

## REVIEW

# Cancer prevention: state of the art and future prospects

I. VALLE<sup>1</sup>, D. TRAMALLONI<sup>2</sup>, N.L. BRAGAZZI<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup> SSD “Popolazione a rischio”, Health Prevention Department, Local Health Unit ASL 3 Genova, Italy;<sup>2</sup> School of Public Health, Department of Health Sciences (DISSAL), Genova, Italy

## Key words

Cancer prevention • Organized screening program • Vaccine

## Summary

*Cancer imposes a heavy societal burden worldwide, in terms of both epidemiology and costs. The introduction of more sophisticated imaging and diagnostic techniques and advanced drugs that specifically target tumor cells is leading to increasingly expensive treatments, which may be affordable only for few patients. Prevention, and particularly primary prevention, is an effective way of addressing the challenging issue of cancer, since between a third and a half of cancers could be prevented on the basis of our current knowledge of risk factors. Moreover, prevention is cost-effective, its effects are not limited to high-risk subjects but extend to the entire population, and it is not dependent on socio-economic status. Regulatory measures can have a broad impact, even on future generations; by empowering and educating subjects, promoting healthy behaviours and teaching self-care, they can trigger a virtuous cycle. In recent decades, oncology has shifted from being merely reactive to being proactive; this shift has led to the development of so-called “P4 medicine”, where the 4 Ps stand for “preventive”, “predictive”, “personalized” and “participatory”. Prevention programs are an important part of the effort to control cancer, as they are able to reduce both the*

*incidence of cancer and mortality. For instance, screening for colorectal, breast and cervical cancer is reducing the burden of these common tumors. Anti-cancer vaccines, both prophylactic and therapeutic, constitute another important preventive tool. Although progress has been made in these areas, much remains to be done. With regard to screening programs, coverage could be increased by introducing new, more acceptable, less invasive tests, stratifying screening through correlation with anamnestic, clinical, radiological and genomic data (so-called “population-based personalized cancer screening”), and exploiting new information and communication technologies, such as smartphone applications or personalized text messages (so-called “screening 2.0”). Advocacy and recommendations by physicians can also play a role, in that eligible subjects need to be able to discuss their doubts and their perceived psycho-social barriers. However, new screening initiatives should be implemented only after a careful health technology assessment has been performed within the framework of evidence-based medicine, organized screening programs have been strengthened and opportunistic or spontaneous programs have been limited.*

## The global burden of cancer

Cancer imposes a heavy societal burden worldwide, in terms of both epidemiology and costs [1, 2]. Despite striking advances in the field of molecular oncology, combating cancer remains a challenge. The introduction of more sophisticated imaging and diagnostic techniques and advanced drugs that specifically target tumor cells (so-called individualized drug therapy) is driving up the costs of treatment [2, 3]. As a consequence, the benefit of these achievements may be scarcely affordable and the costs could dramatically impact on health-care systems [2, 3]. Despite its alleged advantages, the implementation of genomics in routine clinical practice remains far from cost-effective [3].

As Vineis and Wild maintain [1], prevention, and specifically primary prevention, is a particularly effective way to address the challenging issue of cancer.

Primary and secondary prevention offers several advantages:

1. As such programs are population-based, they could benefit people other than those directly targeted [1].

2. As cancer has a long latency period, its causes and risk factors could be eliminated or reduced in the long term, thus yielding a broader impact on Public Health. Interventions are not limited to surgical or pharmacological treatments, but include a variety of programs and measures aimed at correcting unhealthy lifestyles and favouring continuous transformation, for example through regulation against occupational or environmental exposure to certain substances. By empowering and educating people, promoting healthy behaviors and teaching self care, a virtuous cycle can be set in motion, meaning that these preventive efforts do not need to be renewed with every generation. This is important in periods of economic and financial hardship, when public resources are scarce [1]. Moreover, some regulatory measures could help to prevent various types of cancer and other pathologies; for example, cigarette smoking, besides being associated with lung cancer, could lead to an increased risk of developing breast cancer [4], prostate cancer [5], lymphoma [6] and other diseases [7]. In addition, avoiding exposure to

carcinogenic substances may contribute to preventing other non-communicable diseases (NCDs), such as cardiovascular, reproductive, endocrine and dys-metabolic pathologies [1]. In conclusion, a single public health measure would have multiple, enduring “cascade effects” which a single clinical intervention would not have.

- 3) Prevention is cost-effective and can impact positively on socio-economic inequalities [8-12]. Since up to half of cancers could be prevented on the basis of present knowledge of etiopathogenesis and risk factors [1], preventive medicine can act as a rapid and effective means of connecting research with clinical practice [13].

Primary and secondary prevention should therefore be regarded as a priority for global cancer control [1, 14].

