Clyde B. Schechter, MD
Department of Family and Social Medicine, Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, New York
Natasha K. Stout, PhD
Department of Population Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Harvard Pilgrim Health Care Institute, Boston, Massachusetts
Amy Trentham-Dietz, PhD
Carbone Cancer Center, Department of Population Health Science, School of Medicine and Public Health, University of Wisconsin at Madison, Madison, Wisconsin
On behalf of the CISNET Breast Working Group Principal Investigators

DOI: 10.1002/cncr.31150, Published online December 26, 2017 in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com)

Reply to Distinguishing Between CISNET Model Results Versus CISNET Models

We thank Berry et al from the Cancer Intervention and Surveillance Modeling Network (CISNET) Breast Working Group for taking the time to read and respond to our article.[1]

We affirm that we are not, nor did we ever intend to claim to be, CISNET investigators. Because none of us has been a CISNET author, none of our academic affiliations overlap with CISNET Working Group institutions, and because we made no claim of CISNET affiliation in either the title page or "Methods" section of our article,[1] we did not anticipate that readers would assume we were affiliated with CISNET. We took every opportunity to cite prior CISNET publications as the sources of the publicly available data used in our article.[2-6] It should be noted that we did not use data from the study by Berry et al[7] cited in their letter, but we did use data from prior studies by Mandelblatt et al, which are cited below and were cited in our article.[1-4]

The end of our "Introduction" section states the motivation for our paper,[1] namely that our study was performed because the most recent CISNET analysis involved only 1 of the 3 most widely discussed screening strategies. This statement should further clarify that we are not affiliated with the CISNET Breast Working Group.

We thank the CISNET investigators for their important computer modeling work, and look forward to future CISNET publications evaluating competing screening strategies.

FUNDING SUPPORT

No specific funding was disclosed.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES

Elizabeth Kagan Arleo has a paid position as the Editor-in-Chief of *Clinical Imaging*. R. Edward Hendrick has received personal fees from GE Healthcare for work performed outside of the current study. Mark A. Helvie has received institutional grants from GE Healthcare and IBM Watson for work performed outside of the current study.

REFERENCES

1. Arleo EK, Hendrick RE, Helvie MA, Sickles EA. Comparison of recommendations for screening mammography using CISNET models. *Cancer.* 2017;123:3673-3680.
2. Mandelblatt JS, Cronin KA, Bailey S, et al; Breast Cancer Working Group of the Cancer Intervention and Surveillance Modeling Network. Effects of mammography screening under different screening schedules: model estimates of potential benefits and harms. *Ann Intern Med.* 2009;151:738-747.
3. Mandelblatt JS, Cronin K, de Koning H, Miglioretti DL, Schecter C, Stout N. Model Report: Collaborative Modeling of U.S. Breast Cancer Screening Strategies. Rockville, MD: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force; 2015. AHRQ Publication No. 14-05201 EF-4.
4. Mandelblatt JS, Stout NK, Schechter CB, et al. Collaborative modeling of the benefits and harms associated with different U.S. breast cancer screening strategies. *Ann Intern Med.* 2016;164:215-225.
5. National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, Cancer Intervention and Surveillance Modeling Network (CISNET). Breast cancer modeling. https://cisnet.cancer.gov/breast/. Accessed November 8, 2016.
6. van Ravesteyn NT, Stout NK, Schechter CB, et al. Benefits and harms of mammography screening after age 74 years: model estimates of overdiagnosis. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2015;107:djv103.
7. Berry DA, Cronin KA, Plevritis SK, et al; Cancer Intervention and Surveillance Modeling Network (CISNET) Collaborators. Effect of screening and adjuvant therapy on mortality from breast cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2005;353:1784-1792.

Elizabeth Kagan Arleo, MD
Department of Radiology
Weill Cornell Imaging at New York-Presbyterian
New York, New York
R. Edward Hendrick, PhD
Department of Radiology
University of Colorado at Denver
School of Medicine
Denver, Colorado
Mark A. Helvie, MD
Department of Radiology
Comprehensive Cancer Center
University of Michigan Health System
Ann Arbor, Michigan
Edward A. Sickles, MD
Department of Radiology
University of California at San Francisco
San Francisco, California

DOI: 10.1002/cncr.31151, Published online December 26, 2017 in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com)