

## **Case study**

### **ROLE OF BREAST FEEDING AND PARITY IN PREVALANCE OF BREAST CANCER AND BONE METASTSSIS**

#### **ABSTRACT:**

In pakistan per annum prevalence rate is 90,000. The frequency of breast cancer in karachi was 69.1 per 100,000 according to 1998-2002 data. 1.7 million cases and 521,900 deaths were reported in year of 2012. Breast cancer as single cause of death accounts for 25% of diagnosed cancer cases and 15% of all cancer deaths. Major risk factors are primary infertility, long exposure of contraceptive pills and estrogen due to late menopause. Younger age is itself associated with worst outcome especially in hormone positive case. the fifth and sixth decades are more vulnerable for breast cancer development in west. upper and outer quadrant of left breast is commonest site for breast cancer. Breast feeding exerts beneficial effect on both mother and infant health. During and after several years of lactation low estrogen levels may be directly responsible for decline in breast cancer cases. Delayed ovulation is another indirect safe effect for reduction in breast cancer cases. Bone scanning is the first choice to pick bone metastasis secondary to breast cancer. 95% sensitivity is recommended.

this study evaluates the role of parity and breast feeding in patients of breast cancer with bone metastasis. for that purpose 100 diagnosed females of breast cancer were included for project. proper history, especially about parity and lactation was sought. bone scan is done to rule out bone spread. no statistically significant difference was found in parity (alive children and abortion) among bone scan positive and negative case. breast feeding practices were significantly less in bone scanning positive (76%) cases as compared to negative (87%) cases ( $p < 0.05$ ). Breast feeding of any duration has a significant role in protection from breast cancer. Parity does not directly impact the prevalence of breast cancer.

#### **INTRODUCTION:**

During the life span every 1 out of 9 woman is at risk of breast cancer.(1) in Pakistan per annum prevalence rate is 90,000. the frequency of breast cancer in Karachi was 69.1 per 100,000 according to 1998-2002 data.(2) oral cavity and ovarian cancers are predominant but breast cancer is contributing among all cancers in significant ratio .(3) breast cancer is account for highest mortality rate and diagnostic ratio among females worldwide, which approximately accounts 1.7 million cases and 521,900 deaths in year of 2012. Breast cancer as single cause of death accounts 25% of diagnosed cancer cases and 15% of all cancer deaths. Advanced countries have about half of total cases of breast cancers and 38% of deaths. Greater number of cases belong to northern America, Australia/New Zealand, and northern and western europe; average number of cases in central and eastern europe, latin america, and the caribbean; and least in africa and asia. Difference in prevalence rate of breast cancer at international scale shows the differences in diagnostic facilities and risk factors. Major risk factors are primary infertility, long exposure of contraceptive pills and estrogen due to late menopause. Increase fertility along with sufficient breast feeding declines the risk of breast cancer. (4)12 use of menopausal and combine hormone therapy, obesity, alcohol addiction, sedentary life style are dynamic risk factors among nations. (4,5). 1980 and the late 1990s, was the era when breast cancer incidence came under considerable rates which was about 30% in western countries, the risk factors like common use of hormonal therapy, short family size or might be due to increased availability of diagnostic facilities. (6) In first of 2000s the prevalence suddenly became lowered because of less use of menopausal hormone therapy in countries like United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Australia. (7,8,9,10,11,12). mammographic screening was another attributed factor for decline in breast cancer incidence rates. (13). mammography

and improved treatment, were also proved help full tool in decreasing rate of breast cancer. (6)14. However more work is needed to make the respective contributions clear. (14,15,16)