## Oncology in the framework of P4 medicine

In recent decades, oncology has shifted from being merely reactive and has adopted a proactive model within the framework of so-called “P4 medicine” [15, 16], where the 4 Ps stand for predictive, preventive, personalized and participatory. Advances in the field of molecular biology, high-throughput technologies (HTTs) and “omics” sciences, as well as in imaging techniques and mathematical and computational modelling, have led to the discovery of biomarkers which can be used to predict the onset, course and prognosis of tumors; this enables diagnosis, treatment and prevention to be correlated within a highly integrated, coherent framework. Rather than being “one-size-fits-all”, P4 medicine is individually tailored to the specific needs of the patient. Screening and prevention play a major role in an approach that is gradually shifting from disease to wellness.

It should be emphasized that this new effort requires a holistic view at all levels [17]; cancer is a complex adaptive system (CAS), the etiopathogenesis of which can be unravelled only by means of a systems approach (systems biology and “omics” sciences). Cancer management requires multi-level system-based management [18]. Organized screening is a highly standardized form of “systems screening”; as it is constantly monitored through quality check and process indicators and relies on evidence-based protocols and guidelines, it differs from opportunistic or spontaneous screening [19].

In the system of systems (SoSs) perspective, cancer screening programs can be integrated into health promotion plans, becoming “teachable moments”, during which people can be sensitized to the importance of proper nutrition, physical activity and other healthy behaviors [20]. In this way, as already mentioned, a virtuous cycle with cascade effects can be set in motion.

The following sections present an overview of the currently available organized cancer screening tests, a discussion of their present state and future prospects, and a brief look at the topic of anti-cancer vaccines.

## PREVENTION OF CERVICAL CANCER

Cervical cancer is the tenth most frequent cancer and the third most common cancer in terms of mortality, after breast and colorectal cancer [21-23], though this trend is decreasing.

Risk factors for developing cervical cancer include: tobacco and alcohol consumption, a history of genital warts, early age on first sexual intercourse or first pregnancy, multiparity, sexual promiscuity and unprotected sex, a history of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), low socio-economic status and low educational level, Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) infection and other conditions resulting in immunosuppression [21-23].

Screening modalities include [21-23]: 1) cervical cytology (Papanicolaou or Pap smear), which may be conventional or liquid-based (LBC), and may be assisted by automated screening technologies (ASTs) [24]; 2) colposcopy, which involves direct visual inspection (DVI) performed by using 3-5% acetic acid (VIA), 3-5% acetic acid and magnification (VIAM), or Lugol’s iodine (VILI); and 3) HPV-DNA testing [25]. Other modalities, such as cervicoscopy, cervicography, colposhysteroscopy/microcolposhysteroscopy, speculscopy (a magnified chemiluminescent screening examination) and polar probes (such as spectrophotometry/microspectrophotometry, Raman scattering and fluorescence spectroscopy), are still experimental and can be used as second-line techniques for the further evaluation and assessment of abnormal results. A next-generation assay, which is quite promising, is HPV mRNA testing [26-28].

According to the 2010 European Guidelines for Quality Assurance of Cervical Cancer Screening [29], the American Cancer Society (ACS), the American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (ACOG) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention-Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (CDC-ACIP), the age at which screening should be started is in the range of 20-30 years, but preferably not before 25 years (in Italy, for example, the age is 25 years). Women aged 21-29 years should undergo a Pap smear every 3 years, regardless of their sexual activity. If the result of the test is abnormal (such as atypical cells of undetermined significance, or ASCUS), the woman should undergo HPV-DNA testing [29, 30]. Women over the age of 29 years can be screened every 5 years with a combination of HPV-DNA testing and Pap smear. The age at which screening should be discontinued is in the range of 60-65 years of age (in Italy, for example, it is 65 years), in the absence of abnormal results [29, 30].

Recently, four European randomized controlled trials (RCTs) (Swedescreen in Sweden, POBASCAM in the Netherlands, ARTISTIC in Great Britain and NTCC in Italy) have shown that HPV-based screening started at the age of 30 years, with screening intervals of up to 5 years, is still effective in protecting women against invasive carcinoma [31]. However, although this strategy appears to be the most cost-effective, it is applied in few countries [32].

Compliance with cervical cancer screening programs is still unsatisfactory and strongly age-dependent [33].

Variables which can predict adherence to screening include educational level, culture, psychosocial issues and marital status [33, 34].

High-quality cervical screening helps to reduce the incidence of cervical cancer and mortality. In Italy, the incidence of squamous cell and invasive cancers has significantly decreased from 11.6/100,000 to 8.7/100,000 since the introduction of cervical screening [35].

#### PREVENTION OF COLORECTAL CANCER

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the third most common cancer in men, after lung and prostate cancer, and the second most frequent cancer in women after breast cancer, with more than 1,360,000 cases per year (10% of the total cancer burden). Its incidence increases with age, and more men than women are affected [36]. CRC is a major cause of cancer-related death, ranking fourth after lung, liver and stomach cancer [37].

Risk factors for developing CRC are: obesity [38], consumption of red and highly processed meat [39], tobacco and alcohol use, a history of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) such as ulcerative colitis and Crohn's disease, a family history of inherited CRC, and syndromes such as familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP) or hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer (HNPCC) [40]. Vegetable consumption and physical activity are protective factors [41].

