Effect of implementing population-based prostate-specific antigen screening on testing rates and prostate cancer overdiagnosis in England: a statistical modelling study

Andrew J. Vickers, Adam Brentnall

Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, USA (AV), Wolfson Institute of Population Health, Queen Mary University of London, Charterhouse Square, London, EC1M 6BQ, UK (AB).

Corresponding author: Andrew Vickers, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, 1275 York Avenue, NY, NY 11215 vickersa@mskcc.org

Funding: This work was supported in part by the National Institutes of Health/National Cancer Institute (NIH/NCI) with a Cancer Center Support Grant to Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center [P30 CA008748], a SPORE grant in Prostate Cancer to Dr. H. Scher [P50-CA92629].

Conflicts of interest: Dr. Vickers is named on the patent for the statistical model that has been licensed and commercialized as the 4Kscore by OPKO Diagnostics. Drs. Vickers receives royalties from sales of this test and owns stock options in OPKO.

Abstract

Objective: To determine the potential effect of implementing population-based prostate-specific antigen (PSA) screening in England on overdiagnosis and testing rates compared with the current opportunistic testing policy.

Design: Statistical modeling study. English data on rates of prostate cancer by stage, symptomatic and asymptomatic PSA testing, and life expectancy were merged with epidemiological assumptions on lead time to evaluate plausible overdiagnosis and PSA testing rates from an organized population-based program, in comparison with the current opportunistic policy. In the base-case scenario, organized screening increased the rate of asymptomatic PSA testing (screening) in men aged $50 - 69$ year and decreased PSA testing in older men. An alternative modeling approach estimated change in overdiagnosis using data from the CAP trial, and current asymptomatic cancer detection rates.

Setting: England, 2018/19.

Participants: Adult men.

Main outcome measures: Rates of PSA testing, early-stage prostate cancer incidence, and overdiagnosis (prostate cancer that would not be diagnosed in a man's lifetime but for the PSA test).

Results: In the base scenario, introduction of population-based screening led to an approximate 25% reduction in both PSA testing and overdiagnosis rates in the target population compared with the current policy. This was due to the anticipated decrease in PSA testing and overdiagnosis in men aged 70+ years being larger than the projected increase in PSA testing and overdiagnosis in men 50-69 years. The overall incidence of early-stage cancer prostate cancer was similar. Population-based screening was found to detect more early-stage cancers that were not overdiagnosed, and therefore likely to have a greater impact on prostate-cancer morbidity and mortality than current policy. Findings were robust in sensitivity analyses including an entirely separate modeling approach.

Conclusion: Opportunistic screening policies in England have led to high rates of overdiagnosis and PSA testing. In comparison with current policy, a risk-adapted, population-based prostate cancer screening program would likely reduce the number of PSA tests and overdiagnoses, and increase benefits of PSA testing from reduced prostate-cancer mortality Population health in England could be improved by either adopting an organized program or by prohibiting PSA testing of asymptomatic men in primary care.

Introduction

Screening for prostate cancer using prostate-specific antigen (PSA) is not currently recommended by the UK National Screening Committee due to "concerns about high levels of overdiagnosis [and] overtreatment.[1] Accordingly, there is no organized National Health Service (NHS) PSA screening program comparable to the NHS Breast Screening Program (NHSBSP) with mammography, or the NHS Bowel Program with fecal immunochemical tests. In both these programs the target population are proactively contacted at a determined interval, provided with information for informed decision making, and if desired, invited to take the screening test.

In place of population-based screening, the current NHS policy is known as the "Prostate Cancer Risk Management Program". This is an opportunistic testing program[2] whereby "any man can make an appointment with their GP to discuss having the … PSA test" [3] and, following such informed decision-making, "anyone aged 50 or over with a prostate can ask for a PSA test"[4]. Moreover, as part of national guidelines on recognition of suspected cancer[5], a PSA test is recommended for men with lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS), erectile dysfunction or hematuria. As a result, many men in the UK receive PSA tests. Collins et al. reported data on the incidence of PSA testing in England in 2018, finding that among ~10m men followed for a mean of ~8 years, 1.5m had close to 4m PSA tests[6]. They also noted that asymptomatic testing was much higher for men in their 70s, 80s and 90s compared to those aged 50 – 70 years. Overdiagnosis of prostate cancer is strongly associated with age[7] and therefore opportunistic testing policies have led to very high rates of PSA screening in the groups of older men who are at highest risk for overdiagnosis[8].

Given that the current UK PSA testing policy results in overdiagnosis, a relevant question for policymakers is how the introduction of population-based PSA would change rates of overdiagnosis in the population compared with the current *status quo*. By population-based screening we mean a program where PSA testing in asymptomatic people through the NHS is organized through a call and recall system, following a defined screening regimen that includes screening intervals, triage tests, diagnostic testing, referral and appropriate information technology systems for monitoring. PSA testing outside of the program would be restricted to urologists and not be available in primary care. To estimate of how rates of PSA testing and overdiagnosis would accordingly be expected to change with such a program, we undertook a statistical modeling study using data on levels of PSA testing by age group in England, rates of prostate cancer diagnoses by stage, the proportion of those diagnoses that resulted from a "for cause" biopsy, and predicted changes in screening rates by age group that might be expected following the introduction of population-based PSA testing.

Methods

An overview of the data sources and scenarios used in the base case model is given in Table 1. National statistics were obtained on the number prostate cancer cases in England annually, and the proportion of cases that are clinical T-stage 1 (T1) and T2 versus T3 and T4, separately by age group (less than 50, 50 - 59, 60–69, 70–79 and 80+ years). Our base case scenario used rates from 2019, to match PSA testing data from Collins et al.[6]

Our mathematical model is described in detail in the Supplementary Appendix. In brief, we took overdiagnosis to be negligible in men diagnosed with stage T3 and T4 disease. The risk of overdiagnosis for T1 and T2 prostate cancer for each decade of age was calculated in terms of the lead time and life expectancy and then multiplied by the number of men undergoing PSA testing in that age group to calculate total number of overdiagnoses. Changes in overdiagnosis with the implementation of population-based screening were estimated by increasing the number of men aged 50 – 69 undergoing PSA testing (to 70% in the base case, comparable to compliance with other cancer screening programs[9]) and reducing PSA testing in older men (by 80% in the base case, what has been empirically observed in older men with the implementation of population-based screening[10]). Current UK policy is that a PSA should be given if requested by a patient or if a patient reports certain symptoms, such as erectile dysfunction. We separately modeled changing just the former or both of these policies, in other words, population-based screening would be implemented with a policy that men could not request PSA with or without a policy that a PSA could not be ordered in primary care in response to symptoms. It is of note that T1 and T2 prostate cancer does not cause symptoms. To calculate the number of PSA tests under population-based screening, we followed the algorithm suggested by European guidelines as to the frequency of PSA testing at different ages[11] We triangulated our findings using an independent modeling strategy. This was derived using the cumulative incidence after screen detection from a screen using 15 years of follow-up from the UK CAP trial of PSA testing[12]. Code for both approaches is given in the Supplementary Material allowing independent researchers to change the inputs to determine how it affects the findings.

