Use of repeated mammograms to evaluate risk of breast cancer: a systematic review of methods used in the literature

Akila Anandarajah
Yongzhen Chen
Carolyn Stoll
Angela Hardi
Shu Jiang
Graham A. Colditz

Correspondence to: Graham Colditz: colditzg@wustl.edu

Abstract

Objective This systematic review aimed to assess methods used to relate repeated mammographic images to breast cancer risk, including the time from mammogram to diagnosis of breast cancer, and methods for analysis of data from either one or both breasts (averaged or assessed individually).

Design A systematic review was performed.

Setting The databases including in Medline (Ovid) 1946-, Embase.com 1947-, CINAHL Plus 1937-, Scopus 1823-, Cochrane Library (including CENTRAL), and Clinicaltrials.gov. were searched through October 2021, to extract published articles in English, describing relationship of the change in mammographic features with risk of breast cancer.

Participants Women with mammogram images.

Main outcome measure Breast cancer incidence.

Results Twenty articles were included in the final review. We found that BIRADs and Cumulus were most commonly used for classifying mammographic density and automated assessment was used on more recent digital mammograms. Time between mammograms varied from 1 to 4 years, and only 9 of the studies used more than 2 mammograms to quantify features. One study used a prediction horizon of 5 and 10 years, one used 5 years only and another 10 years only, while in the others the prediction horizon was not clearly defined with investigators using the next screening mammogram.

Conclusion This review provided an updated overview of the state of the art and revealed research gaps; based on these, we provide recommendations for future studies using repeated measure methods for mammogram images to make the use of accumulating image data. By following these recommendations, we expect to improve risk classification and risk prediction for women to tailor screening and prevention strategies to level of risk.

Article summary
Strengths and limitations of the study

- To the best of our knowledge, this is the most recent systematic review on the topic of using multiple mammogram images to define risk of breast cancer.

- This review was performed strictly following systematic review guidelines including a medical librarian with expertise in searching, multiple independent reviewers involved in study selection and data extraction, and reporting following PRISMA 2020 guidelines.
- Due to heterogeneity of methods for assessment and classification (categorical and continuous) of mammographic features including breast density and time to breast cancer, we did not perform risk of bias or conduct a meta-analysis.
- Few studies looked at repeated measures of non-density features.

Funding statement
This work was supported by Breast Cancer Research Foundation grant number (BCRF 21-028).

Competing interests The authors declare they have no competing interests.

Data availability statement
Data are available upon reasonable request by contacting the corresponding author. All data relevant to the study are included in the article or uploaded as supplementary information.

Introduction

Evolving technology from film mammograms to digital images has changed the sources of data and ease of access to study a range of summary measures from breast mammograms and risk of breast cancer.[1] In particular, given women have repeated mammograms as part of a regular screening program,[2-4] access to repeated images has become more feasible in real time for risk classification. Improved risk classification is fundamental to counseling women for their risk management.[5 6]

The leading measure for risk categorization extracted from mammograms is breast density.[7 8] This is now widely used and reported with many states requiring return of mammographic breast density measures to women as part of routine screening. Mammographic breast density is a strong reproducible risk factor for breast cancer across different approaches used to measure it (clinical judgement or semi/automated estimation).[7] Mammographic breast density has typically been measured as an average value across both left and right breasts to relate to risk of subsequent breast cancer. Change in breast density has been much less frequently studied. However, growing access to the large data from mammograms encourages a reassessment of the approaches employed to assess change in density and risk of subsequent breast cancer.[9 10]

Guidelines recommend screening mammography from age 45 (American Cancer Society[2]) or 50 (US Preventive Services Task Force[3]), with either annual or biennial mammography.[4] Women generally have a series of repeated mammograms (longitudinal data). Additionally, these recurring screening mammograms capture both the left and right breast (bivariate profiles), see Figure 1. Despite the availability of bivariate longitudinal images, general decision making is still based on mammographic breast density at a point in time, averaged between the two breasts,[11] to forecast the overall breast cancer risk. While a growing number of studies use more than just baseline mammogram values which could improve risk classification and is promising for clinical decision making, we note there is no systematic review and summary of these studies, although a recent publication reported results from 9 studies and combined results showing a positive association between increase in BIRADs density category and increase in breast cancer risk.[12] A richer summary of methods used to classify density and other features on mammograms and evaluate change in relation to risk can identify common approaches and help guide the use of change for breast cancer risk prediction. Therefore, we undertook the current systematic review.



Figure 1. Illustration of the available mammography data from routine screening.

We aim to summarize the methods used, the time from mammogram to diagnosis of breast cancer, methods for analysis of data from either one or both breasts (averaged or assessed individually), and identify gaps in evidence to prioritize future studies.

Materials and Methods

Eligibility Criteria

Population: We considered all studies of adult women (at least eighteen years old) involving original data. Abstract-only papers, review articles, and conference papers were excluded.
Intervention: We included studies measuring change in mammographic features between mammograms. A study had to use at least two different mammograms to be included.

Outcomes: Our primary outcomes of interest were risk of breast cancer, including both invasive and in situ cancers, and differences in mammographic features over time. Risk of breast cancer was required to be dichotomized (yes/no), and analysis of other risks (e.g., risk of interval vs. screen-detected cancer) were not included. Studies were required to assess the relationship of the change in mammographic features with risk of breast cancer.

Only studies available in English were included.

Information Sources
The published literature was searched using strategies designed by a medical librarian (AH) for the concepts of breast density, mammography, and related synonyms. These strategies were created using a combination of controlled vocabulary terms and keywords, and were executed in Medline (Ovid) 1946-, Embase.com 1947-, CINAHL Plus 1937-, Scopus 1823-, Cochrane Library (including CENTRAL), and Clinicaltrials.gov. Results were limited to English using database-supplied filters. Letters, comments, notes, and editorials were also excluded from the results using publication type filters and limits.

Search Strategy
An example search is provided below (for Embase).

('breast density'/exp OR ((breast NEAR/3 densit*):ti,ab,kw OR (mammary NEAR/3 densit*):ti,ab,kw OR (mammographic NEAR/3 densit*):ti,ab,kw)) AND ('mammography'/deOR mammograph*:ti,ab,kwOR mammogram*:ti,ab,kwOR mastrography:ti,ab,kwOR ‘digital breast tomosynthesis’:ti,ab,kwOR ‘x-ray breast tomosynthesis’:ti,ab,kw)NOT('editorial'/it OR 'letter'/it OR 'note'/it) AND [english]/lim

The search was completed for the first time on September 9, 2020, and was run again on October 14, 2021 to retrieve citations that were published since the original search. The second search was dated limited to 2020-present. Full search strategies are provided in the appendix.

Selection Process
Two reviewers (AA, CS) worked independently to review the titles and abstracts of the records. Next, the two reviewers independently screened the full text of the articles that they did not reject and indicated those measuring mammographic features over time, which were ultimately eligible for inclusion. Any disagreements of which articles to include were resolved by consensus.

Reference lists of included studies were hand searched to find additional relevant studies.