According to one study breast cancer appear during thirties and fourtees which is comparatively younger age group. that is supported by another study. (17). breast cancer appearance in younger age is itself associated with worst outcome especially in hormone positive case. (18). the fifth and sixth decades are more vulnerable for breast cancer development in west. (19) Upper and outer quadrant of left breast is commonest site for breast cancer (20). an opposite relation between breast-feeding reduced incidence of breast cancer is may be due to estrogen related changes in mammary gland differentiation. The mammary gland matures at puberty developmental changes occur with each successive pregnancy. (21,22). (23) , *during and after several years of lactation* low estrogen levels may be directly responsible for decline in breast cancer cases. (23) , delayed ovulation is another indirect safe effect for reduction in breast cancer cases (24) . lifetime ovulations has been proved a risk factor to breast cancer and it suppresses during lactation especially first six months up to 1% - 5%.(25). Breastfeeding has establish role in declining number of breast cancer case, so educational programmes and promotional activities for breastfeeding are much essential and needs enthusiastic struggle to give awareness about this disease. (26) women with brca1 mutated genes are advised to breast-fed for more than 1 year showed a statistically significantly lower incidence of breast cancer. (27) International agency for research on cancer (iarc), predicted that *at the end of 2015 india had to encounter about 250,000new cases..* (28). breast feeding exerts beneficial effect on both mother and infant health. fertility was not proved as protective factor from breast cancer, but full term pregnancies as compare to abortive cases was associated with a statistically significant reduction in number of breast cancer cases. (  $p$  trend = .008); risk was reduced by 14% (95% confi dence interval [ci] = 6% to 22%) for every new birth. among brca1 or brca2 gene mutated females, child birth before 20 years( 20 – 24) years, was appear a positive factor against protection from breast cancer 20 – 24 years.(29). hormonal change during full term pregnancy provides the better protection to hormone sensitive tissues like breast against cancer development especially in younger age. During successful pregnancies breast tissue become more mature and differentiated as compare to virgin breast tissues, the same exhibited by altered gene expression profiles. Unique hormonal changes during pregnancy influences the permanent differentiation especially the raised levels of prolactin and gh in multiparous woman.(30) every birth lowers the risk of breast cancer upto 11%. two studies did not support that parity associated protection against the development of erc/prc breast cancer. (31,32,33,34). Bone scanning is the first choice to pick bone metastasis secondary to breast cancer. 95% sensitivity is recommended. Bone scan may come positive in 10%-22% non malignant cases and rate for false negative cases only 10%. (35,36). in pathologically diagnosed stage ii tumours, a bone scan after surgical removal of malignant part is strongly recommended.(37) bone scan is also recommended to detect primary bone disease like paget disease and avascular necrosis even the radiographs is negative. there is ascope of radionuclide bone imaging in furure as well.(38) bone scan is the first imaging technique for detection of bone diseases. radionuclide bone imaging is fast cheaper and easy to avail for most patients as well as sensitive for various pathologic conditions. the dye for the procedure is technetium-99m–labeled with diphosphonates. these compounds take 2–6 hours for deposition after injection, 50% of injected compound dose deposit in skeletal system. a gamma camera equipped with a low-energy, high-resolution collimator yield the highest-resolution radiographs. Additional anterior and posterior whole-body images are often obtained as needed.(39)every sucessive birth lowers the risk of breast cancer upto 11%. the protective effect was maintained within the erc/prc group are responsible for protection even when the analyses were stratified by age. Women in the oldest age at risk of 27% more for developing erc/prc positive breast cancers as compared with the young age. Although two studies presented that parity does not gives the protection against the erc/prc positive breast cancer. (31,32,33,34)

## **Aims and Objectives:**

To evaluate the role of parity and breast feeding in patients of breast cancer with bone metastasis

## **Methods:**

Only diagnosed cases of breast cancer were selected for study. they were of any age group premenopausal, perimenopausal, postmenopausal, passing through any stage of cancer, married ,unmarried both, lactating, nonlactating. History of lactation and parity was taken by each patient. bone scan was done to check the metastatic involvement of bones. During the study chemo therapy and radiotherapy was allowed accordingly and most of patients have passed through the first three cycles of chemotherapy and radiotherapy.

## **Bone Scan:**

Bone scan done on siemen e cam scanner with accessories. (figure) intravenous dye technicium 99 mdp has been used. this test helps to see if a cancer has metastasized to bones and is useful because it provides a picture of the entire skeleton.for this purpose, 20/mci (dose) of radioactive material (technetium 99) was injected into a vein (intravenously or iv). the substance settles in areas of damaged bone throughout the entire skeleton over the course of a couple of hours. (six hours to twenty four hours). patient lied on a table for about 30 minutes while a special camera detected the radioactivity and created a picture of the skeleton. (fig a).

## **Statistical Analysis:**

The data feeding and analysis was on computer package spss (statistical packages of social sciences) version 11.0. Clinical characteristics will be summarized in terms of frequencies, means  $\pm$  sd and percentages for qualitative/categorical variables ( parity, breast feeding practices).