Results

The results for the base case scenario are shown in Table 2. The number of PSA tests under population-based screening was reduced by approximately 25% compared with current policy. This was driven by a very large decrease, from >900,000 to <200,000 men aged 70 years or older, which more than offset the approximate expected doubling of PSA testing in men in their 50s. The number of PSA tests in men in their 60's was also reduced, as the population-based strategy excluded from screening men with PSAs < 1 ng/ ml, constituting about half of this age group.

The projected effect of population-based screening on overdiagnosis was also close to a 25% reduction, again driven by a large decrease of early-stage cancers in older men. The absolute number of overdiagnosed men did not increase by a large amount in younger men, in line with the model assumption on the longer life expectancy of younger men, and hence greater likelihood that a cancer would eventually be clinically diagnosed during their lifetime. The anticipated overall number of early-stage cancers was very similar under population-based screening, with increased incidence in younger men offset by a decrease in older men. There was a ~10% increase in the number of early-stage cancers that are not overdiagnosed.

Table 3 shows results from the sensitivity analyses. Given that the base case showed an advantage to population-based screening, we focused on changes that would be expected to reverse this result. However, even with extreme assumptions, such as 100% compliance with population-based screening,

no change in for cause biopsies and only a 50% reduction in screening in older men, the number of men overdiagnosed did not importantly increase with population-based screening. We examined one further scenario, which was a more aggressive approach to reducing "for cause" PSA testing and biopsy. This reduced overdiangosis by about half compared to contemporary policies, driven by a large decrease in early-stage cancers in men aged 70 and over.

The results of the independent analysis using the CAP data are shown in figures 1 and 2. The results are consistent with the primary analysis. In the base scenario for overdiagnosis (figure 1a), if introduction of population-based screening led to an 80% reduction in screening in men 70 and greater screening and an increase in overdiagnosis in younger men of about 50%, there would be approximately 1000 fewer overdiagnoses than currently, in comparison with the estimate of around 1200 shown in the primary analysis (table 2). It further shows that if population-based screening reduces incidence of asymptomatic prostate cancer in men older than 70 years by 80%, asymptomatic detection would need to increase by more than 250% in men aged 50-69 to increase overdiagnosis relative to the current policy (Figure 2). This is impossible given that close about 40% of men aged 50 – 69 already received PSA tests.

Discussion

Using a simple modeling strategy, we found that, in comparison with the current opportunistic testing policy, implementation of population-based PSA screening in the UK is unlikely to substantially increase either the number of prostate cancer overdiagnoses, or the number of PSA tests done annually. Provided that access to PSA testing in asymptomatic men is only available through the screening program, the anticipated increase in PSA tests and overdiagnosis associated with a roll out of population-based screening in younger men is likely to be offset by a countervailing decrease in older men when PSA tests were no longer available in primary care. In the base model scenario, population-based screening was expected to reduce both PSA testing and overdiagnosis by about 25%. In another reasonable scenario, abandoning the policy of recommending PSA testing in primary care for symptoms such as erectile dysfunction, hematuria and LUTS, the total incidence of overdiagnosis was approximately halved.

Screening for prostate cancer using PSA testing leads to overdiagnosis, and so it might appear counterintuitive that implementing a program to provide PSA tests would reduce overdiagnosis. However, it is perhaps unsurprising that a rational program specifically designed to reduce overdiagnosis would have better outcomes than a *laisse faire* approach where a man can get a PSA if he asks for one, even if he has too short a life expectancy to benefit.

Our findings also suggest that implementation of population-based screening would provide greater benefit than current policy. This is because the number of T1 and T2 cancers that are not overdiagnoses increases by about 10%. Such cases represent cancers detected early and thus represent a chance of cure of a disease that might otherwise progress to metastasis.

It is sometimes argued that implementation of population-based screening would require considerable extra resources to cope with the increase in cases and would thus place undue strain on an already over-burdened health system.[13] Our findings suggest this would not be the case in the UK. Provided that increased detection in younger men is accompanied by reduced detection in older men, population-

based screening was found unlikely to increase either the number of PSA tests done annually, nor the total current number of early-stage prostate cancers detected, in comparison with the current *status quo*. Further, one might also anticipate a reduction in the number of advanced stage cancers due to the increase in early-stage cancers that are not overdiagnosed. Given the very high resource requirements for advanced disease, this suggests that implementation of population-based screening might also result in a decrease in resource requirements for prostate cancer. We also postulate that population-based screening could alleviate burden on primary care physicians, who are asked to engage in complex and lengthy shared decision-making with patients about a subject in which their expertise may be less than complete. For instance, one shared decision-making proposal is that physicians inform patients on 16 separate facts and ask 12 questions about preferences[14].

There are many other advantages of organized screening over opportunistic testing that are beyond the scope of our analysis. One of these is that it should reduce the major well-documented regional and income disparities associated with the opportunistic testing. In the Collins et al. analysis of PSA testing, for instance, rates of PSA testing in the north-east of England were over 40% lower than in the south-east; there was a similar difference in PSA testing comparing the highest versus lowest quintile of deprivation[6]. Dodkins et al. have demonstrated how such variations lead to differences in rates of metastatic prostate cancer[15], with an approximate relative 10% increased risk comparing the least to highest deprivation quintile.

Our estimates of the risk of overdiagnosis are comparable to those reported elsewhere in the literature. In perhaps the most well-known study from 2009[19276453], the risk of overdiagnosis was estimated as "23% to 42% of all screen-detected cancers". We estimated that, in current practice, 7,821 of 22,364 (35%) early-stage cancers were overdiagnosed.

Two other models have been built to evaluate the potential utility of organized prostate cancer screening the UK, but one of the motivations for this work was an observation that they do explicitly consider the level of PSA testing ongoing in the UK, nor model how formal screening would reduce opportunistic PSA testing in older men. For example, one report on how a national prostate cancer screening program would affect NHS costs and activity[16] found that a population-based screening would increase the number of prostate cancer diagnoses. This is because the model focused only on men aged 45 – 69 and assumed no change in PSA rates in men aged 70 and above. Another model[17] similarly did not incorporate how implementation of population-based screening would affect rates of opportunistic screening, especially in older men and, thereby also implicitly assumed that screening would be an "add on" to existing activity. We do not believe "population-based screening plus PSA testing whenever a man wants it" is a reasonable policy and therefore do not believe estimates of the effects of such a policy are interesting.