Data Collection Process
We created a data extraction sheet which two reviewers (AA, YC) used to independently extract data from the included studies. Disagreements were resolved by a third reviewer. If included studies were missing any desired information, any additional papers from the work cited, such as previous reports, methods papers, or protocols, were reviewed for this information.

Data Items
Any estimate of change in a mammographic feature over time or risk of breast cancer was eligible to be included. Predictive ability could be evaluated using an area under the curve, hazard ratio, odds ratio, relative risk, 5-year risk, or p value. Change could be reported as a percentage or an absolute value. No restrictions on follow-up time were placed. For studies that reported multiple risk estimates, we prioritized the primary models which were discussed in the

results section of the paper. If all models were discussed equally, then we listed the models with the best ability to predict breast cancer. For studies that reported multiple types of change, we prioritized the primary types which were discussed in the results section of the paper. If all types were discussed equally, then we listed the most frequent types of change.

We collected data on:
the report: author, publication year
the study: location/institution, number of cases, number of controls
the research design and features: lapsed time from mammogram to diagnosis
the mammogram: machine type, mammogram view(s), breast(s) used for analysis, time between mammograms, number of mammograms
the model: how density was measured, type of model, baseline variable(s), texture feature(s), prediction horizon

Risk of Bias
The objective of this review is to summarize the methods and analysis techniques used to assess change in mammographic features and risk of breast cancer rather than to quantitatively synthesize the results of the studies. Therefore, a risk of bias assessment, while typically performed in a systematic review, would not serve the objective and was not performed.

Patient and public involvement
No patient involvement

Human subjects
This study did not involve human subjects and therefore oversight from an Institutional Review Board was not required.

Registration and protocol
This review was not registered and a protocol was not prepared.

Results
The search and study selection process is shown in Figure 2. A total of 11,111 results were retrieved from the initial database literature search and imported into Endnote. 11 citations from ClinicalTrials.gov were retrieved and added to an Excel file library. After removing duplicates 4,863 unique citations remained for analysis. The search was run again in October 2021 to retrieve citations that were published since the original search. A total of 1,633 results were retrieved and imported to Endnote. After removing duplicates, including duplicates from the original search, 466 unique citations were added to the pool of results for analysis. Between the two searches a total of 11,577 results were retrieved, and there were 5,329 unique citations.

Of the 5,329 unique citations, 5,124 were excluded based on review of title and abstract. 205 full-text reports were retrieved and assessed for eligibility by two readers. Of these, 186 were excluded for reasons such as not measuring change, not having risk of breast cancer as an outcome, being an abstract or a duplicate paper, or not being published in English.

10 potential reports were identified from hand searching of citations. All of these were reviewed by full-text, and 9 were excluded for being duplicates or not having a measure of change in a mammographic feature.

After fully screening search results, 20 studies meeting eligibility criteria were included in the review.[13-32] These 20 studies used 2 or more mammograms to relate change in density or other features to risk of breast cancer and met eligibility criteria as set out in the selection flow chart. See PRISMA flow chart (Figure 2).

The key descriptive features of the 20 eligible studies are summarized in table 1. These rely on mammography film records (10 studies) though studies published from 2016 onwards often use digital images. Number of cases included in each study varied from a low of 68 cases[27] to a high of 1592 in a Spanish case control study.[26] See table 1.

Measures of breast density used in these studies are summarized in Table 2. BIRADS (6 studies) and Cumulus (5 studies) were the most commonly used methods for density assessment. Automated assessments were used on digital mammograms. Table 2 shows that the time between mammograms varied across studies from 1 to 4 years reflecting differences in guidelines and screening practice across countries. 20 association studies reported time between mammograms of 1 to 3 or more years, and most used only 2 mammogram measures of density or other features. Of note, from the 20 studies only 9 used more than 2 images separated in time to assess change in relation to risk. Furthermore, the covariates used to adjust estimates of association varied substantially across these studies.

Data from studies of change in mammographic density or features and subsequent risk incorporated into prediction models are summarized in Table 3. Here we also summarize the number of mammograms used and the prediction horizon. Only 1 (Kerlikowske[19] based on change in BIRADs category between 2 mammograms) reported prediction horizon of 5 and 10 years. In others the prediction horizon was not clearly defined, rather investigators use the next screening mammogram.[14 21 29 30 33] There is much variation in approaches to analysis used to relate change in mammographic breast density or features to breast cancer risk. Approaches included change in BIRADs category, change from first to last image (ignoring intermediate images), and change in density as a continuous measure.

These studies show modest improvement in estimating 5- and 10-year risk with AUC increasing from 0.635 to 0.640 after adding change in density.[19] Brandt shows similar modest change in AUC to discriminate cases form controls using volumetric percent density change in cancerous breast and normal breast from 0.52 to 0.54 though the time horizon appears to be the time between the two mammograms used for this study (median time 3 years).[14] Tan on the other hand evaluated bilateral asymmetry of breast density between left and right breast as a marker of near term cancer risk.[29]

The statistical methods used to model change and assumptions including breast imaged (ipsilateral or contralateral to the cancer) and approach to comparing cases and controls for the other association studies are summarized in Table 4. Some studies used change in BIRADs category, others had continuous breast density generated from machine derived measures.

Discussion

We identified 20 studies addressing change in mammographic breast density or other features and risk of breast cancer. Of these, 9 had only 2 images giving only modest ability to detect an association between change in density and risk of breast cancer. Only 6 studies report AUC for their analysis, and 5 of these use this measure to summarize discrimination of the cases from the controls. Only Kerlikowske uses change in density categories from BIRADs classification to predict 5- and 10-year risk, in the study adding change in density to the prediction model gave modest improvement in model performance. Overall, approaches to analysis of repeated

mammogram images reflect the underlying approach to density (categorical or continuous) and this variation further limits interpretation of this body of evidence.

Focus of these studies is predominantly on mammographic breast density with limited study of change in texture features. Only 2 studies look at change in texture features.[21 29] A recent meta-analysis of change in density and breast cancer risk used data from 4 cohort studies and reported a pooled result for increase in breast density compared to women with non-dense breast tissue (HR=1.61; 95% CI 1.33-1.92) for studies reporting hazard ratios and pooled OR for those reporting odds ratios (OR=1.98; 95% CI 1.31-3.0).[12] In that meta-analysis, decrease in breast density was associated with reduced risk compared to women with stable breast density (HR = 0.78; 95%CI 0.71-0.87). Of note, a single study contributed multiple measures of change in density within this analysis without adjustment for use of a common reference group.

Interval between images used for change is quite variable (range from as short as 1 year to maximum of 5.8 years). The majority of studies evaluate change in category of density for example BIRADs not a continuous measure of density. With only 2 images used, change in category is limited and the shorter time interval between images reduces power to differentiate trajectories of mammographic features over time. We might ask, given the low rate of decline in mammographic density with age as described,[34 35] is the interval used in these studies sufficient to detect meaningful change? To address this gap in the literature, future studies should use repeated measures methods incorporating more mammographic images over longer time periods.

There is a steady decline in mammographic breast density through midlife to menopause and beyond.[34 35] This slow decrease over time makes a discrete change in category harder to capture and will be limited compared to use of continuous mammographic density measures that are now becoming more broadly available. Future studies using the continuous density measures may better capture change and the risk associated with these changes.

