 9 December 2005

Keywords: Breast self-examination; Breast cancer screening

Nurses have long been advocates of breast selfexamination (BSE), believing that not only were they promoting a practice that could be life-saving but that they were also empowering women to take greater control over their health. There is an abundance of research in the nursing literature reporting the measurement of women's BSE practices, the psychometric correlates of BSE practice and strategies attempting to increase BSE practice among women (Champion and Menon, 1997; Chouliara et al., 2004; Petro-Nustus and Mikhail, 2002; Reis et al., 2004; Secginli and Nahcivan, 2004). In their study to be published in forthcoming issue of IJNS, Secginli and Nahcivan (in press) sought to identify variables correlated with the breast cancer screening behaviours of BSE and mammography in Turkish women, presumably so that rates of both these practices could be increased. While I do not take issue with the methodology or results presented in this paper, it is still, nonetheless, fundamentally flawed. The authors clearly delineate the rates of participation in both screening activities and the psychometric correlates of both BSE and mammography separately. There is a tendency, however, when discussing the benefits of screening to combine both BSE and mammography as if they were interconnected. BSE and mammography are two discrete procedures and should be discussed as such. Furthermore, all studies examining breast screening practices are designed on the premise that through early detection of breast lumps, breast cancer mortality can be

Results from two large randomized controlled trials (RCTS) involving almost 400,000 women in Russia and China have shown that BSE is not effective in reducing mortality from breast cancer, and does not improve the probability of survival after breast cancer diagnosis (Semiglazov et al., 1999; Thomas et al., 2002). Moreover, both studies also demonstrated that regularly practicing BSE was significantly more likely to cause harm by way of increased biopsies for benign breast lumps. In a systematic review of the benefits of BSE, the Cochrane group has concluded that "screening by breast self-examination cannot be recommended" (Kosters and Gotzsche, 2005) and most experts no longer recommend BSE (Baxter and Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health, 2001; Elmore et al., 2005; Harris and Kinsinger, 2002). Furthermore, even in countries such as Turkey, where mammography screening may not be widely available, because of its lack of demonstrable benefits, promoting BSE is not a prudent use of the limited funds available for preventive services (Thomas et al., 2002).

0020-7489/\$ - see front matter © 2006 Published by Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2005.12.001

89

57

59

61

63

65

67

71

75

77

81

83

85

reduced and lives can be saved. In the introduction and literature review sections of their paper, Secginli and Nahcivan present no evidence on the effectiveness of either BSE or mammography in detecting breast cancer and decreasing mortality. Perhaps, this is because although the benefits of mammography are still currently being debated (Goodman, 2002; Olsen and Gotzsche, 2005; U.S. Preventive Services Task Force, 2002), a preponderance of evidence has now clearly shown that BSE does not save lives and offers no benefit to women.

^{*}Tel.: +852 2819 2643; fax: +852 2872 6079.

E-mail address: tarrantm@hku.hk.

2 M. Tarrant / International Journal of Nursing Studies ■ (■■■) ■■■■■

routinely taught breast self-examination to screen for breast

cancer? Canadian Medical Association Journal 164 (13),

47

49

1837-1846.