A possible alternative to both the current informed choice policy and population-based screening would be to maintain the current *status quo* but restrict PSA testing both in older men and in response to symptoms. For instance, the current policy might be amended from "anyone aged 50 or over with a prostate can ask for a PSA test" to "anyone aged 50 - 69 with a prostate can ask for a PSA test"; guidelines might also be updated to remove the recommendation for PSA in men with LUTS, erectile

dysfunction or hematuria. While this would reduce the high level of overdiagnosis under the current policy, it would not address the policy problem of regional and economic disparities.

Our simplified modeling approach is subject to several limitations. For instance, we did not take into account the effect of repeated PSA tests, and assumed that diagnoses occurring within an age group (e.g. 70 – 79) took place at the midpoint age (e.g. 75). Critically, however, there is no reason to believe that such limitations would importantly bias our findings towards population-based screening. In particular, any such bias would have to be extremely large to change our main conclusion that the introduction of population-based screening would not increase prostate cancer overdiagnosis.

In conclusion, implementation of an organized, population-based prostate screening program would not importantly increase PSA testing and overdiagnosis in comparison with current NHS policies and guidelines on PSA testing. Indeed, such a program would most likely reduce the harms and costs of screening as well as increase benefits in terms of mortality. As such, our findings suggest that current NHS policies and guidelines on PSA should be abandoned. The NHS should "fish or cut bait"[18], either prohibit the use of PSA in primary care or implement a comprehensive, risk-adapted, population-based screening program designed in response to best evidence on how to reduce the harms and maximize the benefits of PSA screening.

Table 1. Overview of data sources and scenarios for each model input. All inputs are available in the Stata code included in the Supplementary Material.

Input	Data source	How varied in sensitivity analysis	Comments
Number of early and late stage prostate cancers diagnosed by age group	NHS data[19]	Not varied	
Life expectancy by age group	UK life tables[20]	Not varied	
Male population by age	UK Office of National Statistics[21]	Not varied	Data available for England and Wales. Assumed 50% male and took into account relative population in England vs. Wales and size of population 90+ vs. 80 – 90.
Current PSA testing rates by age group	Study on UK PSA testing[6]	Not varied	
Proportion of PSA tests given for symptoms of prostate cancer	Study on UK PSA testing[6]	Varied the probability that existence of prior symptoms led to PSA testing from 100% to 50% with 80% as the base case.	Insensitive to changing assumptions, with ~2% difference between 100% vs. 50% rates.
Proportion of prostate cancers diagnosed after for cause biopsy	UK primary care audit study[22]	Varied the probability that existence of prior symptoms led to biopsy from 100% to 50% with 80% as the base case; also varied how this probability differed between early and late stage cancers from odds ratio of 1 for late stage cancer (i.e. no difference) to an odds ratio of 3 for late stage cancer with 2 being the base case	Estimates highly sensitive to rate of for cause cancers, discussed further in text.
Compliance	UK compliance with bowel and breast screening both ~70%[23]	Varied from 50% to 100%, with 70% as the base case	Moderately sensitive to changing assumptions. Under base scenario, varied from 69% relative number of diagnoses with 50% compliance to 85% with 100% compliance
Lead time	ERPSC[24]	Varied from 5 to 15 years, with 10 years as the base case	Relatively insensitive to changing assumptions, with less than 6% difference in relative overdiagnosis rates between 5 vs. 15 year lead time.
Change in PSA use in older men with population-based screening	Lithuania study[10]	Varied from 80% (base case) to 50%	Sensitive to changing assumptions, with a 50% vs.80% reduction in screening leading to roughly half the reduction in overdiagnosis associated with population-based screening.
Proportion of men overdiagnosed irrespective of life expectancy	ERSPC[25]	Varied from 0 (base case) to 20%	Number of patients overdiagnosed changes, but relative number between current practice and population-based screening unaffected.

Table 2. Estimated PSA tests, early-stage cancers (stage T1 or T2) and overdiagnoses under current policy and projected under population-based screening for the base case scenario

Age group	Under current policy			Projected under population-based screening		
	PSA tests	Early-stage cancers	Overdiagnoses	PSA tests	Early-stage cancers	Overdiagnoses
18-49	94,306	359	12	94,306	359	12
50-59	330,176	3,343	263	734,744	5,208	410
60-69	518,458	7,846	1,472	392,044	10,787	2,024
70-79	617,789	8,514	3,966	123,558	5,214	2,428
80+	316,781	2,302	2,108	63,356	1,250	1,145
Total	1,877,511	22,364	7,821	1,408,008	22,819	6,020

Table 3. Results of sensitivity analyses changing various inputs and assumptions

Scenario	Relative number of overdiagnoses with population-based screening compared to current policy
Base case	77.0%
Alternative scenario 1. Symptoms before biopsy were always cause of biopsy and no difference in symptomatic presentation between early and late-stage cancers	94.4%
Alternative scenario 2. Compliance rate with population-based screening 100% in men of screening age	87.2%
Alternative scenario 3. Decrease in screening older men only 50% with population-based screening	89.0%
Combine scenarios 1 – 3	103.3%
Base case with additional policy that PSA cannot be ordered in primary care in response to symptoms such as hematuria	50.3%

Figure 1: Change in estimated number of overdiagnosed prostate cancers detected each year in England from population screening using data from CAP. Change in detection of asymptomatic cancers in men aged 50-69 years is given as a factor of 1 (ie. no increase, black1.35 (red), 1.5 (orange) or 2. Plot (a) shows results under the base scenario for overdiagnosis from the CAP trial; (b) shows results based on the lower bound of the 95% CI for overdiagnosis from the CAP trial; (c) is based on the upper bound of the 95% CI.

Figure 2: **Required change of detection in older men to reduce overdiagnosis, using CAP data.**
Estimated proportional decrease in detection rate of asymptomatic cancer from population-based screening compared to current opportunistic policy required in men aged 70+ required to match the increase in overdiagnosis in men of screening age. The base scenario estimate (black) is shown with estimates from the upper and lower 95% CI overdiagnosis estimates (gray).