While breast cancer rarely develops simultaneously in both breasts, current models still utilize average mammographic density and/or other features between the two breasts in conducting the risk prediction. Although mammographic density from the two breasts appears to be highly correlated at the baseline, deviation between the two breasts may be better captured over time using repeated mammography. Based on this review of the literature, we conclude that longitudinal bivariate analysis[36] of mammograms has never been used in breast cancer epidemiology.

We note limited use of change measures for improving risk prediction. Prediction to next routine mammogram may reflect available evidence but it is not helpful for current risk reduction recommendations for high-risk women (lifestyle changes, chemoprevention, or surgery), each typically with a longer term 5- or 10-year time horizon.[5 37]

We live in a precision medicine society. For high income countries, this requires translation of advances in biotechnology to focus treatment and prevention according to level of risk, and further balance risks and benefits of treatment or prevention.[38] Cancer prevention is often conceptualized as strategies that interrupt cancer pathways and maximize the short- and long-term benefits of prevention intervention.[39-41] To implement precision prevention, we need refined strategies for 5 or 10 year risk classification[38] that can be applied in real time in the clinical setting, such as in the context of screening mammography which remains a standard for early detection of BC.[4 42] Focus, therefore, should be placed on better use of repeated

mammographic measures of breast features to stratify risk and identify both the high risk groups, and also the low risk groups[43] to tailor screening and prevention strategies.[44]

Limitations

There are several limitations with the current review. Heterogeneity of the data did not allow for a meta-analysis. Additionally, systematic reviews are always subject to possible publication bias if all relevant studies have not been published. We used several strategies to reduce the risk of this including using a thorough search strategy designed by a medical librarian with expertise in searching for systematic reviews, and searching clinicaltrials.gov for any ongoing studies.

Conclusion

Despite current limitation in the literature the more widespread use of digital mammography and availability of digital images repeated over time offers growing opportunity to improve risk classification and risk prediction for women.



Figure 2: PRISMA 2020 Flow Diagram

Literature cited

1. van Ravesteyn NT, van Lier L, Schechter CB, et al. Transition from film to digital mammography: impact for breast cancer screening through the national breast and cervical cancer early detection program. *Am J Prev Med* 2015;48(5):535-42. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2014.11.010 [published Online First: 2015/04/22]
2. Oeffinger KC, Fontham ET, Etzioni R, et al. Breast Cancer Screening for Women at Average Risk: 2015 Guideline Update From the American Cancer Society. *JAMA* 2015;314(15):1599-614. doi: 10.1001/jama.2015.12783 [published Online First: 2015/10/27]
3. Siu A. L., U. S. Preventive Services Task Force. Screening for Breast Cancer: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. *Ann Intern Med* 2016;164(4):279-96. doi: 10.7326/M15-2886 [published Online First: 2016/01/13]
4. Qaseem A, Lin JS, Mustafa RA, et al. Screening for Breast Cancer in Average-Risk Women: A Guidance Statement From the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med* 2019;170(8):547-60. doi: 10.7326/M18-2147 [published Online First: 2019/04/09]
5. Bevers TB, Ward JH, Arun BK, et al. Breast Cancer Risk Reduction, Version 2.2015. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2015;13(7):880-915.
6. Louro J, Posso M, Hilton Boon M, et al. A systematic review and quality assessment of individualised breast cancer risk prediction models. *Br J Cancer* 2019;121(1):76-85. doi: 10.1038/s41416-019-0476-8 [published Online First: 2019/05/23]
7. Boyd NF, Guo, H., Martin, L.J., Sun, L., Stone, J., Fishell, E., Jong, R.A, Hislop, G., Chiarelli, A., Minkin, S., Yaffe, M.J. Mammographic density and the risk and detection of breast cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2007;356(3):227-36.
8. Boyd NF, Rommens JM, Vogt K, et al. Mammographic breast density as an intermediate phenotype for breast cancer. *Lancet Oncol* 2005;6(10):798-808. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(05)70390-9 [published Online First: 2005/10/04]
9. Salazar AS, Rakhmankulova M, Simon LE, et al. Chemoprevention Agents to Reduce Mammographic Breast Density in Premenopausal Women: A Systematic Review of Clinical Trials. *JNCI Cancer Spectr* 2021;5(1):pkaa125. doi: 10.1093/jncics/pkaa125 [published Online First: 2021/02/09]
10. Brentnall AR, Warren R, Harkness EF, et al. Mammographic density change in a cohort of premenopausal women receiving tamoxifen for breast cancer prevention over 5 years. *Breast Cancer Res* 2020;22(1):101. doi: 10.1186/s13058-020-01340-4 [published Online First: 2020/10/01]
11. Warwick J, Birke H, Stone J, et al. Mammographic breast density refines Tyrer-Cuzick estimates of breast cancer risk in high-risk women: findings from the placebo arm of the International Breast Cancer Intervention Study I. *Breast Cancer Res* 2014;16(5):451. doi: 10.1186/s13058-014-0451-5 [published Online First: 2014/10/09]
12. Mokhtary A, Karakatsanis A, Valachis A. Mammographic Density Changes over Time and Breast Cancer Risk: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Cancers (Basel)* 2021;13(19) doi: 10.3390/cancers13194805 [published Online First: 2021/10/14]

13. Azam S, Eriksson M, Sjölander A, et al. Mammographic Density Change and Risk of Breast Cancer. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 2020;112(4):391-99. doi: 10.1093/jnci/djz149
14. Brandt KR, Scott CG, Miglioretti DL, et al. Automated volumetric breast density measures: differential change between breasts in women with and without breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res* 2019;21(1):118. doi: 10.1186/s13058-019-1198-9 [published Online First: 2019/10/30]
15. Busana MC, De Stavola BL, Sovio U, et al. Assessing within-woman changes in mammographic density: a comparison of fully versus semi-automated area-based approaches. *Cancer Causes and Control* 2016;27(4):481-91. doi: 10.1007/s10552-016-0722-9
16. Byrne C, Ursin G, Martin CF, et al. Mammographic Density Change With Estrogen and Progestin Therapy and Breast Cancer Risk. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 2017;109(9) doi: 10.1093/jnci/djx001
17. Humphrey A, Harkness EF, Moschidis E, et al. Mammographic density over time in women with and without breast cancer. In: Lang KTATP, ed.: Springer Verlag, 2016:291-98.
18. Kang D, Kim J-Y, Kim J-Y, et al. The relationship between breast density change during menopause and the risk of breast cancer in Korean women. *Cancer Prevention Research* 2021
19. Kerlikowske K, Gard CC, Sprague BL, et al. One versus Two Breast Density Measures to Predict 5- and 10-Year Breast Cancer Risk. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2015;24(6):889-97. doi: 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-15-0035 [published Online First: 2015/04/01]
20. Kerlikowske K, Ichikawa L, Miglioretti DL, et al. Longitudinal measurement of clinical mammographic breast density to improve estimation of breast cancer risk. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 2007;99(5):386-95. doi: 10.1093/jnci/djk066
21. Khoo DAA, Li J, Czene K, et al. A combined segmentation and registration framework for bilateral and temporal mammogram analysis. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Health Informatics* 2016;6(2):380-86. doi: 10.1166/jmihi.2016.1704
22. Kim EY, Chang Y, Ahn J, et al. Mammographic breast density, its changes, and breast cancer risk in premenopausal and postmenopausal women. *Cancer* 2020 doi: 10.1002/cncr.33138
23. Kim S, Park B. Association between changes in mammographic density category and the risk of breast cancer: A nationwide cohort study in East-Asian women. *International Journal of Cancer* 2021;148(11):2674-84. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.33455
24. Lokate M, Stellato RK, Veldhuis WB, et al. Age-related changes in mammographic density and breast cancer risk. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2013;178(1):101-09. doi: 10.1093/aje/kws446
25. Maskarinec GP, I. : Lurie, G. : Kolonel, L. N. A longitudinal investigation of mammographic density: The multiethnic cohort. *Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention* 2006;15(4):732-39. doi: 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-05-0798
26. Roman M, Sala M, Bare M, et al. Changes in mammographic density over time and the risk of breast cancer: An observational cohort study. *Breast* 2019;46:108-15. doi: 10.1016/j.breast.2019.04.007 [published Online First: 2019/05/28]