## **Results**

**Table 1:-** shows no statistically significant difference in parity (alive children and abortion) among bone scan positive and negative case. breast feeding practices were significantly less in bone scanning positive (76%) cases as compared to negative (87%) cases ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Figure 1:**-shows frequency distribution of subjects according to their alive and abortion cases. highest frequency was seen children not fed in cases having parity 4-6


**Figure 2:**-shows distribution of subjects as per breast feeding frequency of bony metastasis is lower in breast feeding mothers as compared to non lactating mothers.

TABLE:-1

|                       | <b>BONE SCAN</b>         |                          |                |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| <b>PARITY</b>         | <b>POSITIVE (N= 100)</b> | <b>NEGATIVE (N= 100)</b> | <b>P-VALUE</b> |
| <b>ALIVE CHILDREN</b> |                          |                          |                |
| NONE                  | 14                       | 7                        | 0.209          |
| 1-3                   | 23                       | 27                       |                |
| 4-6                   | 40                       | 49                       |                |
| 7 & ABOVE             | 23                       | 17                       |                |
| <b>ABORTION</b>       |                          |                          |                |
| NONE                  | 59                       | 59                       | 0.320          |
| 1                     | 21                       | 29                       |                |
| 2                     | 15                       | 11                       |                |
| 3                     | 5                        | 1                        |                |
| <b>BREAST FEEDING</b> |                          |                          |                |
| NO                    | 24                       | 13                       | 0.045          |
| YES                   | 76                       | 87 *                     |                |

\* STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT  $P < 0.05$

Distribution of the subjects as per breast feeding, having positive- and negative bone scan



values are presented as frequencies of breast feeding in bone scan negative and positive patients. \* $p > 0.05$  from patients with positive bone scan following student t- test.





figure showing frequencies of parity both alive and abortion in bone scan positive and negative patients



**Bone scan film showing skeleton after dispersion of radioactive dye, affected areas appeared as dark spots. Fig- a**

With the permission of kiran hospital, karachi

### **DISCUSSION:-**

Cancer is a leading cause of death in both more and less economically developed countries; the burden is expected to grow worldwide due to the growth and aging of the population, particularly in less developed countries, in which about 82% of the world's population resides. The adoption of lifestyle behaviors that are known to increase cancer risk, such as smoking, Poor diet, physical inactivity, and reproductive changes (including lower parity and later age at first birth), have further increased the cancer burden in less economically developed countries.(40)

Breast cancer incidence rates have been rising. Estimated number of new cancer cases in 21 world areas, 2012. \*region estimates do not sum to the worldwide estimate due to calculation method.(41)

According to the presenting study, on the bases of breast feeding 87% cases were breast fed in negative bone scan as compared to 76% cases positive bone scan  $p < 0.05$ , that is statistically significant

and reflecting the importance of breast feeding in protection from breast cancer. Frequency of breast cancer and bone metastasis in breast feed mothers found lower than non lactating mothers.

Parity especially 4-6, either alive or abortions, showed higher frequency and are at greater risk. Breast feeding as a known risk factors for the development of cancer but protective effect of lactation against the cancer according to research is controversial except the impact of parity and age at first birth. Many research papers shows the inverse association, and the estimated risk is between 0.4 and 0.9, not dependent on age group, or for women developed breast cancer at different ages. Some research papers shows the opposite relation between duration of breastfeeding and development of cancer. While some papers support the protective effect when compares the lactating and non lactating cases. Most of statistically insignificant case-control studies support an inverse relationship. Although some studies, shows no relationship. Two cohort studies did not indicate any relation between breast feeding and prevalence of breast cancer. There are evidence in some papers regarding the beneficial effect of lactation from breast cancer if detected under the age of 40, but provide some protection for older patients. Even though breast cancer is relatively rare in young women, it is a serious problem. Preventive measures are lacking both for women with an inherited tendency to develop breast cancer and for other women. Breastfeeding has various beneficial effects in addition to those reported here.(42). *Minimum* two studies (43,44) *showed lesser* risk of breast cancer in women who breast-fed their *babies* and it is more effective and active for premenopausal women than postmenopausal women 43. According to a big international research<sup>44</sup>, the risk of breast cancer decline up to 4.3% with a total duration of 12 months of breast-feeding and upto 27% for women with a total duration of breast-feeding of 55 months or more. The only factor known to consistently decrease lifetime breast cancer risk regardless of ethnicity is early childbirth. Women who have undergone a first full-term pregnancy/birth (fftb) before 20 years of age have a 50% reduced lifetime risk of developing breast cancer when compared with nulliparous women , whereas first full-term births over 35 years of age lead to an increased risk of developing breast cancer . However, the