References

1. UK National Screening Committee, Prostate Cancer. https://view-health-screening-recommendations.service.gov.uk/prostate-cancer/. Accessed November 19 2025.
2. Norori N, de Biase C, Wong YH, et al. Evaluating whether Prostate Cancer UK's risk checker is a help or hindrance to prostate-specific antigen testing policy: a mixed-methods study. *BJGP Open* 2024;8(2) doi: 10.3399/bjgpo.2024.0040 [published Online First: 20240729]
3. Guidance. PSA testing: advice for men without symptoms https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/prostate-specific-antigen-testing-description-in-brief. Accessed November 19 2025.
4. PSA Test. UK NHS. https://www.nhs.uk/tests-and-treatments/psa-test/. Accessed November 19 2025.
5. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Suspected cancer: recognition and referral. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng12/resources/suspected-cancer-recognition-and-referral-pdf-1837268071621. Accessed November 19 2025.
6. Collins KK, Oke JL, Virdee PS, et al. Prostate specific antigen retesting intervals and trends in England: population based cohort study. *Bmj* 2025;391:e083800. doi: 10.1136/bmj-2024-083800 [published Online First: 20251008]
7. Vickers AJ, Sjoberg DD, Ulmert D, et al. Empirical estimates of prostate cancer overdiagnosis by age and prostate-specific antigen. *BMC Med* 2014;12:26. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-12-26 [published Online First: 20140211]
8. Vickers A, O'Brien F, Montorsi F, et al. Current policies on early detection of prostate cancer create overdiagnosis and inequity with minimal benefit. *Bmj* 2023;381:e071082. doi: 10.1136/bmj-2022-071082 [published Online First: 20230517]
9. NHS England Screening. https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/screening/. Accessed November 19 2025.
10. Patasius A, Krilaviciute A, Smailyte G. Prostate Cancer Screening with PSA: Ten Years' Experience of Population Based Early Prostate Cancer Detection Programme in Lithuania. *J Clin Med* 2020;9(12) doi: 10.3390/jcm9123826 [published Online First: 20201126]
11. Van Poppel H, Hogenhout R, Albers P, et al. A European Model for an Organised Risk-stratified Early Detection Programme for Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol Oncol* 2021;4(5):731-39. doi: 10.1016/j.euo.2021.06.006 [published Online First: 20210804]
12. Martin RM, Turner EL, Young GJ, et al. Prostate-Specific Antigen Screening and 15-Year Prostate Cancer Mortality: A Secondary Analysis of the CAP Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2024;331(17):1460-70. doi: 10.1001/jama.2024.4011
13. Science Media Centre. expert reaction to 23 year follow up data from The European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. October 29 2025. https://www.sciencemediacentre.org/expert-reaction-to-23-year-follow-up-data-from-the-european-randomized-study-of-screening-for-prostate-cancer. Accessed November 19 2025. .

14. Feng B, Srinivasan M, Hoffman JR, et al. Physician communication regarding prostate cancer screening: analysis of unannounced standardized patient visits. *Ann Fam Med* 2013;11(4):315-23. doi: 10.1370/afm.1509

15. Dodkins J, Cook A, Mayne E, et al. Geographic, socioeconomic and demographic inequalities in the incidence of metastatic prostate cancer at time of diagnosis in England: a population-based evaluation. *BMJ Oncol* 2025;4(1):e000643. doi: 10.1136/bmjonc-2024-000643 [published Online First: 20250401]

16. Prostate Cancer Research. Prostate Cancer Screening: The Impact on the NHS. https://www.prostate-cancer-research.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Prostate-Cancer-Screening-The-Impact-on-the-NHS-Report.pdf. Accessed November 19 2025. .

17. University of Sheffield School of Medicine and Population Health (SCHARR). Cost-effectiveness of Prostate Cancer Screening for Men of Average and High Risk. University of Sheffield 2025.

18. Vickers A. Early Detection of Prostate Cancer - Time to Fish or Cut Bait. *N Engl J Med* 2025;393(17):1742-43. doi: 10.1056/NEJMe2509793

19. Rapid Cancer Registration Data: Incidence and treatment dashboard. NHS England. https://nhsd-ndrs.shinyapps.io/rcrd/. Accessed November 19 2025. .

20. National life tables: UK. https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/lifeexpectancies/datasets/nationallifetablesunitedkingdomreferencetables. Accessed November 19 2025. .

21. UK Office of National Statistics. https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/demographics/age-groups/latest/]. Accessed November 19 2025. .

22. Merriel SW, Akter N, Zakkak N, et al. Factors affecting prostate cancer detection through asymptomatic prostate-specific antigen testing in primary care in England: evidence from the 2018 National Cancer Diagnosis Audit. *Br J Gen Pract* 2025;75(754):e300-e05. doi: 10.3399/bjgp.2024.0376 [published Online First: 20250502]

23. NHS England Statistics. https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/screening/]. Accessed November 19 2025. .

24. Draisma G, van Rosmalen J. A note on the catch-up time method for estimating lead or sojourn time in prostate cancer screening. *Stat Med* 2013;32(19):3332-41. doi: 10.1002/sim.5750 [published Online First: 20130131]

25. Hugosson J, Roobol MJ, Månsson M, et al. A 16-yr Follow-up of the European Randomized study of Screening for Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol* 2019;76(1):43-51. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2019.02.009 [published Online First: 20190226]

Supplementary appendix

Methods

We assumed that any man with T3 or T4 cancer would have been diagnosed during the course of his life irrespective of PSA. To estimate annual rates of screening-related overdiagnosis in patients with T1 and T2 prostate cancer, we considered that a proportion of T1 and T2 would be related to work-up for symptoms of prostate cancer. Our inputs for this parameter used data from the 2018 National Cancer Diagnosis Audit[1] which reported the proportion of patients diagnosed with prostate cancer after asymptomatic PSA testing, separately by age group. Patients were defined as having asymptomatic PSA only if there was no prior record of the symptoms defined in NHS policy to require a PSA (LUTS, erectile dysfunction, hematuria). However, the presence of a symptom would not necessarily mean that symptoms were the reason for the PSA test: a man might have had, say, erectile dysfunction, his doctor did not consider that related to prostate cancer, but agreed to give a PSA when the man requested it. Accordingly, we included an estimate for the proportion of patients who had an NHS-defined indicating symptom before a PSA, but the subsequent PSA test (therefore any resulting diagnosis) was not causally due to that symptom. In our base model, we set parameters so that the rate was 20% overall, that is, in most cases, the symptoms were the cause of the PSA. We further specified that this rate would vary by stage, that is, if a patient had symptom, then a PSA test and then was diagnosed with T3 or T4 disease, it was more likely that test was due to symptoms than if T1 or T2 disease was diagnosed. Hence, we used a rate 13% for T3/T4 and 27% for T1/T2, with both the absolute values, and the difference between stages, varied in sensitivity analyses. We separately evaluated a policy where PSA could not be given for cause in primary care. This was done by setting the probability of symptoms leading to a PSA test to a very low value, 0.1.