CRC can be screened in several ways [42, 43], the most commonly used method being the stool test, known as fecal occult blood test (FOBT). Variants of this test are the guaiac-based FOBT (gFOBT), the fecal immunochemical test (FIT) and the stool DNA test (sDNA).

In the event of positivity, flexible sigmoidoscopy (FS) or total colonoscopy (TC) can be performed [37]. Computed tomography (CT) scans (CT colonography, or CTC) can be used in those patients in whom TC is contraindicated or if it has not been possible to perform a complete TC [37].

Other tests, which are still experimental, are double-contrast barium enema (DCBE), colon capsule endoscopy (CCE) and high-resolution colonoscopy (HRC) [37]. The Epi proColon® 2.0 test (Epigenomics AG) is a highly sensitive and specific new-generation test; this assesses aberrant methylated patterns of the septin 9 gene, which is usually hypermethylated in CRC [44].

CRC screening should be started at the age of 50 years; subjects who are particularly at risk for CRC should be screened earlier and more frequently. According to the guidelines, screening options for eligible subjects include: FOBT every year; DCBE every 5 years; FS every 5 to 10 years, usually combined with FOBT every 1-3 years; virtual colonoscopy (VC) every 5 years; colonoscopy every 10 years. In the event of positivity, colonoscopy should be performed [37].

Adherence to the program is still low: for example, a recently published systematic review has found that in 2000, in the USA, only 34% of the population complied with CRC screening following the recommendations and guidelines [45]. It has been observed that doctors, particularly family doctors, play a major role in increas-

ing participation by discussing the benefits and usefulness of screening with their patients [46, 47].

High-quality CRC screening [48] has been seen to reduce the incidence of CRC by 33% and mortality due to CRC by 43% [36].

#### PREVENTION OF BREAST CANCER

Despite advances in treatment and diagnosis, breast cancer is still a serious Public Health concern [49], with 1,384,155 expected new cases worldwide and an estimated 459,000 deaths [49]. Moreover, both incidence and related mortality have increased by 18% since 2008. According to the ACS, breast cancer affects one in every eight women in the US. It is estimated that the annual global burden of breast cancer will reach 3.2 million new cases by 2050 [49].

Risk factors for developing a breast cancer include: breast size [50], lack of physical activity, overweight and obesity [51-53], infertility and nulliparity, first full-term pregnancy at the age of 30 years or later, early age on menarche, tobacco and alcohol use, hormone replacement therapy (HRT) such as oestrogen and progestin, exposure to diethylstilbestrol (DES), inherited genetic anomalies (BRCA1, BRCA2) [49, 53, 54], and Cowden and Li-Fraumeni syndrome [53, 54]. Breastfeeding and vegetable consumption are protective factors.

Mammography is the gold standard in early breast cancer detection; screening results are communicated by means of the highly standardized "breast imaging reporting and database system" (BI-RADS).

In 2009-2010, the US Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) issued new updated recommendations for routine mammography screening, after examining and comparatively assessing five different screening modalities: namely, screen-film two-dimensional (2D) mammography, clinical breast examination (CBE), breast self-examination (BSE), three-dimensional (3D) digital mammography (such as the Digital Breast Tomosynthesis, or DBT, recently approved by the Food and Drug Administration, FDA), and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) [55]. Other screening modalities, such as thermography, are still experimental, while tissue-sampling approaches (fine-needle aspiration, or FNA, nipple aspiration or ductal lavage) are usually used for diagnostic purposes only. The USPSTF recommended against routine mammographic screening in women aged 40-49 years, unless the patient's history suggested it and after careful assessment of the benefits and harm. Biennial mammographic screening was recommended for women aged 50-74 years; no evidence of additional benefits or harms emerged with regard to CBE, while BSE was advised against. The USPSTF called for further studies on the clinical usefulness of digital mammography and MRI.

By contrast, the American College of Radiology (ACR), the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) and the Society of Breast Imaging (SBI) calculated that mammography, if not performed in women aged 40-49 years, would miss 19-33% of cancers and would sacrifice 33 years of life per 1,000 women screened. These

agencies therefore recommended routine screening mammography commencing at the age of 40 years.

A mathematical model seems to support the opinion of the USPSTF [56], since including women in their 40s would increase the number of false-positive cases by 53%. One solution could be the use of ultrasonography [57], which would enable radiologists to detect additional 3-4 cancers per 1,000 high-risk women screened [48]. Moreover, MRI and ultrasound as supplemental screening techniques would be particularly useful for women with extremely dense breasts [48]. However, implementation of this policy should be carefully evaluated by means of a cost-effectiveness analysis, in order to develop the best strategy.

Despite these controversies, breast cancer screening has undoubtedly contributed to reducing cancer mortality by 30-50% [58]. In Italy, after the introduction of organized mammography screening, the IMPACT working group found a statistically significant, steady reduction in the incidence of late-stage breast cancer from the third year onward, with the incidence rate ratio (IRR) declining from 0.81 to 0.71 [59]. This decline was more evident in three regions: Liguria, Tuscany and Lombardy [60]. However, coverage remains low (69.1%) [61].

