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We wish to thank Pulido et al. (1) for their pertinent and insightful comments about our systematic review and meta-analysis of abbreviated breast MRI (abMRI) (2), and about the systematic review and meta-analysis by Baxter et al. (3) that was published in the same issue of Clinical Radiology earlier this year.

Pulido et al. (1) highlighted the striking difference in the conclusions of the quality review of the evidence made in the two meta-analyses. Our own study, Geach et al. (2) concluded that only a very low level of confidence could be placed in the evidence synthesised from the studies, while Baxter et al. (3) concluded that there was a low risk of bias amongst the studies they evaluated. We note that of the consecutive screening studies included in the meta-analyses, and assessed for evidence quality, only 3 studies overlapped between the two reviews (were included in both reviews’ quality assessments) (4–6).

For two of these 3 overlapping studies (4, 6), both Baxter et al. and our own review found a high risk of bias around the studies’ index tests (due to readers interpreting the full protocol MRI (fpMRI) directly after the abMRI). In the third study that was common to both reviews (5) timing of the fpMRI and abMRI reading was not a concern, but Baxter et al. instead noted concerns about the applicability of the reference standard, because the amount of follow up was not specified and so...
they classified the study as “unclear risk of bias”. In our review, this lack of specification of the reference test contributed to our lowering our confidence in study design from high to moderate. Therefore, the judgements made by the two reviews about risk of bias for the 3 overlapping studies were quite similar.

In addition, however, our own review also noted that in all 3 overlapping studies, and indeed in all 5 of the studies we assessed for the meta-analysis, only the positive fpMRI scans received a biopsy, whereas the positive abMRI scans did not. This we described in our review as the reference standard differing by index test. This factor was not mentioned by Baxter et al. but for our own review contributed to a lowering of our confidence in the quality of the evidence. We also lowered our confidence in evidence quality by considering all the studies together, noting wide confidence intervals, particularly around sensitivity and also heterogeneity between studies of both study populations and MRI protocols. Interestingly, Baxter et al. commented that for the consecutive screening studies there were insufficient numbers of studies to assess heterogeneity statistically.

The differences between the conclusions of the two reviews therefore in part arise from only 3 studies overlapping between the two reviews and in part from a different methodology being used: Baxter et al. used QUADAS-2(7) while we used GRADE(8).

We agree with Pulido et al.(1) that the heterogeneity, both of MRI protocol studied and of study populations, between published studies of abMRI is an important cause for reduced levels of confidence in the resultant evidence.
We also agree with Pulido et al. (1) that abMRI has great potential to provide cost effective screening through early detection of breast cancer, in particular earlier detection of the most clinically significant, aggressive cancers, currently detected larger and later than other less aggressive cancers by mammographic screening (9). The potential for abMRI to be cost effective hinges on its high sensitivity for small, aggressive breast cancers combined with faster (than full protocol MRI) acquisition and reporting throughput (2–4,10,11).

Current uncertainties around feasibility, effectiveness and cost effectiveness will need to be addressed before the risk/benefit balance of introducing abMRI into clinical screening practice can be fully understood and recommendations to policy makers made with confidence. These unknowns are likely to be both protocol and population specific and will influence how the cost effectiveness of abMRI compares with that of current screening modalities: full protocol MRI (high risk population) and digital mammography (moderate and population-risk populations). Current uncertainties include issues around: recall rates, biopsy rates, MRI biopsy rates, scanner and workforce capacity and workforce interpretation-training.

Finally, we agree with Pulido et al. (1) that high quality research is required to answer these uncertainties and to determine both the optimal abMRI protocol and the population(s) most likely to benefit from screening with abMRI.
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