For T1/T2 cancers following asymptomatic PSA testing, the probability of overdiagnosis was taken to depend on the expected lead-time of cancer detection and life-expectancy. A statistical analysis[2] of the European PSA screening randomized trial[3] there estimated a lead time of about 10 years, a number we varied between 5 and 15 years in sensitivity analyses. . We used a slightly more conservative assumption of 7 years, with 5 and 10 years used in a sensitivity analysis. Using the England and Wales life tables for 2017 – 2019, we calculated the probability that man would survive until the lead time if aged at the midpoint of each age decade (i.e. 45, 55, 65, 75 and 85 years). These life tables include death from prostate cancer, but this constitutes only a small fraction of deaths and so is unlikely to impact results. Although lead times and survival times have different distributions, the probability of surviving to the mean lead time is similar to the probability a lead time randomly selected from a distribution of lead times is less than a survival time randomly selected from a distribution of lead times. Moreover, any departures from this assumption would be incorporated in the sensitivity analysis modifying the lead time.

To calculate the annual overdiagnosis rate if screening were implemented at age 50 - 69, we used the overdiagnosis rates calculated for the current policy and made adjustments depending on age group. For men under 50 years of age, the number of patients overdiagnosed is very small and any adjustments would make not qualitatively change our findings. Under population-based screening men aged 50 – 69

years would receive an invitation to receive a PSA test, for which we assumed a base case compliance that 70% of invitees would attend (following evidence from breast and bowel screening in the UK)[4], that 70% of invitees would attend[4]. Hence, the rate of screening-related overdiagnosed prostate cancer by age group was anticipated to increase by the difference between 70% and the current testing rate (excluding for cause) in each age group[5][6]. For men aged 70 years or older, the base case scenario considered data from Lithuania[7], one of the few countries to implement population-based screening, showing an ~80% reduction in the number of older men undergoing PSA testing after it was made available in a state-run program.

To estimate the number of PSA tests per year under current policy, we used data on age-group specific PSA screening rates[5]. To estimate the projected number of PSA tests under population-based screening, we used the following rates for each age group. For age <50 years, we assumed that rates would not change. For men aged 50 – 59 years, we followed European guidelines [8] that screening intervals are 5 years if PSA < 1 ng/ml, and 2 to 4 years if PSA is above 1 ng/ml, which we operationalized to every 4 years if PSA 1 – 2 and every 2 years if PSA 2 – 3 ng/ml. For men aged 60 – 69 years, we used a similar regimen, except there would be no additional screening were PSA < 1 ng/ml[9]. The proportion of the population in each PSA group was derived using normative data on PSA levels in a large unscreened Swedish cohort[10][11]. For men aged 70+ years, we assumed an 80% decrease in screening rates, as described above

Overdiagnosis and PSA testing rates under the current policy and under population-based screening were multiplied by estimates of the population size by age group, using population data from England[12], to estimate the total number of overdiagnoses and PSA tests. The model was implemented in a Stata do file (see below).

We triangulated our findings using an independent modeling strategy. This was derived using the cumulative incidence after screen detection from a screen using 15y follow-up from the CAP trial[13], where the excess to 15 years was estimated to 11.7% of screen-detected cancers, with the 95%CI (0.0% to 26.7%) used to define lower and higher overdiagnosis scenarios.To account for death from other causes, we used competing risks methods applying competing mortality rates based on English male mortality period rates[14] and prostate cancer mortality rates by age (2018-20[15]]. The number of overdiagnosed cases by age group was estimated by multiplying the assumed number of asymptomatic prostate cancers detected by the corresponding estimated overdiagnosis rate. The base case for the number of asymptomatic cancers detected by age was from a 2018 study[1] where n=871 men were diagnosed aged 70 years or older with asymptomatic prostate cancer, and n=982 aged 50-69 years. Change in overdiagnosis relative to this scenario was evaluated as a function of proportional increase in detection of men 50-69 and decrease in men 70 years or older. We then estimated the impact of increased asymptomatic cancer detection in men aged 50-69 year vs decrease detection in men aged 70 years or more. The code for this analysis can be found at https://urldefense.com/v3/__https://github.com/brentnall/pca-overdx__;!!KVWo1iE!Ti8mr6ii88NvNKIR1W9jGxggOSKqRw2uot_oWukOZsGpfWHrE3kOsYA-VVpVkwvwmnsXsYBg-tVjjVHSGuHKiZ36$.

Stata do files

There are two do files, one to compare overdiagnosis rates under current policy and under population-based screening and second to compare PSA testing rates under both scenarios. Both print out a table of results with cells delimited by "&".