27. Salminen TM, Saarenmaa IE, Heikkila MM, et al. Risk of breast cancer and changes in mammographic parenchymal patterns over time. *Acta Oncol* 1998;37(6):547-51. doi: 10.1080/028418698430241 [published Online First: 1998/12/22]
28. Sartor H, Kontos D, Ullén S, et al. Changes in breast density over serial mammograms: A case-control study. *European Journal of Radiology* 2020;127 doi: 10.1016/j.ejrad.2020.108980
29. Tan M, Zheng B, Leader JK, et al. Association Between Changes in Mammographic Image Features and Risk for Near-Term Breast Cancer Development. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging* 2016;35(7):1719-28. doi: 10.1109/TMI.2016.2527619 [published Online First: 2016/02/18]
30. Vachon CM, Pankratz VS, Scott CG, et al. Longitudinal trends in mammographic percent density and breast cancer risk. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2007;16(5):921-8. doi: 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-06-1047 [published Online First: 2007/05/18]
31. Van Gils CH, Hendriks JHCL, Holland R, et al. Changes in mammographic breast density and concomitant changes in breast cancer risk. *European Journal of Cancer Prevention* 1999;8(6):509-15. doi: 10.1097/00008469-199912000-00006
32. Work MER, L. L. : Quante, A. S. : Crew, K. D. : Whiffen, A. : Terry, M. B. Changes in mammographic density over time in breast cancer cases and women at high risk for breast cancer. *International Journal of Cancer* 2014;135(7):1740-44. doi: 10.1002/ijc.28825
33. Eriksson M, Li J, Leifland K, et al. A comprehensive tool for measuring mammographic density changes over time. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2018;169(2):371-79. doi: 10.1007/s10549-018-4690-5 [published Online First: 2018/02/03]
34. Krishnan K, Baglietto L, Stone J, et al. Longitudinal Study of Mammographic Density Measures That Predict Breast Cancer Risk. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2017;26(4):651-60. doi: 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-16-0499 [published Online First: 2017/01/08]
35. Burton A, Maskarinec G, Perez-Gomez B, et al. Mammographic density and ageing: A collaborative pooled analysis of cross-sectional data from 22 countries worldwide. *PLoS Med* 2017;14(6):e1002335. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002335 [published Online First: 2017/07/01]
36. Ying GS, Maguire MG, Glynn RJ, et al. Tutorial on Biostatistics: Longitudinal Analysis of Correlated Continuous Eye Data. *Ophthalmic Epidemiol* 2021;28(1):3-20. doi: 10.1080/09286586.2020.1786590 [published Online First: 2020/08/04]
37. Visvanathan K, Fabian CJ, Bantug E, et al. Use of Endocrine Therapy for Breast Cancer Risk Reduction: ASCO Clinical Practice Guideline Update. *J Clin Oncol* 2019;37(33):3152-65. doi: 10.1200/JCO.19.01472 [published Online First: 2019/09/04]
38. Pashayan N, Morris S, Gilbert FJ, et al. Cost-effectiveness and Benefit-to-Harm Ratio of Risk-Stratified Screening for Breast Cancer: A Life-Table Model. *JAMA Oncol* 2018;4(11):1504-10. doi: 10.1001/jamaoncol.2018.1901 [published Online First: 2018/07/07]
39. Britt KL, Cuzick J, Phillips KA. Key steps for effective breast cancer prevention. *Nat Rev Cancer* 2020;20(8):417-36. doi: 10.1038/s41568-020-0266-x [published Online First: 2020/06/13]

40. Serrano MJ, Garrido-Navas MC, Diaz Mochon JJ, et al. Precision Prevention and Cancer Interception: The New Challenges of Liquid Biopsy. *Cancer Discov* 2020;10(11):1635-44. doi: 10.1158/2159-8290.CD-20-0466 [published Online First: 2020/10/11]
41. Vineis P, Wild CP. The science of precision prevention of cancer. *Lancet Oncol* 2017;18(8):997-98. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(17)30331-5 [published Online First: 2017/08/02]
42. Kerlikowske K, Bibbins-Domingo K. Toward Risk-Based Breast Cancer Screening. *Ann Intern Med* 2021;174(5):710-11. doi: 10.7326/M21-0398 [published Online First: 2021/02/09]
43. Pace LE, Keating NL. Should Women at Lower-Than-Average Risk of Breast Cancer Undergo Less Frequent Screening? *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2021;113(8):953-54. doi: 10.1093/jnci/djaa219 [published Online First: 2021/01/31]
44. Brooks JD, Nabi HH, Andrulis IL, et al. Personalized Risk Assessment for Prevention and Early Detection of Breast Cancer: Integration and Implementation (PERSPECTIVE I&I). *J Pers Med* 2021;11(6) doi: 10.3390/jpm11060511 [published Online First: 2021/07/03]

Table 1 Studies using repeated assessment of mammographic features included in systematic review (sorted by year published)

Author	**Year**	**Location/ institution**	**Machine type**	**View used (CC/MLO/both)**	**# cases**	**# controls**	**Time from mmg to diagnosis of cancer**
Salminen[27]	1998	The Cancer Society of Finland	film	NR	68	4013	At least 6 months
van Gils[31]	1999	Nijmegen, Netherlands	film	Up until 1981/1982 the lateromedial view was used and, after that time, the MLO view	108	400	Prior to diagnosis. Diagnosed with cancer between 1985 and 1994. Screening from 1975-1994.
Maskarinec[25]	2006	Hawaii and Los Angeles	film	CC	607	667	The earliest mammogram was taken 6.3 ± 4.0 years before diagnosis
Kerlikowske[20]	2007	Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium	NR	NR	2639	299316	Within 12 months of the last examination
Vachon[30]	2007	Mayo Clinic	film	CC	372	713	The time interval between the initial mammogram and the diagnosis of cancer or exam date in controls was 7.0 ± 1.5 years on average (range, 2.1-10.4).
Lokate[24]	2013	Utrecht, Netherlands	over 99% of the mammograms were film	MLO	533	1367	Mammograms taken until diagnosis
Work[32]	2014	Columbia University Medical Center	film	NR	85	85	Cancer diagnosis occurred a median of 1.5 years after the second mammogram (range, 6 months to 9.4 years)
Kerlikowske[19]	2015	Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium	NR	NR	13715	708939	Diagnosed during follow-up period (which has mean = 6.6 years, range = 1 day to 10 years). Women diagnosed the 3 months following their second examination were excluded.