protective effect of pregnancy is not immediate. When compared with nulliparous women, uniparous women have an elevated risk of breast cancer soon after delivery, which only declines some years later. This increased risk is most pronounced in women who are aged 30 years or older at the time of their first delivery. On average, the transient increase lasts w10 years but is also dependent on age, being postponed an additional 10 years in women with fftb after 30 years of age. (45)

### **CONCLUSIONS:-**

Breast feeding has a significant role in protection from breast cancer. Duration of breast feeding is not important factor.

Parity does not directly affect the prevalence of breast cancer. Females with average parity are at more risk of breast cancer.

### **REFERENCES:-**

1. CARCINOMAN BREAST. [INTENET] (ACCESSED 20 J A N , 2 0 1 2 , A T H T T P : // W W W . - ANNIEAPPLESEEDPROJECT.ORG/)
2. PARKIN DM, FERNANDEZ LM. USE OF STATISTICS TO ASSESS THE GLOBAL BURDEN OF BREAST CANCER. BREAST J. 2006;12:S70-80.
3. BHURGRI Y. KARACHI CANCER REGISTRY DATA-- IMPLICATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL CANCER CONTROL PROFILE OF BREAST CANCER PATIENTS PROGRAM OF PAKISTAN. ASIAN PAC J CANCER PREV. 2004;5:77-82.
4. COLDITZ GA, BAER HJ, TAMIMI RM. BREAST CANCER. IN: SCHOTTENFELD D, FRAUMENI JF JR, EDS. CANCER EPIDEMIOLOGY AND PREVENTION. 3RD ED. NEW YORK: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS; 2006:995-1012.
5. CHLEBOWSKI RT, MANSON JE, ANDERSON GL, ET AL. ESTROGEN PLUS PROGESTIN AND BREAST CANCER INCIDENCE AND MORTALITY IN THE WOMEN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE OBSERVATIONAL STUDY. J NATL CANCER INST. 2013;105:526- 535.
6. ALTHUIS MD, DOZIER JM, ANDERSON WF, DEVESA SS, BRINTON LA. GLOBAL TRENDS IN BREAST CANCER INCIDENCE AND MORTALITY 1973-1997. INT J EPIDEMIOL. 2005;34:405- 412.
7. CANFELL K, BANKS E, MOA AM, BERAL V. DECREASE IN BREAST CANCER INCIDENCE FOLLOWING A RAPID FALL IN USE OF HORMONE REPLACEMENT THERAPY IN AUSTRALIA. MED J AUST. 2008;188:641-644.
8. PARKIN DM. IS THE RECENT FALL IN INCIDENCE OF POST-MENOPAUSAL BREAST CANCER IN UK RELATED TO CHANGES IN USE OF HORMONE REPLACEMENT THERAPY? EUR J CANCER. 2009;45:1649-1653.
9. SERADOUR B, ALLEMAND H, WEILL A, RICORDEAU P. CHANGES BY AGE IN BREAST CANCER INCIDENCE, MAMMOGRAPHY SCREENING AND HORMONE THERAPY USE IN FRANCE FROM 2000 TO 2006. BULL CANCER. 2009;96: E1-E6.
10. CRONIN KA, RAVDIN PM, EDWARDS BK. SUSTAINED LOWER RATES OF BREAST CANCER IN THE UNITED STATES. BREAST CANCER RES TREAT. 2009;117:223-224.