Change in number of overdiagnoses

```
********************************************************************************
* Andrew Vickers January 10 2026
* calculate effect of implementing population based screening on overdiagnosis in UK
********************************************************************************

quietly{

***ASSSUMPTION
*RATE OF SCREENING COMPLIANCE ith population based screening
* base assumption is to 70%
* UK FOBT program is about 67% https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bowel-cancer-screening-annual-report-2023-to-2024/bowel-cancer-screening-standards-data-report-2023-24#bcsp-s02-uptake
*as is mammography https://www.england.nhs.uk/2024/01/new-breast-screening-figures-prompt-fresh-uptake-appeal/

                                        local compliance_rate=.7

*store details of inputs is a local called "scenario" for later printing
local scenario="Compliance with population based screening: `compliance_rate'."

***ASSSUMPTION
*LEAD TIME
*use 10 (base assumption), 5, 7 or 15

                                        local lead=10

local scenario="`scenario' Lead time: `lead' years."

 ***ASSSUMPTION: probability of for cause PSA
 *if a man has a symptom before PSA that doesn't mean symptom cause PSA
 * specify the probability that for a man with a symptom and then a PSA, the PSA was because of the symptom
 * default is .8
 *should be close to the probability of for cause biopsy below

                                        local pifcpsa=.1

 local scenario="`scenario' Probability that symptoms before PSA caused PSA `pifcpsa'."

***ASSSUMPTION
 *REDUCTION IN SCREENING RATES IN OLDER MEN
 * base scenario is represent 80% reduction (doi: 10.3390/jcm9123826.)
```

```
                                         local reduction=.8

local scenario="`scenario' Reduction in screening in older men 0`reduction'."

***ASSSUMPTION
*PROPORTION OF OVERDIAGNOSIS IRRESPECTIVE OF LONGEVITY
* base case is 0%. alternative is 10% or higher

                                      local overdiagnosis_fixed=.1

local scenario="`scenario' Probability of overdiagnosis irrespective of life expectancy 0`overdiagnosis_fixed'."

 ***ASSSUMPTION: probability of for cause biopsy
 *if a man has a symptom before PSA that doesn't mean symptom cause PSA
 * specify the probability that for a man with a symptom and then a PSA, the PSA was because of the symptom
 * default is .8

                                         local pifc=.1

local scenario="`scenario' Probability that symptoms before biopsy caused PSA `pifc'."

  ***ASSSUMPTION differnece in for cause biopsy between T1T2 and T3T4
* We want to explore possibility that probability that a biopsy is for cause is different for T1T2 than T3T4
* say odds ratio of 2 for T3T4 vs. T1T2 vs. 1 in base scenario

                                            local or =2

local scenario="`scenario' Odds ratio for T3vsT4 being for cause `or'."

*input data downloaded from https://nhsd-ndrs.shinyapps.io/rcrd/ for prostate cancer cases by age
*the data set gives data for 2019  for age groups <50, 50's, 60's, 70's, 80+

*create a data set of age groups and number of T1T2 and T3T4

clear
set obs 5
*create age group avariable
g agegroup="18-49"
replace agegroup="50-59" in 2
replace agegroup="60-69" in 3
replace agegroup="70-79" in 4
replace agegroup="80+" in 5

*input number of T1T2 and T3T4 into separate variables
*create and label the variables
g t1t2=.
g t3t4=.
label var t1t2 "Number of T1 and T2 cases per year by age group"
label var t3t4 "Number of T3 and T4 cases per year by age group"
*input the variables from a matrix where the numbers are stored
matrix input T1T2 =(359.0269775390625, 3343.35888671875, 7845.56201171875, 8513.986328125, 2301.658203125)
```

```
matrix input T3T4 =(141.9730224609375, 1823.64111328125, 5974.43798828125, 8655.013671875, 4997.341796875)
forvalues i=1/5{
            replace t1t2=T1T2[1,`i'] in `i'
            replace t3t4=T3T4[1,`i'] in `i'
}

*input probability of surviving to lead time , data from life tables
*Depends on user defined lead time
if `lead'==5{
            matrix input LE=(0.987219979178038, 0.971720308827179, 0.930098706853037, 0.819791969238004, 0.521310437148245)
            }

if `lead'==7{
            matrix input LE=(0.980600906549838, 0.95668048060138, 0.894864123202306, 0.729382961948629, 0.356579774396768)
}

if `lead'==10{
            matrix input LE=(0.968775311632956, 0.928390138746436, 0.8294060151066, 0.576563342877298, 0.167578291806409)
}
if `lead'==15{
            matrix input LE=(0.941378645004122, 0.863494467503171, 0.679940390422085, 0.300568488319017, 0.0247674156386894)
}

*create a matrix to store current screening rates for 50- 59 and 60 - 69
*screening rate in under 50's not used so just given as 0
 *(all data on screening rates from from table 1 of https://www.bmj.com/content/391/bmj-2024-083800.full)
*also see kiana-k-collins.shinyapps.io/bmj_shiny_app_v2
 matrix input OSR=(0, .37 , .45)

*create a matrix to store current screening rates for cause for 50- 59 and 60 - 69
*screening rate in under 50's not used so just given as 0
 *dta from Kiara collins
 *https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7805413/#table2
 *first set of data from from https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7805413/#table2
 matrix input FCR=(0.295260489948538, 0.312117346310517, 0.363983891806933, 0.399382096238511, 0.380534670008354)

*now adjust for user defined probability of symptoms before PSA caused PSA
forvalues i=1/5{
            local FCR`i'= FCR[1,`i']*`pifcpsa'
}
matrix input FCR=(`FCR1', `FCR2', `FCR3', `FCR4', `FCR5')

*create a matrix to store current rates of for cause cancers each age group <50, 50's, 60's, 70's, 80+

*derived from https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39401928/
 matrix input FC=(0.702,0.764,0.788,0.818,0.873)

*adjust for user defined robability that symptoms before biopsy caused PSA
```

```
forvalues i=1/5{
        local FC`i'= FC[1,`i']*`pifc'
}
matrix input FC=(`FC1', `FC2', `FC3', `FC4', `FC5')

* take into account probability that a biopsy is for cause is different for T1T2 than T3T4
*user defined odds ratio

forvalues i=1/5{
        *get number t1t2s and t3t4s and total cancers into locals
        local t1t2= t1t2[`i']
        local t3t4= t3t4[`i']
        local total =`t1t2'+`t3t4'
        *updated odds in T3T4 is baseline odds (derived from probability) * OR
        local odds=FC[1,`i']/ (1-FC[1,`i'])*`or'
        *convert to a probability of for cause in T3T4
        local pit3t4`i'=`odds'/(1+`odds')
        *to calculate probability of for cause in T1T2...
        * start by calculating absolute number of t3t4 that are for cause
        local fct3t4`i'=`t3t4'*`pit3t4`i''
        *calculate total number of for cause
        local fc=FC[1,`i']*`total'
        *subtract out to get t1t2 for cause
        local fct1t2=  `fc'-`fct3t4`i''
        *probability of for cause in T1 t2
        local pit1t2`i'=`fct1t2'/`t1t2'
}
matrix input FCT1T2=(`pit1t21', `pit1t22', `pit1t23', `pit1t24', `pit1t25')
matrix input FCT3T4=(`pit3t41', `pit3t42', `pit3t43', `pit3t44', `pit3t45')

*************************************************************************************
*now import life expectancy
*life expectancy is proportion surviving 10 years
*life expectancy is taken from england and wales life tables for 2017 - 2019
*https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/lifeexpectancies/datasets/nationallifetablesenglandandwalesreferencetables
*we used 10 year survival probability for age 45, 55, 65, 75, and 85 for the age groups respectively.
*england  male population is taken from
*https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/demographics/age-groups/latest/
*breakdown by gender not given, so assume 50% male as reasonable approximation
*population is for england and wales, so take 95% of that to get England only
g le=.
label var le "Probabilty of surving n years, where n is from user input"
forvalues i=1(1)5{
        replace le=LE[1,`i'] in `i'
}

*calculate current number of overdiagnosed cases
*approximated by the number of cases multiplied by proportion not surviving  the mean lead time (give as le)

g current_overdiagnosed=t1t2*(1-le)*(1+`overdiagnosis_fixed')

label var current_overdiagnosed "current number of overdiagnosed cases"
```

```
********************************************************************************
*calculate overdiagnosis rates under population based screening
*create a variable for number of T1T2 cases under population screening
g t1t2_screening=.
label var t1t2_screening "estimated number of T1T2 cases under population based screening"

*AGE GROUP <50
*.  assume nothing changes for men < 50 (some good reason to get a PSA test if young)
replace t1t2_screening=t1t2 if age=="18-49"

*loop over age 50 - 70
forvalues i=2/3{
        *get proportion currently diagnosed T1T2 cases for-cause PSA (e.g. DRE, urinary symmptoms, family history)
        *remainder are screened
        local fc=FCT1T2[1,`i']*t1t2[`i']
        local sc=(1-FCT1T2[1,`i'])*t1t2[`i']
        * calculate number of cases if screening increases

 *put overall screening rate in a local (all PSA / population)
 local ospi=(OSR[1,`i'])
 *put for cause screening rates in a local (for cause PSA / all PSA)
 local fcsr=(FCR[1,`i'])
 *calculate proportion of population overall that is getting an asymptomatic PSA (asymptomatic PSA / population)
 local psapi= `ospi' * (1- `fcsr')
  *calculate proportion of population overall that is getting an for cause PSA (for cause PSA / population)
 local fcpi= `ospi' *  `fcsr'
 *calculate proportion of population that would get asymptomatic PSA under screening
 local targetpsa = `compliance_rate' - `fcpi'

  *proportional increase in T1T2
  local proportional_increase=`targetpsa'/`psapi'

 *increase in cases

 local sc=`sc' *`proportional_increase'

        *total early cases under screening
        replace t1t2_screening=`fc'+`sc' in `i'

}

*loop over age 70+
forvalues i=4/5{
        *get proportion currently diagnosed cases for-cause PSA (e.g. DRE, urinary symmptoms, family history)
        *remainder are screened
                local fc=FCT1T2[1,`i']*t1t2[`i']
        local sc=(1-FCT1T2[1,`i'])*t1t2[`i']
        local sc=`sc'*(1-`reduction')
        *total early cases under screening
        replace t1t2_screening=`fc'+`sc' in `i'
```

```
}

************************************************************************************
*compare overdiagnoses rates
*calculate overdiagnoses under population based screening
*approximated by the number of cases multiplied by proportion not living the mean lead time
* add in a certain proportion overdiagnosed irrespective
g screening_overdiagnosed=t1t2_screening*(1-le)*(1+`overdiagnosis_fixed')

label var screening_overdiagnosed "estimated number of overdiagnosed cases under population based screening"

*Calculate total number of cases and overdiagnoses under current practice and under screening
*Use capital letter to represent that these are total amounts
*calculate current number of early cases and overdiagnosis for early stage cancers and store in locals
egen CURRENT_OD=sum(current_overdiagnosed)
sum CURRENT_OD
local CURRENT_OD=r(mean)
egen CURRENT_CASEST1=sum(t1t2)
sum CURRENT_CASEST1
local CURRENT_CASEST1=r(mean)
egen CURRENT_CASEST2=sum(t3t4)
sum CURRENT_CASEST2
local CURRENT_CASEST2=r(mean)

*calculate projected number of early cases and overdiagnosis for early stage cancers under population based screening
egen PROJECTED_OD=sum(screen)
sum PROJECTED_OD
local PROJECTED_OD=r(mean)
local rr=round(`PROJECTED_OD'/`CURRENT_OD'*100,.1)
egen PROJECTED_CASES=sum(t1t2_screening)
sum PROJECTED_CASES
local PROJECTED_CASES=r(mean)

*drop temporary variables used to calculated totals
drop CURRENT_OD CURRENT_CASES* PROJECTED_OD PROJECTED_CASES
*save out results
sort age
************************************************************************************
*Print out results

*create new row for total
set obs 6
replace age="Total" in 6
replace t1t2 = `CURRENT_CASEST1' in 6
replace t3t4 = `CURRENT_CASEST2' in 6
replace current=`CURRENT_OD' in 6
replace t1t2_screening=`PROJECTED_CASES' in 6
replace screening_overdiagnosed=`PROJECTED_OD' in 6

forvalues i=1(1)6{
            if `i'==1{
                    noisily disp "Age group&Current T1T2&Current overdiagnoses&Projected T1T2&Projected overdiagnoses"
```

```
            }
        local a=age[`i']
        noisily disp "`a'&" %-9.0fc t1t2[`i'] "&" %-9.0fc current[`i'] "&" %-9.0fc t1t2_screening[`i'] "&" %-9.0fc screening_overdiagnosed[`i']
    }
}
disp "`scenario'"
disp "Relative proportion of overdiagnosis under population based screening " `rr' "%"

*save results to use to add to PSA results
save "Results OD.dta", replace
```