1	Contrary to the recommendation of Secginli and	Champion, V., Menon, U., 1997. Predicting mammography	
	Nahcivan that more longitudinal studies on the factors	and breast self-examination in African American women.	51
3	influencing the use of BSE are required, the evidence	Cancer Nursing 20 (5), 315–322. Chouliara, Z., Papadioti-Athanasiou, V., Power, K.G., Swan-	
_	against BSE is sufficiently compelling that the Cochrane	son, V., 2004. Practice of and attitudes toward breast self-	53
5	group has also concluded that "it is unlikely that	examination (BSE): a cross-cultural comparison between	
	additional trials investigating breast-self examination as	younger women in Scotland and Greece. Health Care for	55
7	a single general screening method would be worthwhile"	Women International 25 (4), 311–333.	
	(Kosters and Gotzsche, 2005).	Elmore, J.G., Armstrong, K., Lehman, C.D., Fletcher, S.W.,	57
9	What does all of this mean for nursing? Firstly, it	2005. Screening for breast cancer. Journal of the American	
	means that promoting BSE at a population level and	Medical Association 293 (10), 1245-1256.	59
11	investigating factors which can increase performance of	Goodman, S.N., 2002. The mammography dilemma: a crisis for	
	BSE are not worthy of valuable time and money.	evidence-based medicine? Annals of Internal Medicine 137	61
	Resources should be focused on promoting and	(5), 363–365.	
	investigating screening practices with proven benefits,	Harris, R., Kinsinger, L.S., 2002. Routinely teaching breast	63
15	or on more accurate measurement of the benefits of	self-examination is dead. What does this mean? Journal of	
	other screening practices currently in use, such as	the National Cancer Institute 94 (19), 1420–1421.	65
17	mammography. What these findings do not mean,	Kosters, J.P., Gotzsche, P.C., 2005. Regular self-examination	
	however, is that we should teach women to ignore their	or clinical examination for early detection of breast cancer [systematic review]. Cochrane Database of Systematic	67
19	breasts. Education on BSE should be replaced by breast	Reviews 4.	
	awareness education, where women are taught the	Olsen, O., Gotzsche, P.C., 2005. Screening for breast cancer	69
21	cardinal sign of breast cancer, a painless lump, and the	with mammography. Cochrane Database of Systematic	
23	necessity of seeking prompt medical evaluation of that	Reviews 4.	71
	lump (Harris and Kinsinger, 2002). Additionally, if	Petro-Nustus, W., Mikhail, B.I., 2002. Factors associated with	, -
25	women choose to continue to regularly perform BSE,	breast self-examination among Jordanian women. Public	73
	they should be informed that the benefits are unproven	Health Nursing 19 (4), 263-271.	75
23	and that it may result in unnecessary biopsies for benign	Reis, J., Trockel, M., King, T., Remmert, D., 2004. Computer-	75
2729	breast lumps (Thomas et al., 2002). Finally, women	ized training in breast self-examination: a test in a	75
	should continue to participate in mammography screen-	community health center. Cancer Nursing 27 (2), 162–168.	77
	ing programs and receive annual clinical breast exams as	Secginli, S., Nahcivan, N.O., 2004. Reliability and validity of	, ,
31	indicated by the national or regional guidelines for	the breast cancer screening belief scale among Turkish	79
	where they reside.	women. Cancer Nursing 27 (4), 287–294. Secginli, S., Nahcivan, N.O. Factors associated with breast	19
31		cancer screening behaviours in a sample of Turkish women:	81
22	The time has come, therefore, to say good-bye to BSE.	a questionnaire survey. International Journal of Nursing	01
33	There is no evidence to support the practice, and the best	Studies, in press.	02
2.5	available evidence tells us that it does more harm than	Semiglazov, V.F., Moiseenko, V.M., Manikhas, A.G., Prot-	83
35	good. It is natural that nurses would not willingly give	senko, S.A., Kharikova, R.S., Ivanov, V.G., Barash, N.I.,	0.5
	up promoting a practice that they have strongly believed	Seleznev, I.K., Migmanova, N.S., Ivanova, O.A., Orlov,	85
37	in and have invested in considerably. However, if we are	A.A., Popova, R.T., Chagunava, O.L., 1999. Role of breast	0.7
	fully embracing an evidence-based practice we have to	self-examination in early detection of breast cancer: Russia/	87
39	go with the evidence, even if we do not like what it is	WHO prospective randomized trial in St. Petersburg.	00
41	telling us.	Cancer Strategy 1, 145–151.	89
		Thomas, D.B., Gao, D.L., Ray, R.M., Wang, W.W., Allison,	
43		C.J., Chen, F.L., Porter, P., Hu, Y.W., Zhao, G.L., Pan,	91
	References	L.D., Li, W., Wu, C., Coriaty, Z., Evans, I., Lin, M.G.,	
		Stalsberg, H., Self, S.G., 2002. Randomized trial of breast self-examination in Shanghai: final results. Journal of the	93
45	Baxter, N., Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health, C.,	National Cancer Institute 94 (19), 1445–1457.	
	2001. Preventive health care, 2001 update: should women be	U.S. Preventive Services Task Force, 2002. Screening for breast	95

cancer: recommendations and rationale. Annals of Internal

Medicine 137 (5), 344-346.

97