#### ANTI-CANCER VACCINES

There are two kinds of anti-cancer vaccines: preventive (or prophylactic) and therapeutic vaccines. The former include anti-HPV vaccines (Gardasil® and Cervarix®) for the prevention of cervical cancer [62, 63], and anti-HBV vaccines for the prevention of hepatocellular carcinoma [64]. The latter are whole cell-, protein- and peptide-, dendritic cell-, gene-, or idiotypic immunoglobulin-based vaccines [65].

Generally speaking, anti-cancer vaccines stimulate cytotoxic T lymphocytes (CTL) against tumor-associated antigens (TAA) or tumor-specific antigens (TSAs). Therapeutic anti-cancer vaccines have greatly benefited from forward vaccinology [66, 67], which uses advanced mass spectrometry (MS) approaches, thus enabling the design of customized vaccines. Currently, Oncophage® and Provenge® represent the two most successful approved anti-cancer vaccines.

The autologous heat shock protein (HSP)-based vaccine Oncophage® (HSP-peptide complex 96, HSPPC-96) was released in May 2008 in Russia for the treatment of kidney cancer patients at intermediate risk of disease recurrence. Clinical trials conducted among metastatic kidney cancer patients had shown a statistically significant improvement [68]. The second-generation autologous HSP-based vaccine, Vitespen®, a purified gp96-peptide complex, has yielded promising results in a variety of cancers, including CRC, glioblastoma, lung cancer, melanoma and renal cell carcinoma [69].

In April 2010, the FDA approved Sipuleucel-T (Provenge®, Dendreon) for metastatic prostate cancer [70]. This vaccine, which elicits CTLs against prostatic acid phosphatase (PAP), is obtained by using leukapheresis, isolating APCs and processing them with PAP

crosslinked to the granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor (GM-CSF).

Other approved cancer vaccines are Nivolumab (Opdivo®, formerly known as MDX-1106, recently approved for melanoma and squamous non-small cell lung cancer, currently under clinical trial for further malignancies, including CRC and brain cancer), Ipilimumab (Yervoy®, approved for melanoma, under trial for bladder and prostate cancer) and Gendicine® (approved by the Chinese State Food and Drug Administration or CSFDA for the head and neck squamous cell carcinoma).

Cancer vaccines currently under clinical trial include Tremelimumab (also known as Ticilimumab or CP-675,206, under trial for mesothelioma, bladder cancer), DCvax® (for astrocytoma), BiovaxID™ (Dasiprotimut-T, under trial for follicular lymphoma), ProstVac-VF®/Tricom™ (under trial for prostate cancer), PanVac-VF™ (a poxviral-based cancer vaccine containing transgenes for the epithelial mucin 1 and carcinoembryonic antigen or CEA, currently under clinical trial for a variety of cancers, including breast and pancreatic tumor), MVax® (under trial for melanoma), OncoVax® (under trial for CRC), Reniale® (under trial for renal cancer) and a glycoprotein-100 (gp100)-based vaccine against melanoma [65, 68], among others.

#### FUTURE SCREENING PROGRAMS

In many countries, screening tests are also performed for lung cancer, melanoma, prostatic, oral, pancreatic and ovarian cancers. However, their unstructured application has resulted in poor or insufficient scientific evidence [71]. For example, clinical trials such as the European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate (ERSSP) and the Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial (PLCO) [72] yielded conflicting results regarding the utility of Prostate Specific Antigen (PSA)-based screening for prostate cancer, since PSA has not proved superior to digital rectal examination (DRE) [71, 73]. We cannot, however, exclude the possibility that the introduction of more reliable biomarkers, such as MD-miniRNA, which could more effectively distinguish between prostatic hyperplasia and prostate cancer [74], will improve the efficacy of prostate cancer screening.

Further research and high-quality clinical trials are needed. The introduction of new screening programs should be considered only after a careful Health Technology Assessment (HTA) has been performed, and in the light of solid clinical recommendations in conformity with Evidence-Based Medicine (EBM) [75, 76].

#### FUTURE PROSPECTS AND CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, prevention programs are an important weapon in the fight against cancer, and currently available evidence shows that they can contribute to reducing both the incidence of cancer and mortality. However, adherence to screening programs remains an issue to be addressed, in that screening tests are still underused [77]. A promising solution could be to personalize screening.

Stratification for population-based risk-adjusted screening programs could be performed by using *ad hoc* risk models. Since cancer is indeed a common complex disease, screening programs could benefit from the use of genomic information, whilst this is generally not so helpful to diagnosis and prediction at the individual level [78]. It is anticipated that merging personal anamnestic data with those from clinical and radiological examinations will give rise to a new discipline, termed radiogenomics, which would optimize personalized medicine by correlating imaging with genetic information [79].

Another scientific hint of the utility of “population-based personalized screening” is the intrinsic biological and genetic difference between screening-detected cancers and interval cancers (that is to say, cancers arising during inter-screening intervals) [79]. Genomics-based stratification could indicate the optimal screening interval. For example, in the field of breast cancer screening, applying genomics and targeting subjects in the top 25% of the risk distribution would include approximately half of all future breast cancer cases [80]. Moreover, one mathematical model showed that a breast cancer screening program based on age and polygenic risk, and which targeted women aged 35-79 years, would reduce the number of false positives, and therefore of unnecessary biopsies and surgical procedures [81, 82].