Change in number of PSA tests

```
********************************************************************************
* Andrew Vickers October 10 2025
* calculate effect of implementing population based screening on PSA testing in UK
********************************************************************************

*RATE OF SCREENING COMPLIANCE with population based screening
        * base assumption is to 70%
        * UK FOBT program is about 67% https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bowel-cancer-screening-annual-report-2023-to-2024/bowel-cancer-screening-standards-data-report-2023-24#bcsp-
s02-uptake
        *as is mammography https://www.england.nhs.uk/2024/01/new-breast-screening-figures-prompt-fresh-uptake-appeal/
        *https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/screening/
        local compliance_rate=.7
        local scenario="Compliance with population based screening: `compliance_rate'."

 *REDUCTION IN SCREENING RATES IN OLDER MEN
 * base scenario is represent 80% reduction (doi: 10.3390/jcm9123826.)
local reduction=.8
 local scenario="`scenario' Reduction in screening in older men 0`reduction'."

*start with  UK male population
*population is absolute number

*uk male population is taken from
*https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/demographics/age-groups/latest/
*breakdown by gender not given, so assume 50% male as reasonable approximation
clear
set obs 6
g agegroup="80+"
replace agegroup="18-49" in 1
replace agegroup="50-59" in 2
replace agegroup="60-69" in 3
replace agegroup="70-79" in 4

g male_population=.
label var male_population "Male population of UK by age group"
matrix input MP= (3772250, 4076248, 3200360, 2574120, 1484913)
forvalues i=1(1)5{
```

```
            replace male_population=MP[1,`i'] in `i'
}
*assume nelgible PSA tests in patients < 40
*ignore age less than 40 and adjust size of population
*add screening rates from https://kiana-k-collins.shinyapps.io/bmj_shiny_app_v2/
sort age
g current_screening_rate=.
replace current_screening_rate = 81 in 2
replace current_screening_rate = 162 in 3
replace current_screening_rate = 240 in 4
*for age group 80+, rates are given as 238 for 80-89 and 164 for 90+
*population over90 in UK from https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/ageing/bulletins/estimatesoftheveryoldincludingcentenarians/uk2002to2023
*constitutes about 1/3 of those >80
 *take weighted average of screening rates in age 80-89 and 90+
replace current_screening_rate = (238*2+164)/3 in 5

*for men less than 40, take screening rate in those aged 40 - 49
replace current_screening_rate = 25 in 1

***********************************************************************************
*calculate current tests per year (remember rates are per 1000)
*assume nelgible PSA tests in patients < 40
g current_psa_tests=current_screening_rate*male_population/1000

***********************************************************************************
*estimate number of tets under population based screening
g projected_psa_tests=.
*for age 40 - 49, assume no change in rates
replace projected_psa_tests=current_psa_tests in 1
*for age 50 to 59, recommended intervals are:
* every 8 years for PSA < 1 (i.e. 0.2 per year) (European guidelines doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2021.07.024.)
* every 2 to 4 years for PSA 1 - 3
* so say 4 years for PSA 1 - 2 (rate 0.25)
* and 2 years for PSA 2-3 (rate 0.5)
*quantiles (taken from Malmo data)
*60% <1   25% <1-2  15%>2 (includes pts with PSA > 3, so this an overestimate)
replace projected_psa_tests=((0.6*male_population*.2) + (0.25*male_population*.25) + (0.15*male_population*.5))*`compliance_rate' in 2
*for age 60 to 69, recommended intervals are:
* stop if PSA < 1
* every 2 to 4 years for PSA 1 - 3
* so say 4 years for PSA 1 - 2 (rate 0.25)
* and 2 years for PSA 2-3 (rate 0.5)
*quantiles (taken from Malmo data)
*50% <1   30% <1-2  20%>2 (includes pts with PSA > 3, so this an overestimate)
replace projected_psa_tests=(0.3*male_population*.25 +0.2*male_population*.5)*`compliance_rate' in 3

*for age 70+, stopping screening will reduce rates by 85% (doi: 10.3390/jcm9123826.)
replace projected_psa_tests=current_psa_tests*(1-`reduction') in 4/5

*Calculate total number of test current practice and under screening
*Use capital letter to represent that these are total amounts
*calculate current number of tests and store in local
egen CURRENT_PSA=sum(current_psa_tests)
```

```
sum CURRENT_PSA
local CURRENT_PSA=r(mean)

*calculate projected number of PSA tests under population based screening
egen PROJECTED_PSA=sum(projected_psa_tests)
sum PROJECTED_PSA
local PROJECTED_PSA=r(mean)
local rr=round(`PROJECTED_PSA'/`CURRENT_PSA'*100,.1)

*drop temporary variables used to calculated totals
drop CURRENT_PSA PROJECTED_PSA

*************************************************************************************
*Print out results

*create new row for total
set obs 6
replace age="Total" in 6
replace current_psa_tests = `CURRENT_PSA' in 6
replace projected_psa_tests=`PROJECTED_PSA' in 6
l

disp "`Scenario'"
disp "Relative proportion of PSA tests under population based screening " `rr' "%"

sort age
merge 1:1 age using "Results OD.dta"
drop _m
l
forvalues i=1(1)6{
        if `i'==1{
                disp "Age group&Current PSA tests&Current T1T2&Current overdiagnoses&Projected PSA tests&Projected T1T2&Projected overdiagnoses"

        }
        local a=age[`i']
        disp "`a'&" %-10.0fc (current_psa_tests[`i']) "&"  %-9.0fc t1t2[`i'] "&" %-9.0fc current_overdiag[`i'] "&"%-10.0fc (projected_psa_tests[`i']) "&" %-9.0fc t1t2_screening[`i'] "&" %-9.0fc
screening_overdiagnosed[`i']
}
```

