

Response to "Distinguishing between CISNET model results versus CISNET models"  
Response to Letter to the Editor



[Arleo, Elizabeth Kagan](#)



[proxy](#)

*Corresponding Author*



<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5282-0057> ✓



[Hendrick, R. Edward](#)



[proxy](#)

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9971-2651> ✓



[Helvie, Mark A.](#)



[proxy](#)



[Sickles, Edward A.](#)



[proxy](#)

- New York-Presbyterian / Weill Cornell - Radiology  
425 East 61st Street, 9th floor , New York, New York 10065  
United States
- University of Colorado - Denver School of Medicine - Radiology  
3920 BIDENS GATE DR , TIMNATH, Colorado 80547  
United States
- University of Michigan Health System ✓ - Department of  
Radiology and Comprehensive Cancer Care  
Ann Arbor, Michigan  
United States
- University of California San Francisco Medical Center at  
Parnassus ✓ - Radiology  
San Francisco, California  
United States

Author M

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of record](#). Please cite this article as [doi:10.1002/cncr.31151](https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.31151).

We thank Drs. Mandelblatt et al from the CISNET Breast Working Group Principal Investigators for taking the time to read and respond to our article.<sup>1</sup>

We affirm that we are not, nor did we ever intend to claim to be, CISNET investigators. Since none of us has been a CISNET author, none of our academic affiliations overlap with CISNET Working Group institutions, and since we made no claim of CISNET affiliation in either our title page or Methods section, 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 paper.<sup>2-6</sup> It should be noted that we did not use data from reference 2 cited in the CISNET Breast Working Group letter, but did use data from reference 2-4 cited below (and cited in our paper).

The end of our Introduction section states the motivation for our paper:<sup>6</sup> "Although CISNET itself has compared screening strategies,<sup>12</sup> it is precisely because the most recent CISNET analysis involved only one of the three most widely discussed strategies that the current study was performed." This statement should further clarify that we are not affiliated with the CISNET Breast Working Group.

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

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. 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 CK, de Koning H, Miglioretti DL, Schechter CS, Stout N. Model report: collaborative modeling of U.S. breast cancer screening strategies. AHRQ Publication No. 14-05201 EF-4. Rockville, MD: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force; 2015.
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.

# Author Manuscript