Tan[29]	2016	University of Pittsburgh Medical Center	digital (not specified further)	both	159	176	The average elapsed time between the “current” and each of “prior” #1, #2 and #3 studies was 1.16±0.41, 2.30±0.55 and 3.44±0.72 years, respectively.
Busana[15]	2016	National Health Service	film	MLO	313	452	Only images taken at least 1 year prior to diagnosis were included
Humphrey[17]	2016	Manchester, England	digital (not specified further)	both	170	510	Cases had an initial negative mammographic screen and another three years later when cancer was diagnosed.
Khoo[21]	2016	Sweden	film	MLO	250	250	Mammogram before diagnosis used
Byrne[16]	2017	Women’s Health Initiative	film	CC	174	733	NR
Brandt[14]	2019	Mayo Clinic Rochester and the San Francisco Mammography Registry	Hologic Selenia	both	1160	2360	Within 2 months and 1–5 years before diagnosis
Román[26]	2019	Spain	film and digital (not specified further)	both	1592	115796	Diagnosed within two years of the last screening examination in the study period
Azam[13]	2020	Sweden	GE Medical Systems, Philips Healthcare, Sectra Imtec AB and FUJI	MLO	563	43247	Diagnosed during follow-up period (which has average = 5.4 years)
Kim[22]	2020	Kangbuk Samsung Hospital Total Healthcare Centers	Hologic Selenia Dimensions and General Electric Senographe 2000D/DMR/DS A21	both	803	73446	Diagnosed during follow-up period (which has median = 6.1 years, interquartile range = 4.1-8.8 years, maximum = 13 years)
Sartor[28]	2020	Skane University Hospital	Approximately 90% of all images were acquired on Siemens	both	51	102	The last mammogram was defined as the last screening round before diagnosis (76 %) or the diagnostic mammographic examination

			mammography systems: 21% on Novation and 69% on Inspiration, with the remaining 10% on GE Senograph				(24%)
Kang[18]	2021	Samsung Medical Center Health Promotion Center	GE Senograph DS/ESSENTIAL	both	45	3552	Diagnosed during follow-up period (which has median = 4.8 years, interquartile range 2.8–7.5 years)
Kim[23]	2021	Korea National Health Insurance Service (NHIS) database	NR	NR	22781	3278498	Excluded women diagnosed with breast cancer within 90 days after the second screening. Screening in both 2009 to 2010 and 2011 to 2012 with breast cancer incidence identified up to December 2017.

NR: Not reported

Table 2 Features of studies using repeated measures of mammographic features and breast cancer risk (sorted by increasing number of mammograms used)

Author	**Year**	**Avg number of mmgs used**	**Side used (left/right/ both/avg)**	**Density (BIRAD categories/continuous)**	**Avg time between mmgs**	**Avg time from first to last mmg**	**Baseline variables**	**Non-density texture considered Y/N (if yes, what)**
Kerlikowske	2007	2	both	BIRADS	Median = 3.2 years	Median = 3.2 years	adjusted for mammography registry, time between the two screening examinations, age	N
Work	2014	2	left	Cumulus	Median = 4.0 years for cases (range 1-15) and 4.0 years for controls (range 1-14)	Median = 4.0 years for cases (range 1-15) and 4.0 years for controls (range 1-14)	Adjusted for age at first mammogram (Model 1), as well as parity, family history, menopausal status (Model 2) and additionally adjusted for baseline density (Model 3). Change in percent density is not adjusted.	N
Kerlikowske	2015	2	NR	BIRADS	1.8 years	1.8 years	none	N
Humphrey	2016	2	avg	Volpara	3 years	3 years	adjusted for relevant density measure at initial screen	N
Khoo	2016	2	contralateral for cases, random	new framework for fully automatically	at most 3 years	at most 3 years	none	Y. Includes first 13 Haralick texture

			side chosen for controls	measuring breast density and detecting change in density				features computed for three scales and brightness.
Byrne	2017	2	contralateral for cases, random side chosen for controls	Cumulus and Madena	1 year	1 year	adjusted for baseline body mass index, age, clinical center, age at first birth, and parity	N
Brandt	2019	2	both	Volpara	Median = 3.0 years for cases, 3.1 years for controls	Median = 3.0 years for cases, 3.1 years for controls	age, BMI, change in BMI, time between mammograms	N
Román	2019	2	NR	BIRADS	Average = 5.8 years, median = 4.1 years	Average = 5.8 years, median = 4.1 years	adjusted for time between screening mammography examinations (offset), screening center, mammography type, and year of screen	N
Kim	2021	2	NR	BIRADS	screened twice during 2009 to 2010 and 2011 to 2012	screened twice during 2009 to 2010 and 2011 to 2012	adjusted for age, age at menarche, menopausal status, age at menopause, number of children, breastfeeding duration, hormone	N

							replacement therapy among menopausal women, oral contraceptive use, family history in first-degree relatives, body-mass index, smoking status, drinking status during the past year and physical activity per week	
Kim	2020	NR	both	BIRADS	women participated in an annual or biannual health examinations	NR	age adjusted only and adjusted for age, center, year of screening examination, smoking status, regular exercise, alcohol intake, educational level, body mass index, history of diabetes, history of hypertension, history of cardiovascular disease, family history of breast cancer, female hormone medication use, and menopausal status	N
Kang	2021	NR	both	BIRADS	Measured both pre and postmenopause.	NR	Model 1 was adjusted for age and BMI. Model	N

					Excluded participants who had more than a 5-year interval between exams pre and postmenopause.		2 was further adjusted for smoking status, alcohol consumption, family history of BC, diabetes, hypertension and dyslipidemia. Logistic regression model was adjusted for age at menopause and BMI.	
Salminen	1998	2-5	avg	Wolfe's classification	2 years	NR	adjusted for age only and age, body mass index, number of pregnancies, size of the breast	N
Azam	2020	2-5	contralateral for cases, random side chosen for controls	STRATUS	18-24 months	Mean = 5.4 years	adjusted for age, BMI, and MD area at baseline	N
Maskarinec	2006	2.8	avg	CUMULUS	If available, mammograms for every second or third year were scanned	4.2 years for controls and 5.1 for cases	Predictor variables in the final model included age, the square of age, case status, ethnicity, BMI, soy intake early in life, soy intake as an adult, parity, age	N

							at menarche, age at first live birth, menopausal status, and HRT use in the year of the mammogram.	
Sartor	2020	3	both	Libra	Median = 4.5 years for cases and 4.7 years for controls	NR	none	N
Tan	2016	4	both	computer-aided detection scheme	Elapsed time between the “current” and each of “prior” #1, #2 and #3 studies was 1.16, 2.30 and 3.44 years, respectively	Elapsed time between the “current” and each of “prior” #1, #2 and #3 studies was 1.16, 2.30 and 3.44 years, respectively	none	Y. Selected relevant features from 158 initial mammographic density, structural similarity, and texture based image features.
van Gils	1999	5	ipsilateral	fully computerized method	2 years	NR	adjusted for family history of breast cancer, age at first birth/nulliparity, age at menarche, menopausal status and Quetelet index at the beginning of the study period	N