References

1. Merriel SW, Akter N, Zakkak N, et al. Factors affecting prostate cancer detection through asymptomatic prostate-specific antigen testing in primary care in England: evidence from the 2018 National Cancer Diagnosis Audit. *Br J Gen Pract* 2025;75(754):e300-e05. doi: 10.3399/bjgp.2024.0376 [published Online First: 20250502]
2. Draisma G, van Rosmalen J. A note on the catch-up time method for estimating lead or sojourn time in prostate cancer screening. *Stat Med* 2013;32(19):3332-41. doi: 10.1002/sim.5750 [published Online First: 20130131]
3. Roobol MJ, de V, II, Mansson M, et al. European Study of Prostate Cancer Screening - 23-Year Follow-up. *N Engl J Med* 2025;393(17):1669-80. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2503223
4. NHS England Screening. https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/screening/. Accessed November 19 2025.
5. Collins KK, Oke JL, Virdee PS, et al. Prostate specific antigen retesting intervals and trends in England: population based cohort study. *Bmj* 2025;391:e083800. doi: 10.1136/bmj-2024-083800 [published Online First: 20251008]
6. Clift AK, Coupland CA, Hippisley-Cox J. Prostate-specific antigen testing and opportunistic prostate cancer screening: a cohort study in England, 1998-2017. *Br J Gen Pract* 2021;71(703):e157-e65. doi: 10.3399/bjgp20X713957 [published Online First: 20210128]
7. Patasius A, Krilaviciute A, Smailyte G. Prostate Cancer Screening with PSA: Ten Years' Experience of Population Based Early Prostate Cancer Detection Programme in Lithuania. *J Clin Med* 2020;9(12) doi: 10.3390/jcm9123826 [published Online First: 20201126]
8. Van Poppel H, Hogenhout R, Albers P, et al. A European Model for an Organised Risk-stratified Early Detection Programme for Prostate Cancer. *Eur Urol Oncol* 2021;4(5):731-39. doi: 10.1016/j.euo.2021.06.006 [published Online First: 20210804]
9. Vickers AJ, Eastham JA, Scardino PT, Lilja H. The Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center Recommendations for Prostate Cancer Screening. *Urology* 2016;91:12-8. doi: 10.1016/j.urology.2015.12.054 [published Online First: 20160202]
10. Vickers AJ, Ulmert D, Sjoberg DD, et al. Strategy for detection of prostate cancer based on relation between prostate specific antigen at age 40-55 and long term risk of metastasis: case-control study. *Bmj* 2013;346:f2023. doi: 10.1136/bmj.f2023 [published Online First: 20130415]
11. Vertosick EA, Vickers A, Dahlin A, et al. Prostate-specific antigen levels at age 60 and lifetime risk of lethal prostate cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2025 doi: 10.1093/jnci/djaf271 [published Online First: 20250919]
12. UK population by ethnicity. https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/demographics/age-groups/latest. Accessed November 19 2025. .
13. Martin RM, Turner EL, Young GJ, et al. Prostate-Specific Antigen Screening and 15-Year Prostate Cancer Mortality: A Secondary Analysis of the CAP Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2024;331(17):1460-70. doi: 10.1001/jama.2024.4011
14. UK Office for National Statistics. Data and analysis from Census 2021. https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/lifeexpectancies/datasets/mortalityratesqxbysingleyearofage/current.
15. NHS England. Data set, Compendium – Mortality from prostate cancer. Published July 21, 2022. https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/compendium-mortality/current/mortality-from-prostate-cancer/mortality-from-prostate-cancer-crude-death-rate-by-age-group-3-year-average-m.