11. DESANTIS C, SIEGEL R, BANDI P, JEMAL A. BREAST CANCER STATISTICS, 2011. CA CANCER J CLIN. 2011;61:409-418.
12. RAVDIN PM, CRONIN KA, HOWLADER N, ET AL. THE DECREASE IN BREAST-CANCER INCIDENCE IN 2003 IN THE UNITED STATES. N ENGL J MED. 2007;356:1670-1674.
13. YOULDEN DR, CRAMB SM, DUNN NA, MULLER JM, PYKE CM, BAADE PD. THE DESCRIPTIVE EPIDEMIOLOGY OF FEMALE BREAST CANCER: AN INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON OF SCREENING,] INCIDENCE, SURVIVAL AND MORTALITY. CANCER EPIDEMIOL. 2012;36:237-248.
14. BOSETTI C, BERTUCCIO P, LEVI F, CHATENOU D L, NEGRI E, LA VECCHIA C. THE DECLINE IN BREAST CANCER MORTALITY IN EUROPE: AN UPDATE (TO 2009). BREAST. 2012;21:77-82.
15. AUTIER P, BONIOL M, GAVIN A, VATTEN LJ. BREAST CANCER MORTALITY IN NEIGHBOURING EUROPEAN COUNTRIES WITH DIFFERENT LEVELS OF SCREENING BUT SIMILAR ACCESS TO TREATMENT: TREND ANALYSIS OF WHO MORTALITY DATABASE. BMJ. 2011;343:D4411.
16. BERRY DA, CRONIN KA, PLEVITIS SK, ET AL. EFFECT OF SCREENING AND ADJUVANT THERAPY ON MORTALITY FROM BREAST CANCER. N ENGL J MED. 2005;353:1784-1792.
17. GUPTA P, SHARMA RG, VERMA M. REVIEW OF BREAST CANCER CASES IN JAIPUR REGION. J INDIAN MED ASSOC. 2002;100:282-3.
18. KIM EK, NOH WC, HAN W, NOH DY. PROGNOSTIC SIGNIFICANCE OF YOUNG AGE (<35 YEARS) BY SUBTYPE BASED ON ER, PR, AND HER2 STATUS IN BREAST CANCER: A NATIONWIDE REGISTRY-BASED STUDY. WORLD J SURG. 2011;35:1244-53.
19. CUTULI B, LEMANSKI C, FOURQUET A, DE LAFONTAN B, GIARD S, MEUNIER A, ET AL. BREAST-CONSERVING SURGERY WITH OR WITHOUT RADIOTHERAPY VS MASTECTOMY FOR DUCTAL CARCINOMA IN SITU: FRENCH SURVEY EXPERIENCE. BR J CANCER. 2009;100:1048-54.
20. CUTULI B, DE LAFONTAN B, VITALI E, COSTA L, ARISTEI C, MARCHAL C, ET AL. BREAST-CONSERVING TREATMENT (BCT) FOR STAGE I-II BREAST CANCER IN ELDERLY WOMEN: ANALYSIS OF 927 CASES. CRIT REV ONCOL HEMATOL. 2009;71:79-88.
21. RUSSO J, RUSSO IH. TOWARD A PHYSIOLOGICAL APPROACH TO BREAST CANCER PREVENTION. CANCER EPIDEMIOL BIOMARKERS PREV 1994;3:353-64.
22. RUSSO J, TAY LK, RUSSO IH. DIFFERENTIATION OF THE MAMMARY GLAND AND SUSCEPTIBILITY TO CARCINOGENESIS. BREAST CANCER RES TREAT 1982;2:5-73.
23. PETRAKIS NL, WRENSCH MR, ERNSTER VL, MIIKE R, MURAI J, SIMBERG N, ET AL. INFLUENCE OF PREGNANCY AND LACTATION ON SERUM AND BREAST FLUID ESTROGEN LEVELS: IMPLICATIONS FOR BREAST CANCER RISK. INT J CANCER 1987;40:587-91.
24. HENDERSON BE, PIKE MC, CASAGRANDE JT. BREAST CANCER AND THE OESTROGEN WINDOW HYPOTHESIS [LETTER]. LANCET 1981;2:363-4.
25. GRAY RH, CAMPBELL OM, APELO R, ESLAMI SS, ZACUR H, RAMOS RM, ET AL. RISK OF OVULATION DURING LACTATION. LANCET 1990;335:25-9.
26. **REF: BREASTFEEDING REDUCES BREAST CANCER RISK: A CASE-CONTROL STUDY IN NORTH INDIA; BABITA, NEELAM KUMAR, MAHAVIR SINGH,<sup>1</sup> JAGBIR S. MALIK, AND MEENAKSHI KALHAN : INT J PREV MED. 2014 JUN; 5(6): 791-795. PMID: PMC4085934**
27. **[J NATL CANCER INST 2004;96:1094-8] BREAST-FEEDING AND THE RISK OF BREAST CANCER IN BRCA1 AND BRCA2 MUTATION CARRIERS**  
*H. JERNSTRÖM, J. LUBINSKI, H. T. LYNCH, P. GHADIRIAN, S. NEUHAUSEN, C. ISAACS, B. L. WEBER, D. HORSMAN, B. ROSEN, W. D. FOULKES, E. FRIEDMAN, R. GERSHONI-BARUCH, P. AINSWORTH, M. DALY, J. GARBER, H. OLSSON, P. SUN, S. A. NAROD*

