

Re: fibrocystic beast

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.med/2005-12/msg00192.html>

- *From:* "fresh~horses" <fresh-horses@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 16 Dec 2005 12:18:29 -0800
-

bae@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

> In article <1134696797.239573.117100@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
> fresh~horses <fresh-horses@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> > bae@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:
> > > In article <fC9of.37628\$tV6.31128@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
> > > REP <rep@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Mammograms aren't nearly that painful, even with a cyst. Uncomfortable,
> > > > yes; but not actually painful.
> > > >
> > > I thought so too, and had had several uncomfortable but not painful
> > > mammograms, and figured that people who complained about how painful
> > > they are just had low pain thresholds. Then I had one that really hurt.
> > > >
> > > I think some technicians just have bad technique. So if a person has
> > > a painful mammogram, they shouldn't assume the next one is going to
> > > be painful as well. But if you have fibrocystic breasts, it's probably
> > > a good idea to schedule your mammograms, if possible, for the time of
> > > month when your breasts are least tender.
> > > >
> > > At any rate, a few minutes of pain is worth it if it means detecting a
> > > cancer at an early, curable stage.
> > > >
> > > ~~~~~
> > > >
> > > >
> > > ><<At any rate, a few minutes of pain is worth it if it means detecting a
> > > > cancer at an early, curable stage.>>
> > > >
> > > > I don't think, with the best treatments available today, that the above
> > > > statement is accurate.
> > > >
> > > > What, it never happens that a tumor is detected, removed and never recurs
> > > > for the rest of the person's life? Of course that isn't always the case,
> > > > but it often is.
> > > >
> > > > Or you don't think it's accurate that I am willing to undergo a few
> > > > minutes of pain to increase the probability that a cancer I may develop

Re: fibrocystic breast

> is detected early when it may be curable? Well, I am, and many women
> are. Do I think regular mammograms are a guarantee that I won't die of
> breast cancer? Of course not. They have a good chance of reducing that
> risk for people with my risk factors, however.
>
>>"While 96 percent of women diagnosed at a localized stage are alive
>>five years after diagnosis, this does not mean that these women have
>>been cured of breast cancer.1
>
> Well, what percentage would be alive 5 years later if they weren't
> diagnosed at a localized stage? Less than 96%? A 96% chance of at
> least five more years of life sounds good to me.
>
>>Being cancer-free for five years following diagnosis is accurately
>>considered a cure for some cancers. But breast cancer is an exception:
>>it can and does recur at any time, though the likelihood of recurrence
>>is highest in the first two years following treatment, and declines
>>over time.
>
> That's okay. If early detection gives me 5, 10, 20 years of apparent
> absence of the disease before it recurs, that's a win, too. Note that
> most people who get cancer are elderly, so if early detection and treatment
> prevents recurrence before something else kills them, whether they were
> "cured" or not gets kind of hard to define.
>
>>Breast cancer awareness campaigns urging women to have yearly
>>mammograms are based on the premise that breast cancer found early can
>>always be effectively treated.
>
> That 'always' is a red flag, you know. Somebody is about to engage in
> some misleading word juggling. I really doubt anybody is claiming that
> early detection always guarantees cure.
>
>>But the complex biology of breast cancer
>>means that women diagnosed with "early" breast cancer fall into one
>>of three groups. One group has very aggressive disease that, no matter
>>how small it is when it is found, cannot be effectively treated with
>>the therapies that are currently available. These women will die of
>>breast cancer eventually, no matter what treatment they are given,
>>unless they die of something else first.
>
> Perhaps early detection and treatment will prolong their lives. Even a
> few years can make a big difference when you are raising children.
>
> AFAIK, this is a relatively small subset, of mainly pre-menopausal women
> who are not good candidates for mammographic screening anyway. Most breast
> cancer occurs in post-menopausal women, IIRC, more than half in women
> over 70 years old.
>
>>Another group of women diagnosed with breast cancer has a type of
>>either non-aggressive (indolent) invasive disease or a form of DCIS

Re: fibrocystic breast

Re: fibrocystic breast

- >>(ductal carcinoma in situ) that will never be life threatening.
- >
- > Okay.
- >
- >>The third group has a type of breast cancer that responds to currently
- >>available treatments. Finding breast cancer earlier does increase the
- >>likelihood that treatment will work for women in this group."
- >
- > This is good news -- mammography can save or prolong these people's
- > lives.
- >
- > But the information you are leaving out is what fraction of breast
- > cancer falls into each of these categories. If I am going to be in the
- > third category, I want to find out as early as possible if I develop a
- > breast tumor. It's very misleading not to state what fraction of
- > cancers detected by mammogram fall into each category.
- >
- > Note that only about 30% of people diagnosed with breast cancer die
- > of it, so about 70% either have a so-called non-threatening form,
- > have a treatable form and are successfully treated for it, or die of
- > something else before their cancer can kill them. Some of the 30%
- > may have an aggressive form that doesn't respond well to treatment,
- > while others might have been more successfully treated if their cancer
- > was detected earlier.
- >
- > There's also the assumption here that 'cure' is everything. Current
- > treatments can produce remissions that last years or even decades.
- > This sounds a lot better than death within a year or two to me.
- >
- > It looks like this "Breast Cancer Action" outfit has an agenda. The
- > agenda appears to be that nothing anybody does has any effect on risk
- > or prognosis of breast cancer, because it's all caused by evil
- > chemicals, so mammography is a scam, avoiding known risk factors is a
- > scam, making an effort to detect breast cancer early is pointless
- > because for some people it doesn't guarantee survival, in the absence
- > of a certified bona-fide Cure things that prolong life, even by many
- > years, are wrong or worthless or futile, etc.

<< It's okay to have an agenda, but to push it by misleading language is dishonest.

Since that's just what you have done here in a spectacular demonstration of hypocrisy and distortion, I won't bother with further comment to you.

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ **Re: fibrocystic beast**
 - ◇ *From:* bae

- *References:*
 - ◆ **fibrocystic beast**
 - ◇ *From:* amanda
 - ◆ **Re: fibrocystic beast**
 - ◇ *From:* REP
 - ◆ **Re: fibrocystic beast**
 - ◇ *From:* bae
 - ◆ **Re: fibrocystic beast**
 - ◇ *From:* fresh~horses
 - ◆ **Re: fibrocystic beast**
 - ◇ *From:* bae

- Prev by Date: **Re: fibrocystic beast**
- Next by Date: **Re: fibrocystic beast**
- Previous by thread: **Re: fibrocystic beast**
- Next by thread: **Re: fibrocystic beast**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**