Lokate	2013	5	left	CUMULUS	NR	Mean = 9.5 years	Linear mixed effects model was adjusted for body mass index, height, parity, age at first delivery, number of children, menopausal status, contraceptive pill use, and hormone therapy use. All logistic regression analyses were adjusted for the same potential confounders as the linear mixed effects model, plus the follow-up time between the first and last mammograms.	N
Vachon	2007	For cases, 5.0. For controls, 5.2.	both	computer-assisted thresholding program	NR	Mean = for cases, 7.1 years. For controls, 7.0.	adjusted for BMI, menopausal status, breast cancer in a first degree relative, age at first birth, number of births, and HT status	N
Busana	2016	For cases, 5. For controls,	Left for Cumulus. Left and avg for	Cumulus and ImageJ-based method	1 year	NR	adjusted for age, BMI, parity, and family history of BC	N

		7.	ImageJ.					

Table 3 Models of repeated measures of mammographic features and incidence of breast cancer reporting AUC (sorted by number mammograms used)

Author	Year	Avg number of mmgs used	Model of change (e.g., difference between two densities, mixed effects model, etc.)	Prediction horizon (5/10yr)	AUC (baseline with density)	Overall AUC (with change in density or texture features)	Change in AUC for cases	Change in AUC for controls
Kerlikowske*	2015	2	Cox proportional hazards regression and logistic regression	5 and 10 year	5-year risk model: 0.635 (0.635 from 5-fold cross-validation). 10-year risk model: 0.622. 5-year risk model among women who changed density categories: 0.630 (0.629 from 5-fold cross-validation).	5-year risk model: 0.640 (0.639 from 5-fold cross-validation). 10-year risk model: 0.628. 5-year risk model among women who changed density categories: 0.641 (0.639 from 5-fold cross-validation).	A total of 63.5% of women had the same BI-RADS density on two sequential examinations while 17.9% had an increase in breast density category and 18.6% had a decrease. The most common combinations of changing density categories were heterogeneously dense on the earlier examination and scattered fibroglandular on the most recent examination (10.0%) and scattered fibroglandular densities on the earlier examination and heterogeneously dense on the most recent examination (9.9%).	A total of 63.5% of women had the same BI-RADS density on two sequential examinations while 17.9% had an increase in breast density category and 18.6% had a decrease. The most common combinations of changing density categories were heterogeneously dense on the earlier examination and scattered fibroglandular on the most recent examination (10.0%) and scattered fibroglandular densities on the earlier examination and heterogeneously dense on the most recent examination (9.9%).
Khoo	2016	2	Random forest classifier	NR	0.566	0.590	NR	NR
Brandt	2019	2	Logistic	NR	0.52 for	0.54 for	The cancerous	The ipsilateral breast

			regression		VPD, 0.53 for DV	VPD, 0.56 for DV	(ipsilateral) breast VPD decreased 0.26% and the contralateral breast VPD decreased 0.39% for a difference of 0.13%. For DV, the ipsilateral breast decreased 2.10 cm^3 and the contralateral breast decreased 2.74 cm^3 for a difference of 0.63 cm^3.	VPD decreased 0.29% and the contralateral breast VPD decreased 0.28% for a difference of -0.02%. For DV, the ipsilateral breast decreased 1.82 cm^3 and the contralateral breast decreased 1.89 cm^3 for a difference of 0.05 cm^3.
Tan	2016	4	Support vector machine based risk model	NR	0.730 for prior 1, 0.710 for prior 2, 0.666 for prior 3	NR	NR	NR
Vachon	2007	For cases, 5.0. For controls, 5.2.	Logistic regression and general estimating equations	NR	NR	0.65	Difference in percent density from earliest to latest mammogram: for the ipsilateral side, mean (SE) = -1.3% (7.5). For the contralateral side, mean (SE) = -1.5% (7.4). The difference in PD in the contralateral breast between cases and controls was 5.5% at 9 years before the cancer, 5.3%, at 5 years, and only 4.0% at 3 years. The corresponding values for the ipsilateral side were 4.9%, 4.9%, and 4.1%, respectively.	Difference in percent density from earliest to latest mammogram: for the ipsilateral side, mean (SE) = - 1.2% (6.3). For the contralateral side, mean (SE) = -1.1% (6.5). The difference in PD in the contralateral breast between cases and controls was 5.5% at 9 years before the cancer, 5.3%, at 5 years, and only 4.0% at 3 years. The corresponding values for the ipsilateral side were 4.9%, 4.9%, and 4.1%, respectively.

*Kerlikowske 2015 uses change in density to predict future risk of breast cancer, whereas other studies report association between change in mammographic characteristics and risk of breast cancer

Table 4 Analytical models used for repeated measures of mammographic features that do not report AUC (sorted by number mammograms used)

Author	Year	Avg number of mmgs used	Model of change (e.g., difference between two densities, mixed effects model, etc.)	Prediction horizon (5/10yr)	Risk other than AUC	Change for cases	Change for controls
Kerlikowske	2007	2	Multivariable logistic regression	NR	OR of breast cancer if BI-RADS breast density category increased from 1 to 2 (= 1.9) and 1 to 3 (= 3.4)	A total of 19.6% of all women had an increase in breast density category and 18.5% had a decrease. The majority of women had a BI-RADS breast density category of 2 or 3 on the first and last examination: 29.4% of women with breast cancer had BI-RADS scores of 2 on the first and last screens, and 24.3% women with breast cancer had scores of 3 on both screens.	A total of 19.6% of all women had an increase in breast density category and 18.5% had a decrease. The majority of women had a BI-RADS breast density category of 2 or 3 on the first and last examination: 30.0% of women without breast cancer had BI-RADS scores of 2 on the first and last screens, and 22.9% of women without breast cancer had scores of 3 on both screens.
Work	2014	2	Multi-variable conditional logistic regression and linear regression	NR	A >5% decrease in percent density was inversely associated with breast cancer (OR=0.56 for fully adjusted model), while a >5% increase in percent density was positively	Percent density = +0.29% per year. Mean change = -2.67% (range of -34–16).	Percent density = -1.62% per year. Mean change = -5.35% (range of -48–49).

