# Screening for Pancreatic Cancer

### **Recommendation Statement**

## U.S. Preventive Services Task Force

This statement summarizes the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) recommendations on screening for pancreatic cancer and the supporting scientific evidence, and updates the 1996 recommendations contained in the Guide to Clinical Preventive Services, second edition. In 1996, the USPSTF recommended against screening for pancreatic cancer (D recommendation).1 Since then, the USPSTF criteria to rate the strength of the evidence have changed.2 Therefore, this recommendation statement has been updated and revised based on the current USPSTF methodology and rating of the strength of the evidence. Explanations of the current Task Force ratings and of the strength of overall evidence are given in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively.

The complete information on which this statement is based, including evidence tables and references, is available in the brief evidence update<sup>3</sup> on this topic, on the USPSTF Web site (www.preventiveservices.ahrq.gov). The recommendation statement and brief evidence update are also available in print from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Publications Clearinghouse (call 1-800-358-9295, or e-mail ahrqpubs@ahrq.gov). The recommendation is also posted on the Web site of the National Guideline Clearinghouse<sup>TM</sup> (www.guideline.gov).

Recommendations made by the USPSTF are independent of the U.S. Government. They should not be construed as an official position of AHRQ or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

# Summary of Recommendation

The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) recommends against routine screening for pancreatic cancer in asymptomatic adults using abdominal palpation, ultrasonography, or serologic markers. **D recommendation.** 

The USPSTF found no evidence that screening for pancreatic cancer is effective in reducing mortality. There is a potential for significant harm because of the very low prevalence of pancreatic cancer, limited accuracy of available screening tests, the invasive nature of diagnostic tests, and the poor outcomes of treatment. As a result, the USPSTF concluded that the harms of screening for pancreatic cancer exceed any potential benefits.

### **Clinical Considerations**

- Because of the poor prognosis of those diagnosed with pancreatic cancer, there is an interest in primary prevention. The evidence for diet-based prevention of pancreatic cancer is limited and conflicting. Some experts recommend lifestyle changes that may help to prevent pancreatic cancer, such as stopping the use of tobacco products, moderating alcohol intake, and eating a balanced diet with sufficient fruit and vegetables.
- Persons with hereditary pancreatitis may have a higher lifetime risk for developing pancreatic cancer.<sup>4</sup> However, the USPSTF did not review the effectiveness of screening these patients.

Corresponding Author: Ned Calonge, MD, MPH, Chair, U.S. Preventive Services Task Force, c/o Program Director, USPSTF, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 540 Gaither Road, Rockville, MD 20850, e-mail: uspstf@ahrq.gov.

## References

- U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Guide to Clinical Preventive Services. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion; 1996.
- Harris RP, Helfand M, Woolf SH, et al; Methods Work Group, Third U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Current methods of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force: a review of the process. *Am J Prev Med.* 2001;20(3S):21–35.
- 3. Screening for pancreatic cancer: a brief evidence update for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; February 2004. Available at: http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/3rduspstf/pancreatic/pancreup.htm.
- 4. Lowenfels AB, Maisonneuve P, DiMagno EP, et al. Hereditary pancreatitis and the risk of pancreatic cancer. International Hereditary Pancreatitis Study Group. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 1997; 89:442–446.

# Appendix A U.S. Preventive Services Task Force—Recommendations and Ratings

The Task Force grades its recommendations according to one of 5 classifications (A, B, C, D, I) reflecting the strength of evidence and magnitude of net benefit (benefits minus harms):

- **A.** The USPSTF strongly recommends that clinicians provide [the service] to eligible patients. The USPSTF found good evidence that [the service] improves important health outcomes and concludes that benefits substantially outweigh harms.
- **B.** The USPSTF recommends that clinicians provide [the service] to eligible patients. The USPSTF found at least fair evidence that [the service] improves important health outcomes and concludes that benefits outweigh harms.
- **C.** The USPSTF makes no recommendation for or against routine provision of [the service]. The USPSTF found at least fair evidence that [the service] can improve health outcomes but concludes that the balance of benefits and harms is too close to justify a general recommendation.
- **D.** The USPSTF recommends against routinely providing [the service] to asymptomatic patients. The USPSTF found at least fair evidence that [the service] is ineffective or that harms outweigh benefits.
- I. The USPSTF concludes that the evidence is insufficient to recommend for or against routinely providing [the service]. Evidence that [the service] is effective is lacking, of poor quality, or conflicting and the balance of benefits and harms cannot be determined.

# Appendix B U.S. Preventive Services Task Force—Strength of Overall Evidence

#### The USPSTF grades the quality of the overall evidence for a service on a 3-point scale (good, fair, poor):

- **Good:** Evidence includes consistent results from well-designed, well-conducted studies in representative populations that directly assess effects on health outcomes.
- **Fair:** Evidence is sufficient to determine effects on health outcomes, but the strength of the evidence is limited by the number, quality, or consistency of the individual studies, generalizability to routine practice, or indirect nature of the evidence on health outcomes.
- **Poor:** Evidence is insufficient to assess the effects on health outcomes because of limited number or power of studies, important flaws in their design or conduct, gaps in the chain of evidence, or lack of information on important health outcomes.

#### Members of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force\*

Alfred O. Berg, MD, MPH, Chair, USPSTF (Professor and Chair, Department of Family Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA)

Janet D. Allan, PhD, RN, CS, Vicechair, USPSTF (Dean, School of Nursing, University of Maryland, Baltimore, Baltimore, MD)

Ned Calonge, MD, MPH (Acting Chief Medical Officer and State Epidemiologist, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Denver. CO)

Paul S. Frame, MD (Family Physician, Tri-County Family Medicine, Cohocton, NY, and Clinical Professor of Family Medicine, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY)

**Joxel Garcia, MD, MBA** (Deputy Director, Pan American Health Organization, Washington, DC) Leon Gordis, MD, MPH, DrPH (Professor, Epidemiology Department, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD)

Russell Harris, MD, MPH (Associate Professor of Medicine, Sheps Center for Health Services Research, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, NC)

Mark S. Johnson, MD, MPH (Professor and Chair, Department of Family Medicine, University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey-New Jersey Medical School, Newark, NI)

Jonathan D. Klein, MD, MPH (Associate Professor, Department of Pediatrics, University of Rochester School of Medicine, Rochester, NY) Carol Loveland-Cherry, PhD, RN (Executive Associate Dean, Office of Academic Affairs, University of Michigan School of Nursing, Ann Arbor, MI)

Virginia A. Moyer, MD, MPH (Professor, Department of Pediatrics, University of Texas Health Science Center, Houston, TX)

Judith K. Ockene, PhD (Professor of Medicine and Chief of Division of Preventive and Behavioral Medicine, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA)

**C. Tracy Orleans, PhD** (Senior Scientist, The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Princeton, NJ)

Albert L. Siu, MD, MSPH (Professor and Chairman, Brookdale Department of Geriatrics and Adult Development, Mount Sinai Medical Center, New York, NY)

Steven M. Teutsch, MD, MPH (Executive Director, Outcomes Research and Management, Merck & Company, Inc., West Point, PA)

Carolyn Westhoff, MD, MSc (Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Professor of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY)

\*Members of the Task Force at the time this recommendation was finalized. For a list of current Task Force members, go to www.ahrq.gov/clinic/uspstfab.htm.