28. KEY TJ, VERKASALO PK, BANKS E: *EPIDEMIOLOGY OF BREAST CANCER*. *LANCET ONCOL*. 2001, 2: 133-140. 10.1016/S1470-2045(00)00254-0. INT J PREV MED. 2014 JUN; 5(6): 791-795. PMID: PMC4085934

29. **PREGNANCIES, BREAST-FEEDING, AND BREAST CANCER RISK IN THE INTERNATIONAL BRCA1/2 CARRIER COHORT STUDY (IBCCS)**

NADINE ANDRIEU , DAVID E. GOLDGAR , DOUGLAS F. EASTON , MATTI ROOKUS , RICHARD BROHET ,ANTONIS C. ANTONIOU , SUSAN PEOCK , GARETH EVANS , DIANA ECCLES , FIONA DOUGLAS, EMBRACE,CATHERINE NOGUÈS , MARION GAUTHIER-VILLARS , AGNÈS CHOMPRET, GENEPSO , FLORA E. VANLEEUEWEN , IRMA KLUIJT , GEO-HEBON, JAVIER BENITEZ , BRITA ARVER , EDITH OLAH, IBCCS

COLLABORATORS GROUP , JENNY CHANG-CLAUDE JOURNAL OF THE NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE, VOL. 98, NO. 8, APRIL 19, 2006 **98:535 – 44]**

30. KARA BRITT<sup>1,2</sup>, ALAN ASHWORTH<sup>1</sup> AND MATTHEW SMALLEY<sup>1</sup>PREGNANCY AND THE RISK OF BREAST CANCER ENDOCRINE-RELATED CANCER (2007) 14 907–933.

31.COLDITZ BRITTON JA, GAMMON MD, SCHOENBERG JB, STANFORD JL, COATES RJ, SWANSON CA, POTISCHMAN N, MALONE KE, BROGAN DJ, DALING JR ET AL. 2002 RISK OF BREAST CANCER CLASSIFIED BY JOINT ESTROGEN RECEPTOR AND PROGESTERONE RECEPTOR STATUS AMONG WOMEN 20–44 YEARS OF AGE. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EPIDEMIOLOGY 156 507–516.

32. COTTERCHIO M, KREIGER N, THEIS B, SLOAN M & BAHL S 2003 HORMONAL FACTORS AND THE RISK OF BREAST CANCER ACCORDING TO ESTROGEN- AND PROGESTERONE-RECEPTOR SUBGROUP. CANCER EPIDEMIOLOGY, BIOMARKERS AND PREVENTION 12 1053–1060.

33.POTTER JD, CERHAN JR, SELLERS TA, MCGOVERN PG, DRINKARD C, KUSHI LR & FOLSOM AR 1995 PROGESTERONE AND ESTROGEN RECEPTORS AND MAMMARY NEOPLASIA IN THE IOWA WOMEN'S HEALTH STUDY: HOW MANY KINDS OF BREAST CANCER ARE THERE? CANCER EPIDEMIOLOGY, BIOMARKERS AND PREVENTION 4 319–326.

34. MCCREDIE MR, DITE GS, SOUTHEY MC, VENTER DJ, GILES GG & HOPPER JL 2003 RISK FACTORS FOR BREAST CANCER IN YOUNG WOMEN BY OESTROGEN RECEPTOR AND PROGESTERONE RECEPTOR STATUS. BRITISH JOURNAL OF CANCER 89 ,1661–1663.