					associated with breast cancer (OR=2.55); however, these associations were not statistically significant.		
Humphrey	2016	2	Paired t-tests, general estimating equations, and an exchangeable correlation matrix	NR	No statistically significant differences between cases and controls	PD change for affected breast = -0.4%, PD change for unaffected breast = -0.3%	PD change = -0.4% and -0.5%
Byrne	2017	2	Logistic regression	NR	Controlling for baseline mammographic density, a 1% change in mammographic density increased breast cancer risk 4%, but not statistically significantly, in women assigned placebos (OR = 1.04). The increase in breast cancer risk was not statistically significant (OR = 1.20) comparing the highest to the lowest quintile of mammographic density change.	For all women assigned placebo, mean mammographic density change = -0.05% with median of 0.0%	For all women assigned placebo, mean mammographic density change = -0.05% with median of 0.0%
Román	2019	2	Poisson regression	NR	Women whose density category increased from B to C or B to D had a RR of 1.55 and	Most frequently, women remained at density category B at earliest and latest examination	Most frequently, women remained at density category B at earliest and latest examination (40.8%). The proportion of women

					2.32, respectively. The RR for women whose density increased from C to D was 1.51.	(33.1%). The proportion of women that remained at BI-RADS density C or D was greater for women with breast cancer. 34.0% experienced a decrease and 12.5% experienced an increase in breast density category.	that remained at BI-RADS density A or B was significantly greater for women without breast cancer. 25.8% had a decrease, and 11.8% had an increase in breast density category.
Kim	2021	2	Poisson distribution	5 year	For women with BI-RADS Category 4 during both screenings, the 5-year risk was 1.24%.	23.0% of all women had a higher density category, and 22.2% had a lower density category in the second screening compared to the first screening.	23.0% of all women had a higher density category, and 22.2% had a lower density category in the second screening compared to the first screening.
Kim	2020	NR	Flexible parametric proportional hazards models	NR	Multivariable-adjusted HRs for incident breast cancer comparing the regressed, developed, and persistent breast density groups with the “none” group were 1.81, 1.47, and 3.01, respectively.	NR	NR
Kang	2021	NR	Proportional hazards regression model	NR	In comparison to consistently nondense group, HR for consistently dense group =	For all women, 199 (5.5%) experienced a density decrease and 185 (5.1%) a density increase pre to	For all women, 199 (5.5%) experienced a density decrease and 185 (5.1%) a density increase pre to postmenopause. The other 89.4% of participants

					2.31 for fully adjusted model, HR for density decrease = 0.83, and HR for density increase = 1.04. In addition, compared to the participants with decreased breast density after menopause, participants with increased breast density had a four-fold greater risk of BC (HR = 4.27).	postmenopause. The other 89.4% of participants exhibited no changes in density; 641 (17.8%) had consistently dense breast tissue and 2,572 (71.5%) never exhibited dense breast.	exhibited no changes in density; 641 (17.8%) had consistently dense breast tissue and 2,572 (71.5%) never exhibited dense breast.
Salminen	1998	2-5	Multivariate analysis with the Cox proportional hazard model	NR	The age-adjusted relative risks (RR) of breast cancer among women with unfavourable parenchymal patterns of the breast at the first round were only marginally increased (RR varied from 1.5 to 1.3 among women with P2 to DY patterns). After taking into account the mammographic parenchymal pattern sequentially at the rounds preceding the diagnosis, the	At the first screening round, the prevalence of normal mammographic parenchymal pattern (N1) was 13% and the prevalence of DY pattern was about 4%. There was a drift in the mammographic parenchymal patterns from the unfavourable P2,DY types to the favourable N1,P1 types between the first and the last screening rounds. At the last screening round	At the first screening round, the prevalence of normal mammographic parenchymal pattern (N1) was 13% and the prevalence of DY pattern was about 4%. There was a drift in the mammographic parenchymal patterns from the unfavourable P2,DY types to the favourable N1,P1 types between the first and the last screening rounds. At the last screening round the prevalence of N1 patterns was 46% and that of DY patterns under 1%.

					RRS varied from 2.6 to 4.7 and were statistically significant. There was only a small and not statistically significant increase in the risk of breast cancer among those women whose breast patterns changed either from favorable to unfavorable (RR = 1.3) or from unfavorable to favorable (RR = 1.2) compared with women whose patterns remained favorable.	the prevalence of N1 patterns was 46% and that of DY patterns under 1%.	
Azam	2020	2-5	Cox proportional hazards regression	NR	Compared with women with a decreased MD over time, no statistically significant difference in BC risk was seen for women with either stable MD or increasing MD (hazard ratio = 1.01 and 0.98, respectively). Among premenopausal	NR	NR

					women, there was a weak but statistically nonsignificant association between annual increase in MD greater than 10% and risk of BC (HR = 1.12) compared with premenopausal women with an annual decrease in MD greater than 10%. Women ages 40-49 with an increase in annual MD greater than 10% had a statistically nonsignificant 30% higher risk compared to perimenopausal women with greater than 10% annual MD reduction.		
Maskarinec	2006	2.8	Multilevel regression and linear regression	NR	The rate of change in percent density was not significantly related to case status (p = 0.11).	Unadjusted percent densities differed by ~20% between age 40 and 60. We estimated the age-related decline as 5.63% per 10 years. The nonlinear effect of 1.64% per 10 years in the full model	Unadjusted percent densities differed by ~20% between age 40 and 60. We estimated the age-related decline as 5.63% per 10 years. The nonlinear effect of 1.64% per 10 years in the full model described the faster decline of densities over time earlier in life than

						described the faster decline of densities over time earlier in life than later. The mean size of the total breast area was 25% larger at age 75 to 80 than at age 40 to 45, whereas the size of the dense areas decreased by 34% with age.	later. The mean size of the total breast area was 25% larger at age 75 to 80 than at age 40 to 45, whereas the size of the dense areas decreased by 34% with age.
Sartor	2020	3	Wilcoxon signed-rank test	NR	We detected a statistically significant difference in breast density change over time (p = 0.045).	Density change = -0.3%	Density change = +1.7%
van Gils	1999	5	Conditional logistic regression	10 year	In women with 5–25% density initially, we observed a trend of decreasing risk with diminishing density: when women with <5% density throughout the whole period formed the reference category, the odds ratio (OR) for those who decreased from 5–25% to <5% density was 1.9 in contrast to the OR of 5.7 for those	Majority of cases stayed at 5-25% density	Majority of controls stayed at 5-25% density

					with persisting 5–25% density. In women who increased from 5–25% density to >25% density the OR was 6.9.		
Lokate	2013	5	Linear mixed models and logistic regression	NR	For each percentage point decrease in mammographic density, odds ratio = 1.01. Those who increased in density by one or more categories seemed to have a slightly increased risk (statistically significant only for those increasing from the first to the second quartile of dense area, OR = 2.8).	The mean decline in percent density between the first and last available mammograms was 10.8% for both breast cancer cases and controls. The change in absolute dense area was not different for breast cancer cases and controls (mean = -15.2 cm^2). The mean change in absolute nondense area was +12.3 cm^2. 47% of all women showed a decline; 49% stayed in the same category; and 4% showed an increase in percent density over an average period of 10 years. Generally, women in whom breast density decreased with one or more categories had a slightly lower risk of	The mean decline in percent density between the first and last available mammograms was 10.8% for both breast cancer cases and controls. The change in absolute dense area was not different for breast cancer cases and controls (mean = -15.2 cm^2). The mean change in absolute nondense area was +7.3 cm^2. 47% of all women showed a decline; 49% stayed in the same category; and 4% showed an increase in percent density over an average period of 10 years. Generally, women in whom breast density decreased with one or more categories had a slightly lower risk of breast cancer than did those who stayed in the same category, although not statistically significant.