In order to increase coverage, physicians should strongly recommend screening programs and discuss their patients' doubts and perceived psycho-social barriers [83, 84]. Advocacy could play a major role, and Public Health professionals should discourage opportunistic screening. On the other hand, researchers should develop and investigate new, more acceptable, less invasive tests [37].

New information and communication technologies (ICTs), such as smart-phone applications (known as *apps*), personalized short message services (SMS) and texting [85], could also help to promote adherence to programs. “Screening 2.0” is a great opportunity, which is still underused [86].

In sum, oncology has seen great changes in recent decades; together with improvements in diagnosis and treatment, prevention has played a major role in reducing both the incidence of tumors and mortality. Advances in technology and social media and the discovery of new biomarkers are expected to bring additional benefits.

## References

- [1] Vineis P, Wild CP. *Global cancer patterns: causes and prevention*. Lancet 2014;383:549-57.
- [2] Ehni HJ. *Expensive cancer drugs and just health care*. Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol 2014;28:327-37.
- [3] Nelson B. *Genomic medicine: a question of value: despite the promise of personalized medicine, genomic testing has yet to prove its cost-effectiveness*. Cancer Cytopathol 2014;122:557-8.
- [4] Terry PD, Miller AB, Rohan TE. *Cigarette smoking and breast cancer risk: a long latency period?* Int J Cancer 2002;100:723-8.
- [5] Islami F, Moreira DM, Boffetta P, et al. *A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Tobacco Use and Prostate Cancer Mortality and Incidence in Prospective Cohort Studies*. Eur Urol 2014;66:1054-64.
- [6] Kamper-Jørgensen M, Rostgaard K, Glaser SL, et al. *Cigarette smoking and risk of Hodgkin lymphoma and its subtypes: a pooled analysis from the International Lymphoma Epidemiology Consortium (InterLymph)*. Ann Oncol 2013;24:2245-55.
- [7] Samet JM. *Tobacco smoking: the leading cause of preventable disease worldwide*. Thorac Surg Clin 2013;23:103-12.
- [8] Cruzado J, Sánchez FI, Abellán JM, et al. *Economic evaluation of colorectal cancer (CRC) screening*. Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol 2013;27:867-80.
- [9] Jeong KE, Cairns JA. *Review of economic evidence in the prevention and early detection of colorectal cancer*. Health Econ Rev 2013;3:20.
- [10] Bulliard JL. *Estimating the cost-effectiveness of modern screening mammography programmes*. Evid Based Med 2014;19:80.
- [11] C Kitchener H, Canfell K, Gilham C, et al. *The clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of primary human papillomavirus cervical screening in England: extended follow-up of the ARTISTIC randomised trial cohort through three screening rounds*. Health Technol Assess 2014;18:1-196.
- [12] Giorgi Rossi P, Baldacchini F, Ronco G. *The Possible Effects on Socio-Economic Inequalities of Introducing HPV Testing as Primary Test in Cervical Cancer Screening Programs*. Front Oncol 2014;4:20.
- [13] Wild CP, Bucher JR, de Jong BW, et al. *Translational cancer research: balancing prevention and treatment to combat cancer globally*. J Natl Cancer Inst 2014;107:353.
- [14] Khaw KT. *Rose's Strategy of Preventive Medicine*. Oxford, US: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [15] Flores M, Glusman G, Brogaard K, et al. *P4 medicine: how systems medicine will transform the healthcare sector and society*. Per Med 2013;10:565-76.
- [16] Tian Q, Price ND, Hood L. *Systems cancer medicine: towards realization of predictive, preventive, personalized and participatory (P4) medicine*. J Intern Med 2012;271:111-21.
- [17] Greene RA, Dasso E, Ho S, et al. *A person-focused model of care for the twenty-first century: a system-of-systems perspective*. Popul Health Manag 2014;17:166-71.
- [18] Tien JM, Goldschmidt-Clermont PJ. *Engineering healthcare as a service system*. Stud Health Technol Inform 2010;153:277-97.
- [19] Giorgi Rossi P, Federici A, Zappa M. *The cancer screening monitoring system: indicators for organised programmes and possible extension to spontaneous screening*. Pathologica 2013;105:83-5.
- [20] Carlos RC, Fendrick AM. *Improving cancer screening adherence: using the “teachable moment” as a delivery setting for educational interventions*. Am J Manag Care 2004;10:247-8.
- [21] McGraw SL, Ferrante JM. *Update on prevention and screening of cervical cancer*. World J Clin Oncol 2014;5:744-52.
- [22] Köse FM, Naki MM. *Cervical premalignant lesions and their management*. J Turk Ger Gynecol Assoc 2014;15:109-21.
- [23] Aggarwal P. *Cervical cancer: Can it be prevented?* World J Clin Oncol 2014;5:775-80.
- [24] Lee SH, Vigliotti JS, Vigliotti VS, et al. *From Human Papillomavirus (HPV) Detection to Cervical Cancer Prevention in Clinical Practice*. Cancers (Basel) 2014;6:2072-99.
- [25] Chen W, Jeronimo J, Zhao FH, et al. *The concordance of HPV DNA detection by Hybrid Capture 2 and careHPV on clinician- and self-collected specimens*. J Clin Virol 2014;61:553-7.
- [26] Sørbye SW, Fismen S, Gutteberg TJ, et al. *HPV mRNA Is More Specific than HPV DNA in Triage of Women with Minor Cervical Lesions*. PLoS One 2014;9:e112934.
- [27] Burger EA, Kornør H, Klemp M, et al. *HPV mRNA tests for the detection of cervical intraepithelial neoplasia: a systematic review*. Gynecol Oncol 2011;120:430-8.
- [28] Tota JE, Ramana-Kumar AV, El-Khatib Z, et al. *The road ahead for cervical cancer prevention and control*. Curr Oncol 2014;21:e255-64.

