

Appendix 4 (as supplied by the authors): Recalculation of Corresponding Risk for Age Subgroups

****Sub-groups for age were not credible (i.e. not statistically significant), must apply 'All Ages' RR across different baseline risks (based on age) to calculate corresponding risk (1,2)**

SHORT-CASE ACCRUAL

		<u>Assumed Risk per 100,000</u> <u>(taken from SoF table per age group)</u>	<u>Relative Risk (95%CI) of 'All Ages'</u>	<u>Corresponding Risk per 100,000</u>	<u>Absolute Effect (95%CI) per 100,000</u>
40-49		385 per 100,000	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	327 per 100,000 (300 to 358)	58 fewer (from 27 fewer to 85 fewer)
50-59	Low Risk	309 per 100,000	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	263 per 100,000 (241 to 287)	46 fewer (from 22 fewer to 68 fewer)
	Moderate Risk	500 per 100,000	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	425 per 100,000 (390 to 465)	75 fewer (from 35 fewer to 110 fewer)
	High Risk	858 per 100,000	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	729 per 100,000 (669 to 798)	129 fewer (from 60 fewer to 189 fewer)
60-69		615 per 100,000	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	523 per 100,000 (480 to 572)	92 fewer (from 43 fewer to 135 fewer)
70-74		1,031 per 100,000	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	876 per 100,000 (804 to 959)	155 fewer (from 72 fewer to 227 fewer)

Calculation: assumed risk x relative risk = corresponding risk

Ex: $385 \times 0.85 = 327$;
 95%CI: $385 \times 0.78 = 300$;
 $385 \times 0.93 = 358$

Calculation: Assumed risk - corresponding risk = absolute effect

$385 - 327 = 58$;
 95% CI: $385 - 358 = 27$; $385 - 300 = 85$

- Barbeau P, Stevens A, Beck A, Skidmore B, Arnaout A, Brackstone B, Ginty A, Hey A, Hutton B, Shea B, Moher D, Little J.(2017)

NNS- SHORT-CASE ACCRUAL (to replace those in final report in the GRADE Summary of Findings table- last column) (3)

	Risk Difference	Risk Ratio (CI)	Lives Saved per hundred thousand	Number Needed to Screen (CI)
40-49	0.00058	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	58	1,724 (1,176 to 3,704)
50-59 (Low)	0.00046	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	46	2,174 (1,471 to 4,545)
50-59 (Moderate)	0.00075	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	75	1,333 (909 to 2,857)
50-59 (High)	0.00129	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	129	775 (529 to 1,667)
60-69	0.00092	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	92	1,087 (741 to 2,326)
70-74	0.00155	0.85 (0.78-0.93)	155	645 (441 to 1,389)

Process for calculation

Risk Ratio	Take from meta-analysis.
Risk Difference	From the GRADE SoF table, subtract Assumed Risks (control) and Corresponding Risks (Screening) /1,00,000
Lives Saved per Million	From the GRADE SoF table, subtract Assumed Risks (control) and Corresponding Risks (Screening)
Numbers Needed to Screen	100,000/lives saved per hundred thousand

Appendix IV Reference List

- (1) Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al. GRADE Work Group. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence – inconsistency. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64:1294-1302.
- (2) Sun X, Ioannidis PA, Agoritas T, et al. How to use a subgroup analysis: users' guide to the medical literature. *JAMA* 2014;311:405-11.
- (3) Barbeau P, Stevens A, Beck A, et al. Breast Cancer Screening: Part A. An evidence report to inform an update of the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care 2011 Guideline (Prepared by the Knowledge Synthesis Group, Ottawa Methods Centre, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute for the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care under contract by the Public Health Agency of Canada). CTFPHC; October 2017. Available: www.canadiantaskforce.ca (accessed 2017 Oct 9).