						breast cancer than did those who stayed in the same category, although not statistically significant.	
Vachon	2007	For cases, 5.0. For controls, 5.2.	Logistic regression and general estimating equations	NR	For contralateral PD, the ORs range from 1.0043 (for change in PD of -10 or quartile 1) to 0.9972 (for change in PD of +6.5 or quartile 4). These results were similar for the ipsilateral side [0.9997 (for change in PD of -10 or quartile 1) to 1.0002 (for change in PD of +6.5 or quartile 4)]. The best-fitting model for both the ipsilateral and contralateral sides included no variables in which effects changed with follow-up (all P values testing for time-varying effects of mammographic density were 0.10 or higher).	Difference in percent density from earliest to latest mammogram: for the ipsilateral side, mean (SE) = -1.3% (7.5). For the contralateral side, mean (SE) = -1.5% (7.4). The difference in PD in the contralateral breast between cases and controls was 5.5% at 9 years before the cancer, 5.3%, at 5 years, and only 4.0% at 3 years. The corresponding values for the ipsilateral side were 4.9%, 4.9%, and 4.1%, respectively.	Difference in percent density from earliest to latest mammogram: for the ipsilateral side, mean (SE) = -1.2% (6.3). For the contralateral side, mean (SE) = -1.1% (6.5). The difference in PD in the contralateral breast between cases and controls was 5.5% at 9 years before the cancer, 5.3%, at 5 years, and only 4.0% at 3 years. The corresponding values for the ipsilateral side were 4.9%, 4.9%, and 4.1%, respectively.
Busana	2016	For cases, 5. For controls,	Linear mixed models and conditional logistic	NR	Women with a high PD at baseline, which remained high	NR	Cumulus = -1.17% a year, Image-J = -1.07% a year. The linear component of the yearly rate of change in

		7.	regression		over time, had the highest odds of developing BC relative to a woman with mean random intercept and mean slope (OR: 8.10 for Cumulus (left MLO) and 3.42 for the ImageJ-based method (left–right MLO mean). In contrast, women with the lowest PD at baseline, despite a slight increase in their PD over time, had the lowest odds of developing BC (OR: 0.07 for Cumulus (left MLO) and 0.23 for the ImageJ-based method (left–right MLO mean).		PD was more than twice as fast after the menopausal transition than prior to it for Cumulus (-1.10 % vs. -0.50 %, respectively). Similarly, the yearly rate coefficient in the ImageJ-based model was nearly twice as fast after the menopause (-1.16 % vs. 0.67 %, respectively).

Complete Search Strategies:

Search strategies designed and executed by Angela Hardi, MLIS

Embase.com

=3,919 results on 9/9/2020 (Limited to English; editorials, letters, and notes excluded from results)

Updated search (date limited to 2020-present): 602 on 10/14/2021

('breast density'/exp OR ((breast NEAR/3 densit*):ti,ab,kw OR (mammary NEAR/3 densit*):ti,ab,kw OR (mammographic NEAR/3 densit*):ti,ab,kw)) AND ('mammography'/de OR mammograph*:ti,ab,kw OR mammogram*:ti,ab,kw OR mastrography:ti,ab,kw OR 'digital breast tomosynthesis':ti,ab,kw OR 'x-ray breast tomosynthesis':ti,ab,kw) NOT ('editorial'/it OR 'letter'/it OR 'note'/it) AND [english]/lim

Ovid Medline All

= 2694 results on 9/9/2020 (Limited to English; editorials, comments, and letters excluded)

Updated search (date limited to 2020-present): 440 results on 10/14/2021

(Breast Density/ OR (breast adj3 densit*).ti,ab. OR (mammary adj3 densit*).ti,ab. OR (mammographic adj3 densit*).ti,ab.) AND (Mammography/ OR mammograph*.ti,ab. OR mammogram*.ti,ab. OR mastrography.ti,ab. OR "digital breast tomosynthesis".ti,ab. OR "x-ray breast tomosynthesis".ti,ab.) NOT (comment.pt. OR editorial.pt. OR letter.pt.)

CINAHL Plus

=978 results on 9/9/2020; (Limited to English and these publication types: Clinical Trial, Corrected Article, Journal Article, Meta Analysis, Meta Synthesis, Practice Guidelines, Proceedings, Protocol, Randomized Controlled Trial, Research, Review, Systematic Review)

Updated search (dated limited to 2020-present): 135 results on 10/14/2021

((MH "Breast Tissue Density") OR AB(breast N3 densit*) OR TI(breast N3 densit*) OR AB(mammary N3 densit*) TI(mammary N3 densit*) OR AB(mammographic N3 densit*) OR TI(mammographic N3 densit*)) AND ((MH "Mammography") OR AB(mammograph*) OR TI(mammograph*) OR AB(mammogram*) OR TI(mammogram*) OR AB(mastrography) OR TI(mastrography) OR AB("digital breast tomosynthesis") OR TI("digital breast tomosynthesis") OR AB("x-ray breast tomosynthesis") OR TI("x-ray breast tomosynthesis"))

Scopus

=3,162 results on 9/9/2020 (Limited to English; editorials, notes, letters, and book chapters excluded from results)

Updated search (date limited to 2020-present): 423 results on 10/14/2021

TITLE-ABS ((breast W/3 densit*) OR (mammary W/3 densit*) OR (mammographic W/3 densit*)) AND TITLE-ABS (mammograph* OR mammogram* OR mastrography OR "digital breast tomosynthesis" OR "x-ray breast tomosynthesis") AND (EXCLUDE (DOCTYPE , "no") OR EXCLUDE (DOCTYPE , "ch") OR EXCLUDE (DOCTYPE , "le") OR EXCLUDE (DOCTYPE , "ed")) AND (LIMIT-TO (LANGUAGE , "English"))

Cochrane Library

=358 results on 9/9/2020 (1 Cochrane Protocol and 357 results from CENTRAL Trials)

Updated Search (date limited 2020-present in CENTRAL Trials) = 32 results on 10/14/2021

ID	Search
#1	MeSH descriptor: [Breast Density] explode all trees

#2 ((breast NEAR/3 densit*) OR (mammary NEAR/3 densit*) OR (mammary NEAR/3 densit*) OR (mammographic NEAR/3 densit*)):ti,ab,kw
#3 #1 OR #2
#4 MeSH descriptor: [Mammography] explode all trees
#5 (mammograph* OR mammogram* OR mastrography OR "digital breast tomosynthesis" OR "xray breast tomosynthesis"):ti,ab,kw
#6 #4 OR #5
#7 #3 AND #6

ClinicalTrials.gov

= 11 results (searched the "Other terms" field) on 9/9/2020
Updated Search = 12 results on 10/14/2021 (1 new result, added to the Excel library)

("breast density" OR "mammary density") AND (mammograph* OR mammogram* OR mastrography OR "digital breast tomosynthesis" OR "x-ray breast tomosynthesis")