- [29] Arbyn M, Anttila A, Jordan J, et al. *European Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Cervical Cancer Screening. Second edition – summary document*. Ann Oncol 2010;21:448-58.
- [30] Haugdsdal ML, Ryan GL. *HPV and Cervical Dysplasia in Adolescents: A Progressive March Toward Prevention*. J Pediatr Adolesc Gynecol 2014 May 24. pii: S1083-3188(14)00209-5. doi: 10.1016/j.jpap.2014.05.002 [Epub ahead of print].
- [31] Ronco G, Dillner J, Elfström KM, et al. *Efficacy of HPV-based screening for prevention of invasive cervical cancer: follow-up of four European randomised controlled trials*. Lancet 2014;383:524-32.
- [32] Nahvijou A, Hadji M, Marnani AB, et al. *A systematic review of economic aspects of cervical cancer screening strategies worldwide: discrepancy between economic analysis and policymaking*. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2014;15:8229-37.
- [33] Berardi R, Nacciarriti D, Tamburrano T, et al. *Compliance with breast and cervical cancer screening programs in women: results from a population-based study*. Tumori 2013;99:565-71.
- [34] Limmer K, LoBiondo-Wood G, Dains J. *Predictors of cervical cancer screening adherence in the United States: a systematic review*. J Adv Pract Oncol 2014;5:31-41.
- [35] Giorgi Rossi P, Caroli S, Mancini S, et al. *Screening history of cervical cancers in Emilia-Romagna, Italy: defining priorities to improve cervical cancer screening*. Eur J Cancer Prev 2015;24:128-34.
- [36] Tárraga López PJ, Albero JS, Rodríguez-Montes JA. *Primary and secondary prevention of colorectal cancer*. Clin Med Insights Gastroenterol 2014;7:33-46.
- [37] Stracci F, Zorzi M, Grazzini G. *Colorectal cancer screening: tests, strategies, and perspectives*. Front Public Health 2014;2:210.
- [38] Joshi RK, Lee SA. *Obesity related adipokines and colorectal cancer: a review and meta-analysis*. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2014;15:397-405.
- [39] Kim E, Coelho D, Blachier F. *Review of the association between meat consumption and risk of colorectal cancer*. Nutr Res 2013;33:983-94.
- [40] Brenner H, Kloor M, Pox CP. *Colorectal cancer*. Lancet 2014;383:1490-502.
- [41] Tse G, Eslick GD. *Cruciferous vegetables and risk of colorectal neoplasms: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. Nutr Cancer 2014;66:128-39.
- [42] Atkin W. *Options for screening for colorectal cancer*. Scand J Gastroenterol Suppl 2003;38:13-6.
- [43] Döbrössy L, Kovács A, Cornides A, et al. *Factors influencing the participation in colorectal screening*. Orv Hetil 2014;155:1051-6.
- [44] Molnár B, Tóth K, Barták BK, et al. *Plasma methylated septin 9: a colorectal cancer screening marker*. Expert Rev Mol Diagn 2015;15:171-84.
- [45] Subramanian S, Klosterman M, Amonkar MM, et al. *Adherence with colorectal cancer screening guidelines: a review*. Prev Med 2004;38:536-50.
- [46] Schneider TR, Feufel MA, Berkel HJ. *Promoting colorectal cancer screening in public health outreach campaigns*. Hum Factors 2011;53:637-46.
- [47] Zorzi M, Senore C, Da Re F, et al. *Quality of colonoscopy in an organised colorectal cancer screening programme with immunochemical faecal occult blood test: the EQuIPE study (Evaluating Quality Indicators of the Performance of Endoscopy)*. Gut 2014 Sep 16. pii: gutjnl-2014-307954. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2014-307954. [Epub ahead of print].
- [48] Gucaip A, Gupta GP, Pilewskie ML, et al. *Advances in managing breast cancer: a clinical update*. F1000Prime Rep 2014;6:66.
- [49] Tao Z, Shi A, Lu C, et al. *Breast Cancer: Epidemiology and Etiology*. Cell Biochem Biophys 2014 Dec 28. [Epub ahead of print]