35. REF: **PREVALENCE OF REGULATORY T CELLS IS INCREASED IN PERIPHERAL BLOOD AND TUMOR MICROENVIRONMENT OF PATIENTS WITH PANCREAS OR BREAST ADENOCARCINOMA**<sup>1</sup> UDAYA K. LIYANAGE, TODD T. MOORE, HONG-GU JOO, YOSHIYUKI TANAKA, VIRGINIA HERRMANN, GERARD DOHERTY, JEFFREY A. DREBIN, STEVEN M. STRASBERG, TIMOTHY J. EBERLEIN, PETER S. GOEDEGEBUURE, AND DAVID C. LINEHAN<sup>2</sup> *THE JOURNAL OF IMMUNOLOGY*, 2002, 169: 2756–2761.

36. WIKENHEISER KA, SILBERSTEIN EB. BONE SCINTIGRAPHY SCREENING IN STAGE I–II BREAST CANCER: IS IT COST-EFFECTIVE? [REVIEW]. *CLEVE CLIN J MED* 1996;63:43-7.

37.**BASLINE STAGING TESTS IN PRIMARY BREAST CANCER: A PRACTICE GUIDELINE** ROBERT E. MYERS,\* MARY JOHNSTON,† KATHY PRITCHARD,‡ MARK LEVINE,§ TOM

OLIVER,<sup>†</sup> AND THE BREAST CANCER DISEASE SITE GROUP OF THE CANCER CARE ONTARIO PRACTICE GUIDELINES INITIATIVE; CMAJ • MAY 15, 2001; 164 (10) **1439**

38. : RADIONUCLIDE BONE IMAGING: AN ILLUSTRATIVE REVIEW<sup>1</sup>CHARITO LOVE, MD ● ANABELLA S. DIN, MD ● MARIA B. TOMAS, MD TOMY P. KALAPPARAMBATH, MD ● CHRISTOPHER J. PALESTRO, MD RADIOGRAPHICS **2003**; 23:341–358 ● PUBLISHED ONLINE 10.1148/RG.232025103

39. RADIONUCLIDE BONE IMAGING: AN ILLUSTRATIVE REVIEW<sup>1</sup>CHARITO LOVE, MD ● ANABELLA S. DIN, MD ● MARIA B. TOMAS, MD TOMY P. KALAPPARAMBATH, MD ● CHRISTOPHER J. PALESTRO, MD RADIOGRAPHICS **2003**; 23:341–358 ● PUBLISHED online 10.1148/RG.232025103 933

40. GLOBAL CANCER STATISTICS, 2012 LINDSEY A. TORRE, MSPH<sup>1</sup>; FREDDIE BRAY, PHD<sup>2</sup>; REBECCA L. SIEGEL, MPH<sup>3</sup>; JACQUES FERLAY, ME<sup>4</sup>; JOANNIE LORTET-TIEULENT, MSC<sup>5</sup>; AHMEDIN JEMAL, DVM, PHD<sup>6</sup> CA CANCER J CLIN 2015;65:87–108

41. GLOBOCAN 2012. CA CANCER J CLIN 2015;65:87–108 [VOLUME 65](#)

42. BREASTFEEDING AND REDUCED RISK OF BREAST CANCER IN AN ICELANDIC COHORT STUDY LAUFHEY TRYGGVADÓTTIR,<sup>1</sup> HRAFN TULINIUS,<sup>2</sup> JÓRUNN E. EYFJORD,<sup>3</sup> AND TRAUSTI SIGURVINSSON<sup>1</sup> AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EPIDEMIOLOGY 2001;154:37–42.

43. LIPWORTH L, BAILEY LR, TRICHOPOULOS D. HISTORY OF BREAST-FEEDING IN RELATION TO BREAST CANCER RISK: A REVIEW OF THE EPIDEMIOLOGIC LITERATURE. J NATL CANCER INST 2000;92:302–12.

44. COLLABORATIVE GROUP ON HORMONAL FACTORS IN BREAST CANCER. BREAST CANCER

AND BREASTFEEDING: COLLABORATIVE REANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL DATA FROM 47 EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES IN 30 COUNTRIES, INCLUDING 50302 WOMEN WITH BREAST CANCER AND 96973 WOMEN WITHOUT THE DISEASE. LANCET 2002;360:187–

45. PREGNANCY AND THE RISK OF BREAST CANCER KARA BRITT<sup>1,2</sup>, ALAN ASHWORTH<sup>1</sup> AND MATTHEW SMALLEY<sup>1</sup> ENDOCRINE-RELATED CANCER (2007) 14 907– ENDOCRINE-RELATED CANCER (2007) 14 907–933.