- [50] Jansen LA, Backstein RM, Brown MH. *Breast size and breast cancer: A systematic review*. J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg 2014;67:1615-23.
- [51] Kruk J. *Overweight, obesity, oxidative stress and the risk of breast cancer*. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2014;15:9579-86.
- [52] Xia X, Chen W, Li J, et al. *Body mass index and risk of breast cancer: a nonlinear dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies*. Sci Rep 2014;4:7480.
- [53] Larsen MJ, Thomassen M, Gerdes AM, et al. *Hereditary breast cancer: clinical, pathological and molecular characteristics*. Breast Cancer (Auckl) 2014;8:145-55.
- [54] Donepudi MS, Kondapalli K, Amos SJ, et al. *Breast cancer statistics and markers*. J Cancer Res Ther 2014;10:506-11.
- [55] Gregory KD, Sawaya GF. *Updated recommendations for breast cancer screening*. Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol 2010;22:498-505.
- [56] Tsunematsu M, Kakehashi M. *An analysis of mass screening strategies using a mathematical model: comparison of breast cancer screening in Japan and the United States*. J Epidemiol 2015;25:162-71.
- [57] Jimmy O, Kisembo H, Bugeza S, et al. *Breast cancer detection using sonography in women with mammographically dense breasts*. BMC Med Imaging 2014;14:241.
- [58] Feig SA. *Screening mammography benefit controversies: sorting the evidence*. Radiol Clin North Am 2014;52:455-80.
- [59] Foca F, Mancini S, Bucchi L, et al. *Decreasing incidence of late-stage breast cancer after the introduction of organized mammography screening in Italy*. Cancer 2013;119:2022-8.
- [60] Gorini G, Zappa M, Cortini B, et al. *Breast cancer mortality trends in Italy by region and screening programme, 1980-2008*. J Med Screen 2014;21:189-93.
- [61] Altobelli E, Lattanzi A. *Breast cancer in European Union: an update of screening programmes as of March 2014 (review)*. Int J Oncol 2014;45:1785-92.
- [62] Bonanni P, Levi M, Latham NB, et al. *An overview on the implementation of HPV vaccination in Europe*. Hum Vaccin 2011;7(Suppl):128-35.
- [63] Guzzetta G, Faustini L, Panatto D, et al. *The impact of HPV female immunization in Italy: model based predictions*. PLoS One 2014;9:e91698.28-35.
- [64] Lu T, Seto WK, Zhu RX, et al. *Prevention of hepatocellular carcinoma in chronic viral hepatitis B and C infection*. World J Gastroenterol 2013;19:8887-94.
- [65] Hammerstrom AE, Cauley DH, Atkinson BJ, et al. *Cancer immunotherapy: sipuleucel-T and beyond*. Pharmacotherapy 2011;31:813-28.
- [66] Reinherz EL, Keskin DB, Reinhold B. *Forward Vaccinology: CTL Targeting Based upon Physical Detection of HLA-Bound Peptides*. Front Immunol 2014;5:418.
- [67] Overwijk WW, Wang E, Marincola FM, et al. *Mining the mutantome: developing highly personalized Immunotherapies based on mutational analysis of tumors*. J Immunother Cancer 2013;1:11.
- [68] Itoh K, Yamada A, Mine T, et al. *Recent advances in cancer vaccines: an overview*. Jpn J Clin Oncol 2009;39:73-80.
- [69] Wood CG, Mulders P. *Vitespen: a preclinical and clinical review*. Future Oncol 2009;5:763-74.
- [70] Singh BH, Gulley JL. *Therapeutic vaccines as a promising treatment modality against prostate cancer: rationale and recent advances*. Ther Adv Vaccines 2014;2:137-48.
- [71] Stone NN, Crawford ED. *To screen or not to screen: the prostate cancer dilemma*. Asian J Androl 2015;17:44-5.
- [72] Andriole GL, Crawford ED, Grubb RL 3<sup>rd</sup>, et al. *Prostate cancer screening in the randomized Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial: mortality results after 13 years of follow-up*. J Natl Cancer Inst 2012;104:125-32.
- [73] Hayes JH, Barry MJ. *Screening for prostate cancer with the*

*prostate-specific antigen test: a review of current evidence.* JAMA 2014;311:1143-9.

- [74] Xue D, Zhou C, Shi Y, et al. *MD-miniRNA could be a more accurate biomarker for prostate cancer screening compared with serum prostate-specific antigen level.* Tumour Biol 2015 Jan 5. [Epub ahead of print]
- [75] Verbeek AL, van Dijck JA, Kiemeny LA, et al. *Responsible cancer screening.* Ned Tijdschr Geneesk 2011;155:A3934.
- [76] Adriaensen WJ, Matheï C, Buntinx FJ, et al. *A framework provided an outline toward the proper evaluation of potential screening strategies.* J Clin Epidemiol 2013;66:639-47.
- [77] Rossi PG, Camilloni L, Cogo C, et al. *Methods to increase participation in cancer screening programmes.* Epidemiol Prev 2012;36:1-104.
- [78] Khoury MJ, Janssens AC, Ransohoff DF. *How can polygenic inheritance be used in population screening for common diseases?* Genet Med 2013;15:437-43.
- [79] Li J, Holm J, Bergh J, et al. *Breast cancer genetic risk profile is differentially associated with interval and screen-detected breast cancers.* Ann Oncol 2015;26:517-22.
- [80] Sieh W, Rothstein JH, McGuire V, et al. *The role of genome sequencing in personalized breast cancer prevention.* Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2014;23:2322-7.
- [81] Pashayan N, Guo Q, Pharoah PD. *Personalized screening for cancers: should we consider polygenic profiling?* Per Med 2013;10.
- [82] Burton H, Sagoo GS, Pharoah P, et al. *Time to revisit Geoffrey Rose: strategies for prevention in the genomic era?* Italian Journal of Public Health 2011;9:e8665.
- [83] Bukowska-Durawa A, Luszczynska A. *Cervical cancer screening and psychosocial barriers perceived by patients. A systematic review.* Contemp Oncol (Pozn) 2014;18:153-9.
- [84] Harvey SC, Vegesna A, Mass S, et al. *Understanding patient options, utilization patterns, and burdens associated with breast cancer screening.* J Womens Health (Larchmt) 2014;23(Suppl 1):S3-9.
- [85] Lakkis NA, Atfeh AM, El-Zein YR, et al. *The effect of two types of sms-texts on the uptake of screening mammogram: a randomized controlled trial.* Prev Med 2011;53:325-7.
- [86] Bender JL, Yue RY, To MJ, et al. *A lot of action, but not in the right direction: systematic review and content analysis of smartphone applications for the prevention, detection, and management of cancer.* J Med Internet Res 2013;15:e287.

## Abbreviations

2D: two-dimensional; 3D: three-dimensional; ACIP: Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices; ACOG: American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists; ACR: American College of Radiology; ACS: American Cancer Society; APCs: Antigen Presenting Cells; apps: applications for smart-phones and mobile devices; ASCO: American Society of Clinical Oncology; ASCUS: atypical cells of undetermined significance; ASTs: Automated Screening Technologies; BRCA1: Breast Cancer Type 1 susceptibility protein; BRCA2: Breast Cancer Type 2 susceptibility protein; BSE: Breast Self-Examination; CAS: Complex Adaptive System; CBE: clinical breast examination; CCE: colon capsule endoscopy; CDC: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; CEA: carcinoembryonic antigen; CRC: Colorectal Cancer; CSFDA: Chinese State Food and Drug Administration; CT: computed tomography; CTC: CT colonography; CTLs: Cytotoxic T Lymphocytes; DBT: Digital Breast Tomosynthesis; DCBE: Double-Contrast Barium Enema; DES: Diethylstilbestrol; DNA: deoxyribonucleic acid; DRE: digital rectal examination; DVI: direct visual inspection; EBM: Evidence-Based Medicine; ERSSP: European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate; FAP: familial adenomatous polyposis; FDA: Food and Drug Administration; FIT: fecal immunochemical test; FNA: fine-needle aspiration; FOBT: fecal occult blood test; FS: flexible sigmoidoscopy; gFOBT: guaiac-based FOBT; GM-CSF: granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor; HBV: Hepatitis B Virus; HC2: Hybrid Capture 2; HCV: Hepatitis C Virus; HIV: Human Immunodeficiency Virus; HNPCC: hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer; HPV: Human Papillomavirus; HRC: High-Resolution Colonoscopy; HRT: Hormone Replacement Therapy; HSP: Heat-Shock Protein; HSPPC-96: HSP-peptide complex 96; HTA: Health Technology Assessment; HTTs: High-Throughput Technologies; IBD: inflammatory bowel disease; ICTs: Information and Communication Technologies; IRR: incidence rate ratio; LBC: Liquid-Based Cytology; LMICs: Low and Middle Income Countries; mRNA: messenger RNA; NCDs: non-communicable diseases; P4 Medicine: predictive, preventive, personalized and participatory medicine; PAP: prostatic acid phosphatase; Pap smear: Papanicolaou smear; PLCO: Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial; PSA: Prostatic Specific Antigen; RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial; SBI: Society of Breast Imaging; sDNA: stool DNA; SMS: Short Message Service; SoSs: System of Systems; STD: Sexually Transmitted Disease; US: United States of America; USPSTF: US Preventive Services Task Force; TC: total colonoscopy; TAAs: Tumor-Associated Antigens; TSA: Tumor-Specific Antigens; VC: Virtual Colonoscopy; VIA: visual inspection using 3%-5% acetic acid; VIAM: visual inspection using 3%-5% acetic acid and magnification; VILI: visual inspection using Lugol's iodine.

■ Received on January 8, 2015. Accepted on February 10, 2015.

■ Correspondence: Ivana Valle, SSD "Popolazione a rischio", Health Prevention Department, Local Health Unit ASL 3, via B. Agnese 1/c, 16151 Genova, Italy - Tel. +39 010 8498982 - Fax: +39 010 8499055 - E-mail: ivana.valle@asl3.liguria.it